UC Santa Cruz

UC Santa Cruz Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Pentecostal Missionary Training: Cultivating Body Logics, Converting Missionaries, Building A Movement

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5q36t6j9

Author

Brahinsky, Joshua

Publication Date

2014

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SANTA CRUZ

PENTECOSTAL MISSIONARY TRAINING: CULTIVATING BODY LOGICS, CONVERTING MISSIONARIES, BUILDING A MOVEMENT

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

HISTORY OF CONSCIOUSNESS
with an emphasis in
ANTHROPOLOGY

by

Josh Brahinsky

December 2014

The Dissertation of Josh Brahinsky
is approved:

_____
Professor Barbara Epstein, Chair

_____
Professor James Clifford

_____
Professor Susan Harding

_____
Professor Marilyn Westerkamp

_____
Professor Jon Bialecki

_____
Tyrus Miller
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Copyright © by

Josh Brahinsky

2014

Table Of Contents

Introduction: Pentecostal Missionary Training……..…… 1
Anthropology and Organizing – Cultivation – Cultivation Matters: Sensoriums Change – Reciprocity: Missionary Conversions Coming Back Home – Cultivating Discontinuity as Mobilization Philosophy – Methodology: Ethnography – Methodology: An Anthropology of the Senses, Towards a Theory of Cultivation – Chapter Outlines

Preface: Notes on the History and Historiography of Pentecostal Mission……. 27
Early History – Pentecostal Emergence: Chaos Within Order – The Assemblies of God – Why Do They Grow?

Section I: Reciprocity

Chapter I: The Effects of Missionary Conversion: Transforming Pentecostals from Fundamentalist to Evangelical…….…… 66
Missions and Theology: Reciprocal Narratives – Assemblies of God – Missionary Conversions – Challenge to the Fundamentalist Core – Fundamentalist Missiology – Tipping Point: from Fundamentalist to Evangelical – Intercultural Missiology – Pentecostal Missiology: From Indigenous Church Principles to Intercultural Missiology – Bethany University: God Made Culture Too – Tensions Within: Between Home and Missions – Dangers: Going Native – Changing Theology at Home – Conclusion

Chapter II: A Tale of Two Moderns: Pentecostal Higher Education and the Battle of Bethany……..…….…… 127
Bethany University – The Shut Down – The Other Story… Facebook – Evangelical Higher Education – Education and Church Growth – Bible College vs. Liberal Arts College – Bethany Lost Its Way: Bethany and NCN District Story – Fear and Safety in NCN Culture – The Inoculation: Crisis Pedagogy – Creeping Liberalism –What Makes for Fluidity? Reciprocity? Or Spirit? – Other Caveats – Fundamentalism vs. Evangelicalism

Chapter III: How Does One Grow? Debates Between Fundamentalist Separatism and Evangelical Expansion…….…….…… 190
Bethany Took One Route: Evangelicalism – Enclave Culture – Evangelicalism as Change – For Some It Meant Death – But… – Both… Embattled and Thriving – Conclusion

Section II: Cultivation

Chapter IV: Pentecostal Body Logics: Cultivating a Modern Sensorium……. 214
Case Study 1: Bethany University – Case Study 2: The Promise Keepers – Cultivation and Modernity – Utopian Possibilities – Conclusion

Chapter 5: Cultivating Discontinuity: To Nurture and Contain Rupture…..... 247
The nudge: Reed's Story – Cultivation – Early Pentecostal Tarrying – Bethany Cultivation – Texts Teaching Gifts – Containing Rupture – Containing Rupture II: Training Texts – Rupture – Epilogue

Chapter VI: Cultivating Sensory Aptitudes Organizing Modernity……..... 273
Cultivation The Texts: Self-Development – Cultivation The Texts: Systematic and Yielded – Cultivation The Texts: Uncertainty – Cultivation The Practice: Modernity – Modern Cultivation: Therapeutic Culture – Cultivation Theory – Ritual Theory – Cultivation Theory: Volitional Affect – Conclusion

Epilogue to Cultivation: Scaling Anthropology…….....… 340
Scale and Scale Effects – Pentecostal Scale Battles – Scale and False Consciousness – Conclusion

Section III: Cultivation and Discontinuity
The Mobilization Philosophy and Politics of Pentecostalism
Alongside Post-Structural Debates on Resistance, Event, and Agency.

Chapter VII: Modern Agency-Anxiety and Pentecostalism……..…….… 353
A True Story – Agency, An Introduction – Modern Agency-Anxiety – Post-structural Agency-Anxiety – Pentecostal Agency-Anxiety – One Agent: The Pentecostal Scholar – Irrational is Agentive – Irrational is Without Agency – Collective Effervescence: Agency? – Yielding: Agency? – Refiguring Agency vis a vis the Pentecostal Challenge: Collective Mimesis – Refiguring Agency: Agency in Submission_R Marie Griffith – Refiguring Agency: Inhabiting a Tradition_Saba Mahmood – Agency: Relational Hierarchies –Conclusion

Chapter VIII: Do the Subaltern Speak in Tongues? ……..…… 398
Romanticizing Immediacy, Resistance, and the Event – Opening: One Pentecostal World – Opening: One Theory World – The Post-Structural Context – The

Romanticization of Immediacy: Spontaneous Events – Post-structural Critique as Evental Limit-Experience – Rupture or Limit-Experience as a Concrete Solution – Resistance to Linguistic Totalization – Do The Subaltern Speak in Tongues? – Pentecostals and Social Change – Is There A Politics Here? – Could There Be A Politics Here? – Conclusion

Conclusion

Love, Secularism, and the Future of Pentecostal Cultivation……..... 455
Pentecostal Effects on Evangelicalism, The Christian Right, and Global Christianity? – The Impact of Bethany Pedagogy: From Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism – Are Young Evangelicals Skewing More Liberal? – Is Secularism Coming? – Cultivation – Dangers of Cultivation – Cultivation as Utopian

Bibliography……..…...… 480

Abstract: Pentecostal Missionary Training:
Cultivating Body Logics, Converting Missionaries, Building A Movement
Josh Brahinsky 2014

This dissertation explores missionary training pedagogies among the Assemblies of God (AG), a global pentecostal fellowship. Tensions between systematicity and the sensory manifesting via meticulous pedagogies, portable body logics, and evental ruptures contributed to AG's growth from a few thousand to over 67 million in the past 100 years.

"Missionary conversions" meant US missionaries transformed political-theology through encounter with postcolonial interlocutors and came home to provoke AG with newfound cultural sensitivity and compassion ministries. Similarly, pedagogy at AG's Bethany University inoculated students against secularism via encounter with it. Thus, AG shifted from rigid fundamentalism to a more fluid evangelicalism with kingdom theology challenging previous pessimistic premillenialisms. Bethany was closed through a schism between evangelical-pentecostals and fundamentalist-pentecostals in 2011.

Tracing techniques that render bodies capable of mystical experience from 1800s radical evangelicals to current AG practice and its training manuals suggests that instead of "discipline" or the "Age of Mobilization," cultivating tension between systematicity and the sensory characterizes modern evangelicalism, perhaps modernity itself. For pentecostals "cultivation" signals collective self-fashioning that

aspires towards skilled yielding to the Holy Spirit. As such, modern religiosity might be less about turning inward, than about inhabiting modern rationality.

Further, pentecostal practice provides a foil for post-structural mobilization theories responding to similar tensions within modernity. Resonances between pentecostal missionary strategies and post-structural "agency," "resistance," and the "event" when thought with the pentecostal penchant for right wing politics suggests such strategies are politically empty. That pentecostals incite Western agency-anxiety with collective and yielded practices stretches agency to include explicit rendering of relational hierarchies and the recognition of scale effects and scale battles.

In all, pentecostal volitional affect involves sedimenting practices of mutability into the bodies of practitioners via the rhythmic cellular thrumming of flesh, church, and doctrine. Here, ephemeral sensations and testimony solidify into durable sensibilities, aptitudes, and rites, congeal as tradition tied to training texts or scripture, and the crystalline structures enabling rupture - conversion, experience of spirit, and schism – emerge to catch the edges of modern capitalist proliferation and suggest a model for mobilization effective in a period of neoliberal globalization.

Outline: The dissertation is divided into four sections as follows:

1. Reciprocity - Fundamentalist AG missionaries go out into the world, come home changed, change their home churches and universities and cause a battle between fundamentalists and evangelicals within AG. Clarifies that distinctions between evangelical and fundamentalist might pivot upon differing sensibilities built from evangelism and separatism.

2. Cultivation – Describes the training mechanisms developed within AG and how they are disseminated and internalized by practitioners. Develops the notion of portable "body logics" as sedimented elements in pentecostal efforts to nurture and contain the sensory aptitudes that engage ruptural transformation. "Cultivation" is then described as pentecostal language for evangelism, modern historical process, and social science analytic entangling the systematic and the sensory and to varying degrees foregrounding varying sense ratios and consequential scales. Scale effects and scale battles might account for multiple analytics of pentecostal experience.

3. Mobilization Philosophy - Compares AG missiology to contemporary feminist and critical theory querying the lessons for organizing emergent with such a close resonance in concern and technique but one translated across vast differences of faith and politics. In particular, the concurrent emphasis on immediacy, resistance and agency is explored and determined to be apolitical, but deeply mobilizing.

4. Conclusion - Determines that such effective mobilization likely means that, in spite of seeming secularization, AG and Bethany both matter in the US pentecostal, evangelical, and right wing landscape.

Acknowledgements

First, thanks to all the people within AG who generously volunteered their time and energy to help me make this project happen, Everett Wilson, Dan Albrecht, Charlie Self, James Stewart, and Delonn Rance all spent multiple sessions teaching me and listening to my speculations as they evolved. My extended academic committee: Barbara Epstein for systematic kindness, patience, and responsiveness, it has been so great to have an advisor who I feel complete and absolute trust in as an activist, a scholar, and a person. Jim Clifford for serious critique and inspiration somehow always tempered by humor, perhaps imbued with song. Lynn Westerkamp for consistently provocative, but kind, support. Jon Bialecki, Susan Harding, Tanya Luhrmann, Mayanthi Fernando, Danilyn Rutherford, Sarah Chee, Sarah Bakker, Jen Simington and Nirshan Perrera all read substantial parts of this project and if it makes any sense at all it owes lots to all of them. Sara Smith, Amanda Armstrong, AWDU in the UAW 2865, and autonomous students at UCSC have been a constant inspiration and helped me translate pentecostal strategies into the real world. Jeb Purucker also helped lots by defending Badiou. Anne Spalliero from Histcon and Tara and Josh at Interlibrary Loan were crucial support. Rachel, David and Naomi Brahinsky all read parts of this (David read the whole thing and debated with me for years about its meaning), but mostly they provided me with the unconditional love that keeps me alive. Michelle's insights about everything permeate this project, especially scale and systematic care. Thanks to Benj, Teo and Michelle for love, touch, play, and food. This was great fun, I so appreciate you all helped me do it.

Introduction: Pentecostal Missionary Training

20th century pentecostal evangelism was quite expansive. These evangelical protestants – interested deeply in evangelism-activism, the new birth, Jesus, and the bible – also focus their energies on speaking in tongues, faith healing, and other "gifts of the Spirit."[1] Their largest formation, The Assemblies of God (AG), was the locus of my field-work, where I spent much of three years in missionary training sites - especially Bethany University - talking with future missionaries along with their faculty, many of whom had been in the missions field for decades. They had a lot to teach, for over the previous 100 years AG had grown from a small band of a few thousand to over 67 million,[2] running 2000 bible colleges, and with a missions budget of over 200 million/year. Meanwhile the global pentecostal movement expanded to what many scholars describe as over half a million.[3] This means pentecostals make

[1] D. W Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989); Harvey Gallagher Cox, *Fire From Heaven: The Rise Of Pentecostal Spirituality And The Reshaping Of Religion In The Twenty-First Century* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Pub., 1995).

[2] Globally AG claimed 67.5 million in 2013 up from 64 million in 2010. This is from yearly Summary Statistical Reports available on the AG website. http://www.ag.org/top/About/Statistics/index.cfm The website says in the US there were 1.7 million in 1980 up to 3.1 million in 2013. A 2008 Pew study confirms their claims with AG at 1.4% of the US adult population, which would be roughly 3.2 million adults and 4.3 million people if they have an average adult/child ratio. Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. and Pew Research Center., *U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, 2008* (Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, 2008), 12.

[3] The numbers are contested. Scholars describe anywhere between 240 million and 700. The number most often mentioned as a solid estimate is 500. According to the Pew Research Center in 2010 there were 279 million pentecostals and 305 million charismatics for a total of 584 million globally. Pew Research Center. December 2011. Estimated number of Christians in 2010 by Movement (in millions). http://www.statista.com.oca.ucsc.edu/statistics/214746/estimated-number-of-christians-by-movement/ (accessed November 18, 2014). Likewise, David Barrett, who is perhaps cited more than any other missiology statistician says that together pentecostals, charismatics, and neo-charismatics went from 1 million in 1900 to 602 million in 2008. David B. Barrett, Todd M. Johnson, and Peter F. Crossing,

for about a quarter of the world's Christian population and two-thirds of all Protestants.[4] However you slice it, it is one of the fastest growing movements in the 20th century. Such growth is curious. I wondered what could be learned about social movements, religion, organization, people, and the environment that nurtured this expansion? Thus, my dissertation explores AG mission strategies, particularly within their network of higher education.

Anthropology and Organizing

Anthropologists, however, are not usually the folks who think the most directly about social movement mobilization. Our informant communities are often imagined as continuous, even atavistic, something persistent, what we call a "culture," perhaps somewhat fluid, but not usually inspiring questions about emergence. Yet, when anthropologists turn to the US, and to religious communities or other contemporary cultures, the brief histories of these groups becomes easily visible. Thus, for studies of non-liberal religious movements in the US we regularly ask how they emerged and grew?

In exploring these questions, I was first tempted to read the differences between Susan Harding's 2000 narrative of coming to inhabit Christian discursive testimony and Tanya Luhrmann's 2004 tale of bodies in prayer as the shifting sands of academic pleasure – discourse was hip and then lost its caché to the body? But it quickly

---

"Missiometrics 2008: Reality Checks for Christian World Communions," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 32, no. 1 (2008): 27.

[4] Allan Anderson et al., "Introduction," in *Studying Global Pentecostalism Theories and Methods* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 2.

became apparent that Harding and Luhrmann described very different things. Harding's tale of interpellation by narrative and her own experience of reading the world through the textual lens of her fundamentalist informants provides an entry into their language centered world. She describes the initial stages of imbibing and then inhabiting the fundamentalist propensity to internalize a sacred testimony, something she herself experienced, if momentarily. Harding's fundamentalists train their minds, their souls, and yes, their bodies, to take seriously the wash of language. She thus shows more than simply a fidelity to literalism, but the cultivation of sensibilities and sensory aptitudes that make words, doctrine, testimony, and wordplay central to the practice of fundamentalisms.[5]

Luhrmann adds bodies more explicitly to the equation, but her context is different. She works with charismatic evangelicals who share doctrine with fundamentalists, but also nurture significantly distinct sensibilities and sensory aptitudes. Their "gifts of the spirit" have crucial visceral components. Luhrmann describes the meticulous training mechanisms within evangelical communities, bodies, and brains that render them capable of sharp visualization. She tells of affective valences that, given months of effort, often allow for powerful experiences of God's presence in everyday lives. Luhrmann has shown that given proper discipline – a ritualizing structure of practice - a person's capacity for hearing God

[5] Susan Friend Harding, *The Book of Jerry Falwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).

can grow immensely.[6] Thus while, Harding sees discourse as the effective agent, Luhrmann adds bodies. I think they are both right: the power of particular sensibilities emerges differently in each community. This is what I call cultivated.

Given these disparate tales of inspiration, my question changed: I stopped comparing the effectivity of Harding's language to Luhrmann's bodies. Instead of searching for the abstract practice that best mobilizes, or in this case, inspires Godly connection and community, the key to mobilizing increasingly appeared in the nurturing of capabilities and sensibilities that could be deployed for building connection, vitality, and power – spiritual or otherwise. Thus, I now ask about the *process of forming* subjects and sensory communities or sensoria, not merely about their current qualities or the elements that make for current energy. How does one cultivate pentecostal sensibilities and aptitudes, or fundamentalist, charismatic, or evangelical ones? It turns out that not only do pentecostals and fundamentalists cultivate different sensoria and dispositions, but they do it very explicitly and meticulously.

Cultivation

"There is a time to sow and a time to reap. One of the greatest responsibilities of missionary statesmanship is to discover when the soil is ready." J Philip Hogan, Executive Director of AG Department of Foreign Missions 1960-1989[7]

---

[6] Tanya Luhrmann, "Metakinesis : How God Becomes Intimate in Contemporary U.S. Christianity," *American Anthropologist*, 2004; T. M Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012).
[7] Everett A Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit: J. Philip Hogan and the Growth of the Assemblies of God Worldwide, 1960-1990* (Oxford, U.K.: Regnum, 1997), 111.

Cultivation is pentecostal language for evangelism. This means that along with testimonials and other versions of more quotidian outreach, pentecostals foster a set of practices to render themselves capable of powerful sensory experiences that open a vast sense of possibility among participants, one that often permeates everyday life. Pentecostal practices of cultivation trace most clearly from 18th and 19th century evangelicals, especially Methodists, who drew Catholic monastic practices into broader society through their systematic approach to developing a sensorium – a sensory culture. As with their Methodist forbears, for pentecostals, cultivation evokes sensibilities that mobilize. It involves a deeply systematic approach to nurturing and bounding sensory aptitudes that sediment into what I call "body logics," by which sensory experience authenticates the sacred nature of an event. As what Joel Robbins calls a "hard cultural form," these logics circulate without losing much of their shape, especially when projected via AG's vast network of churches, schools, and media.[8] And yet, as a sedimented practice that invites discontinuous rupture, their solidity can also incite change.

In my ethnographic research, testimonies of sensory experience and its nurturance swamped all other forms. I asked informants to explain their certainty. They responded with tales of visceral learning and sensate verification. Along with a great deal of deep philosophizing and rich exploration of meaning and significance, they narrated pivotal moments of bodily sensation. As one Bethany student

[8] Joel Robbins, "Introduction: Global Religions, Pacific Island Transformations," *Journal of Ritual Studies*, 2001, 15–2.

explained, "The reason I still am a Christian is I've felt God and I know he is there."[9] These experiences, it seems, can stick. As another explained, "I walk around feeling that." Further, the dominant sensory ethos within AG changes. In tracing the history of the AG sensorium, we see how the body logics transform from early chaos to the doctrinal solidification of tongues and healing, then followed by a move to a more colloquial "any sensation goes." Initial sensory doctrine was thus abstracted into something simpler - a body logic that travels and became one of the more portable means of teaching pentecostalism.

When asked how such experience emerges, participants describe immediate spontaneity, but also extensive striving and yearning for a state of yielded receptivity – an opening to the Holy Spirit. For instance, students and faculty talk of youthful aspirations to speaking in tongues. Dr. Espinosa, a Bethany faculty member, explained, "[There was] pressure to speak in tongues. Social pressure: it's what all the cool kids do. You want to be on fire for the Lord. That was the controlling message…" As such, nearly every one of the dozens of students and faculty I interviewed described an initial period of pretending to speak in tongues, "fake it till you make it," quite often, although not always, followed by success in reaching what was then experienced as spontaneous and unmediated.

Later, I found the language of careful cultivation throughout AG discourse, but also via a series of texts for training AG ministers to encourage – and control - gifts

[9] Unless otherwise noted, all quotes are from interviews conducted by the author – Promise Keeper interviews from 2005-2007, Bethany and other AG interviews from 2008-2014. Students are recognized by pseudonym, professors quoted directly.

of spirit in their congregations. These texts are quite clear. The task is methodical inspiration. One text, published by AG, encourages pastors to speak these words, "you might hear words in your spirit," or, "you might feel a tension in your tongue." They are then directed to, "encourage [participants] to… open their mouth and release the language…"[10] Such work is quite active, and "takes a bold, deliberate step."[11] Yet, the focus is also very much on yielding for, "only Jesus can baptize someone in the Holy Spirit, so relax."[12] This tension between yielding and action, spontaneity and extended effort, permeates and energizes pentecostal cultivation.

Further, cultivating body logics involves cutting as well as nurturing. Bethany faculty, for instance, develop a careful eye towards discerning between Godly and more devilish experiences. These sensory aptitude are thus built via the reiteration of boundary making processes, the discarding of other possibilities.[13] Recent anthropologies invoke Hegel's cycle of objectification and internalization to suggest that such cutting and then solidifying less than everything, less than holism, is simply what we all do; it is the apparently concrete moment in a history of fluid transformation.[14] They describe people freezing surroundings through language. I argue that we crystalize sensation similarly. As such, the pentecostal use of a

---

[10] Ken Cramer, "Preparing Yourself to Help Others," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 47.
[11] Carey Huffman and John Lindell, *Hungry? A Study in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Pub. House, 2006), 8.
[12] Tim. Enloe, "The Nuts and Bolts of Ministering Spirit Baptism," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Randy Hurst and Tim. Enloe (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 27.
[13] Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).
[14] Jennifer. Kramer, *Switchbacks Art, Ownership, and Nuxalk National Identity* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006); Daniel Miller, *Material Culture and Mass Consumption* (NY: B. Blackwell, 1987).

language of sensation implies a congealed set of skilled aptitudes. The cutting and winnowing via reiterative practices engenders the sedimentation of semi-stable sensory entities, actually changed bodies.

Yet, simply emphasizing stability misses the invigorating tension between the continuity of hard cultural practices solidified as body logics and the discontinuous rupture they cultivate. For here, a massive bureaucracy teaches a deeply systematic process, but one that invites yielding to the contingency and destabilization of an ostensibly outside force – the Holy Spirit – realized through personal transformative rupture, but also collective revival, schism, and other forms of discontinuous practice. One could say that pentecostals are especially liable to moments of productive derailment, while laying new tracks in the process. As such, the sensibilities cultivated by pentecostals include a deep attachment to rupture, and the sense that discontinuous experience - like baptism, speaking in tongues, or conversion - might open minds and bodies to new ways of being that are not accessible via the slogging of everyday reason. In fact, they feel strongly that these events ought to be understood as unmediated and spontaneous. Thus, on one hand, the recognition of entanglement between gridding and the somatic has me formulating a "cultivation theory" that challenges the valorization of the unmediated and thus pushes against body foundationalist or neovitalist imaginings of the body, quotidian practice, or energetic flow as somehow primordial and less gridded than language and therefore a

better site for resistance than the mind.[15] On the other hand, pentecostal rupture shows the value of experience that feels unmediated. Radical discontinuity seems to offer possibilities for opening previously un-thought spiritual, and perhaps political, solutions. Not necessarily healthy, kind, or gentle ones - but new ones. It thus is likely to have a productive place in movements trying to refashion current ways of being. Not necessarily as freedom, or resistance, but as inspiration. The exclamatory moment that feels untouched by social norms is perhaps the most powerful element of pentecostal organizing. The event - read and felt as scaled immediately - has appeal, power, and charisma towards transformation.[16]

I also suspect that cultivation as describing the entanglement of systematicity and the sensory might provide useful language for narrating crucial social processes of modernity. Michel Foucault describes the modern as especially prone to "discipline" and cynically enabling "biopolitics" while Charles Taylor more optimistically portrays the methodical enabling of activism.[17] These both, more or less, envision an increase in the interpenetration of technocratic approaches to life and our bodies and sensibilities. However, pentecostals might prefer Zygmunt Bauman's image of a, "gardener–like, rather than gamekeeper–like, attitude," something more

---

[15] Body foundationalists often argue that the body is not only key, but relatively free from disciplinary structures i.e. Michael D Jackson, "Knowledge of the Body," *Man* 18 (1983): 327–45. Similarly with neovitalists such as Rosi Braidotti, "In Spite of the Times: The Postsecular Turn in Feminism," *Theory, Culture & Society : Explorations in Critical Social Science*, 2008.

[16] For the theorization of the event outside of pentecostalism see: i.e. Martin Jay, "Historicism and the Event," in *Against the Grain: Jewish Intellectuals in Hard Times*, ed. Ezra Mendelsohn, Stefani Hoffman, and Richard I. Cohen, 2014; Slavoj Zižek, *Event: Philosophy in Transit.*, 2014; Alain Badiou, *Philosophy for Militants* (NY: Verso, 2012).

[17] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977); Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended* (London: Penguin, 2003); Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).

akin to cultivation.[18] Further, if this picture holds, then perhaps, instead of the retreat of modern religiosity into the internal private self, with spirit as the inversion of the public sphere,[19] we might instead see modernity as the time where systematicity applies with more intensity to the emotive and the sensual, when bodies, and the spirits now interred within them, increasingly become the coconstitutive subject-objects of technocratic enabling and manipulation.

Cultivation Matters: Sensoriums Change

Recent anthropological research suggests that this pentecostal effort to nurture certain sensibilities is likely to bear fruit, because sensoria, and the sensory aptitudes they nurture, vary significantly across culture and time, and are very clearly impacted by religious practices.[20] As such, scholars have developed tools such as "theory of mind" and the "ratio of senses" to measure these variable cross-cultural sensory dynamics.[21] As such, pentecostal descriptions of visceral experience likely portray more than ephemeral moments of feeling, but also processes of somatic sedimentation.

That is, religious practice changes bodies. Tanya Luhrmann describes the process by which evangelicals come to hear God, which might otherwise be dismissed as simply fantasy. She observes a transformation of their skilled

[18] Zygmunt Bauman, *Freedom* (Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1988), 10.
[19] Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993). Margaret C. Jacob, *The Enlightenment: A Brief History With Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001), 18.
[20] Ong Walter, "The Shifting Sensorium," in *In Howes*, 1991.
[21] Tanya Marie Luhrmann, "Toward an Anthropological Theory of Mind," *Suomen Antro*, 2011.

attunement to mental imagery, what she calls "absorption."[22] Similarly, Newberg and Waldman discuss the neuroplasticity engendered by religious experience and suggest that religious practice can "permanently change the structure" of the parts of the brain controlling moods, conscious notions of self, and sensory perceptions.[23] In other words, there is good reason to think of religious practice as sensory development.

Further, over a relatively brief period of time, groups come to manifest quite distinct sensory aptitudes. Scholars have demonstrated differences in the sensory aptitudes of a given culture across centuries of historical change – i.e. sight overcoming smell,[24] or across cultures, with variants in the ways bodies sense,[25] that can be measured, for instance, via variation in scores on "attention to emotion subscales" and "somatic-focused awareness."[26] But also across much briefer periods, when, for instance, contemporary Vietnamese adopted an increasingly emotional sensorium,[27] or Americans learning Chinese medicine came to feel emotions in their bodies.[28] Luhrmann, for one, describes a 6-9 month learning period by which evangelicals learn to hear God's voice in their prayer practices.[29] And, of course,

---

[22] Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*; Luhrmann, "Metakinesis."
[23] Andrew B Newberg and Waldman, *How God Changes Your Brain: Breakthrough Findings from a Leading Neuroscientist* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2009), 7.
[24] Walter J Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (NY: Methuen, 1982); Constance Classen, *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History and across Cultures* (NY: Routledge, 1993).
[25] Asifa Majid and Stephen C Levinson, "The Senses in Language and Culture," *Senses & Society* 6 (2011): 5–18.
[26] Kathryn Geurts, "Consciousness as 'Feeling in the Body': A West African Theory of Embodiment, Emotion and the Making of Mind," in *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*, ed. David Howes (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2005).
[27] Allen Tran cited in Luhrmann, "Toward an Anthropological Theory of Mind," 6.
[28] Sonya Pritzker, "Thinking Hearts, Feeling Brains: Metaphor, Culture, and the Self in Chinese Narratives of Depression," *Metaphor and Symbol* 22, no. 3 (2007): 251–74.
[29] Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*.

sensory culture travels, partially ensconced in bodies, practices, and language. Put simply, cultivation changes things – bodies, minds, and their relationships.[30]

Reciprocity: Missionary Conversions Coming Back Home

Bethany University in Scotts Valley, California served to cultivate pentecostal aptitudes for evangelism, and its role linking missionary training to missions experience engendered a set of tensions particular to institutions specializing in outreach. In fact, when Bethany closed it had, in some sense, became a casualty of the transformative effects of the missions field. Post WWII US expansion had meant incredible growth within AG which brought increasing diversity and thus precipitated the incipient dissolution of a separatist consensus that briefly held their fundamentalism together in the mid 20th century. Missionaries had left the US brimming with fundamentalist certainty and self-confidence but found themselves facing increasingly confident post-colonial nationals with different scripture readings and pressing material needs. After several years, these missionaries often returned to the US uncertain and deeply refigured. In the process, they helped move AG theology away from inerrancy and premillenialism and towards a kingdom theology.[31]

---

[30] There are debates over the essential nature of mind-body dualisms, but I argue that, at least, to some degree, that sensory ratios change demonstrates a range of variability. For a dualist ontology see: Rita Astuti, "Are We All Natural Dualists?: A Cognitive Developmental Approach," *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7, no. 3 (2001): 429–47; Emma Cohen, *The Mind Possessed: The Cognition of Spirit Possession in an Afro-Brazilian Religious Tradition* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2007). For change, see especially: Geurts, "Consciousness as 'Feeling in the Body': A West African Theory of Embodiment, Emotion and the Making of Mind."

[31] Inerrancy means biblical literalism. Premillenialism is the pessimistic sense that the world must get worse for Jesus to return and kingdom theology reverses this to suggest that the kingdom of god is, to some degree, here now on earth.

This meant less faith in literal readings of the bible and more hope for improvements in material life here on earth. Such returned missionaries also encouraged the development of culturally sensitive missions theory and a pedagogy for prospective missionaries that induces "secular crisis" through encounter with the outside world. The reciprocity engendered by missions experience thus bounced all the way back to the missionary's home churches engendering debate within AG over relationships between evangelistic outreach and separatism and then over cultural sensitivity and pedagogy within AG higher education and missiology – missions theory. In this manner, what I call the "reciprocity of mobilization" transformed missions, and AG more generally, albeit quite slowly.

Begun in 1919 as Glad Tidings Missionary School, Bethany University, the oldest AG Bible College was often small – roughly 500 students – and like Bible Colleges more generally, mostly ignored in narratives of secularizing higher education. Yet, since the Scopes Trial, as focal points for a diffuse network of conferences, summer camps, radio stations and journals, such colleges knit together non-liberal Christianity.[32] In 1966, Bethany added a liberal arts curriculum to their pastoral and missionary training but recently began reaching back for AG's roots, its "DNA," described as missions, worship, and a more concerted rejection of contemporary culture.

Thus, by the late 20th century, Bethany University was embroiled in controversy between the fundamentalist and evangelical impulses within AG. Bethany's position

[32] Joel Carpenter, *Revive Us Again : The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

at the forefront of the AG impulse towards cultural sensitivity and kingdom theology had translated into relative ambivalence about the more intense versions of innerancy still paramount in the Central Valley of California from where funding for Bethany was needed, if it might appear. It didn't. By 2011, saddled with a 15 million dollar debt, Bethany closed. AG district leadership quietly suggested that Bethany had "lost its way." Yet, the trajectory towards a softer political-theology within AG continued. In the same period, at AG's central campuses in Springfield Missouri, the liberal arts focused Evangel College merged with, and may have muzzled, the fundamentalist Central Bible College.

My story then details shifting sands within pentecostalism from fundamentalist-pentecostalism to evangelical-pentecostalism, the missions experiences that, to some degree, generated them, and the battles this process energized. As I tell it, fundamentalism and evangelicalism within AG differ primarily in their long term nurturing of sensibilities towards outreach.[33] As such, each provides varying intensities of the tensions between the rational and the sensory so carefully channeled and nurtured through the pentecostal project of cultivating sensory aptitudes and dispositions.

It turns out that missions, and evangelism more generally, makes for a dangerous enterprise.[34] By reaching out with such passion and vulnerability,

---

[33] Here I foreground Nancy Ammerman's historiographical delineation between evangelicals and fundamentalists. Nancy Tatom Ammerman, *Bible Believers: Fundamentalists in the Modern World* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987), 4.

[34] i.e. Heather J Sharkey, *Cultural Conversions: Unexpected Consequences of Christian Missionary Encounters in the Middle East, Africa, and South Asia*, 2013; Andrew Orta, "'Living the Past Another

missionaries play the middle in a cycle of expansion and transformation. They can't help but bring the exigencies and decentering of global encounter home to unravel the center – that is, if they are any good at what they do.

Cultivating Discontinuity as Mobilization Philosophy

This leads me to the third section of the dissertation where pentecostal mobilization becomes a foil for other contemporary theories of inspiration and activism. As one of the most effective experiments in organizing within neoliberalism and globalization, pentecostalism seems a good case study for thinking alongside critical theory and feminist scholars who share a set of approaches that developed in response to similar contexts. That most pentecostals lean far to the right politically is information that both clarifies and confuses: however effective, the strategies shared between pentecostals and post-structural thinkers are less tied to a particular politics than some imagine.[35] Even so, this juxtaposition of pentecostal and post-structural allows me to refract contemporary discussions of the event, resistance, and agency against an actual movement, with real successes and failures. These strategic questions are central to the activism and critical theory that emerged in the late 20th century at very much the same moment as pentecostals hit their stride in

---

Way:' Reinstrumentalized Missionary Selves in Aymara Mission Fields," *Anthropological Quarterly* 75, no. 4 (2002): 707–43.

[35] Politics: I am working from Gramsci's notion that politics ought to involve an intervention in power structures, but also his sense that hegemony is configured throughout multiple scales and fields in society. Thus, as I see it, to engage with the relationships of power in the broader society can involve images, actions, ideas, and sensibilities that either support or challenge hegemonic power structures. Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, trans. Joseph A Buttigieg (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992).

missions, and it seems likely that some of the similarity arose because they share a social-political context.[36]

I argue that the logic of immediacy and resistance that emerges within post-structuralism resonates closely with pentecostalism. As recent heirs to a long line of anxiety over the dehumanizing processes of modernity among western thinkers, pentecostals and post-structuralists share a romantic vision of an originary, perhaps spiritual, or at least especially healthy, body or flow that is traumatically interrupted and rationalized by modern – often capitalist - technocracy, perhaps a manifestation of excessive and/or misdirected human intervention. They also share a sense that immediacy and spontaneity make for a powerful response. Put simply, if Foucault describes a totalizing grid that we have internalized, there is no reasonable, carefully planned alternative, for all planning is simply a reiteration of control.[37] The only escape then, as Foucault himself suggests, involves a "limit experience" that might help us crack the panopticon in our souls.[38] Although it is less clear what this might entail for Foucault, I suggest that pentecostals, and AG in particular, can be counted as among the most effective teachers of limit experience in the 20th century. In addition, since many pentecostals can be effectively described as subaltern, their situated resistance to the limits they inhabit might invite a liberatory political trajectory. If, as Gayatri Spivak suggests, the subaltern cannot speak and be heard,

[36] Of course, pentecostals are not easy partners to modernization. While on one hand, their practices signal the viscera of the savage to the secular West, on the other, they signify modernity and the fluidity of global capitalism in the global South.
[37] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*.
[38] Michel Foucault, Donald F Bouchard, and Simon Sherry, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), 231.

they might instead elide the confining hierarchies of rationality and aim for the visceral, ostensibly without gridding – perhaps speaking in tongues, either literally, or metaphorically and thus find an effective space outside the grid of modernity, and unconfined by the limits of their own social position.[39] That these limit experiences or irrational modes of subaltern communication require cultivation and nurturance provide the substance for a movement. Further, the enmeshment between systematic cultivation and rupture also suggests that pentecostal practices might undo the apparent dichotomy between irrational affective experience and collective will or volition, thus bringing affect theory more firmly into dialogue with organizing. In this story, the sensory is a project, as much as any other, and events are projects – they require effort and direction. Even so, I will argue that emphasizing the senses, or rupture, per se, does not a specific politics make. They can, however, help access power, and mobilize, and likely provide openings for change.

Methodology: Ethnography

In early 2007, I begin this study with an email to Dr. Russell Spittler, an AG scholar of pentecostalism at Vanguard University who very kindly introduces me into the world of AG scholars at Bethany University where I meet Dan Albrecht, Everett Wilson, James Stewart, Stan Steward, T Espinosa[40] and many others, nearly all of whom spend many hours with me telling tales of pentecostalism, and offering an

[39] Rosalind C Morris and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak?: Reflections on the History of an Idea* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010).
[40] Drs. Chandler and Stewart teach missions, Drs. Albrecht, Espinoza and Ku teach theology and history. Dr. Wilson is a past Bethany president.

analysis of its internal dynamics. The President of Bethany, Reverend Shelton, provides free reign of the campus, access to any classes if the professors agree, and interviews with willing students. They clearly hope I will join them, but are also proud of their project and easily offer it up to the ethnographic eye. I spend much of the next three years sitting in missions preparation, theology, and church history courses, talking with students afterwards during lunch or on the grass before or after their morning chapel, which I attend intermittently. The students interviewed are mostly 18-22, nearly half Caucasian, half Latino, four of African descent. Most are second or third generation pentecostals, a few recent converts, some evangelicals of different sorts, a few only marginally Christian. I also interview Shelton and several other administrators. I design an online survey for Bethany alumni who I contact through Facebook and 150 respond to the 42-question survey.

After a few years focusing on Scotts Valley I expand my research using snowball techniques to find Bethany alumni – many of whom are scholars and leaders within AG. I call and interview, often followed by email conversations. I then travel to Springfield, Missouri for a week of interviews with folks I met on the phone and with AG Missions Department leadership as well as professors at The Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Evangel College, and the Central Bible College. Many of these interviews lead to archives, most significantly of AG training texts for pastors guiding participants in teaching the gifts of the spirit. As I learn more about missions, I decide that talking to missionaries in the field would support the project. I email a few hundred. 30 respond to do phone interviews, mostly via Skype as they

are all across the globe. Finally, when Bethany closes in 2011, I am visiting campus regularly and pulled into multiple offices as people who I had not previously met now passionately tell me their version of the shut down story. This leads to interviews with the NCN district regional leadership to try and balance the critical elements of the tale. In all, I talk with over 150 AG students, faculty, missionaries and administrators and collect precisely 150 surveys, mostly from a different set of people.

Methodology: An Anthropology of the Senses, Towards a Theory of Cultivation

My methodological agnosticism builds from Ann Taves' "ascription model" for describing religious experience. Faced with either of the two types of experience most likely to be considered inherently religious, the "mystical" – an experience of unity - or the "numinous" – an experience of felt presence – Taves suggests we explore the process of naming, the ways "people constitute things as religious or not."[41] Her point is a good one. Scholars can't discern the truth of spiritual connection, and shouldn't denigrate its possibility, and certainly not its power. Thus, the focus could be on ascription. Yet, it turns out that the anxiety over ascribing sacredness to an experience is generative of a great deal of tension, schism, and mobilization – this among pentecostals as well as scholars. Taves methodology of bringing the voices

[41] Ann Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered: A Building Block Approach to the Study of Religion and Other Special Things* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009), 20–21.

of multiple perspectives to face each other demonstrates this beautifully.[42] In my study, however, the multiple voices are primarily from within pentecostalism. As such, I became less interested in determining what they consider sacred than in the generative dynamics of these struggles to ascribe sacrality.

I do find myself also deploying a set of analytic tools and assumptions to clarify pentecostal somaticism. As Russell Spittler explains, thinking broadly about pentecostalism requires understanding that, "religion is physical, whatever else it is."[43] As such, because pentecostals use their bodies so actively, it is easy to make the sensory the center of analysis. However, it is also then easy to resonate with the stereotyped image of the sensual and irrational fanatic (religious, person of color, woman, or poor person) who is generally denigrated, although occasionally elevated, for seemingly pre-modern visceral impulses. To avoid this pitfall I find myself engaging a collection of literature that takes bodies into account, but aims against either rationalist, or irrationalist, bias. In particular, the pentecostal metaphor of cultivation becomes a central analytic in my effort to balance and integrate body and system. This approach to a "cultivation theory" thus makes use of a combination of practice theories, embodiment philosophy, and sensory learning approaches that are used by scholars of experiences deemed special, and sometimes deemed religious.

Put briefly, to develop "cultivation theory" I begin with Talal Asad and Annemarie Mol's language of cultivation. Asad demonstrates the cultivation in a

---

[42] Ann Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999).
[43] R. P Spittler, "Implicit Values in pentecostal Missions," *Missiology: An International Review Missiology: An International Review* 16, no. 4 (1988): 412.

secular sensorium.[44] And Mol uses cultivation for the entanglement of systematicity and the sensory,[45] very much in synch with the practice theories of Pierre Bourdieu and Marcel Mauss.[46] The above-mentioned studies of shifting sensory aptitudes and sensoria provide evidence that the affirmations of my informants are likely reflected in concrete visceral change.[47] I then look to Catherine Bell and Vicky Kirby's theories of language and culture that might help translate between the two – affirmation and body. Kirby suggests that since all is text, there is no reason to think of language and bodies as deeply different forms of being. Bell reframes ritual theory as an iterative process of defining boundaries, thus providing a tool for understanding the sedimentation of body-logics and other portable cultural forms.[48] Finally, very much like Anna Tsing's "friction," cultivation describes the tensions between scales but instead of the global grinding against the local as with Tsing's story, I watch the systematic and the sensory co-making.[49] Yet, this scale relationship is merely one analysis among several others, which might emphasize the local or the global instead. Thus, unlike other "third term" concepts that aim to replace Cartesian dualisms such

---

[44] Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003).
[45] Annemarie Mol, "GOOD TASTE: The Embodied Normativity of the Consumer-Citizen," *Journal of Cultural Economy* 2, no. 3 (November 2009): 270.
[46] Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990); Marcel Mauss, "Techniques of the Body (1935)," in *Sociology and Psychology: Essays. Transl. by Ben Brewster*. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979).
[47] See notes 20-30
[48] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*; Vicky Kirby, *Telling Flesh : The Substance of the Corporeal* (New York: Routledge, 1997).
[49] Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005).

as "affect", or "image,"[50] cultivation does not reject the suggestion that dualisms are real and powerful. Instead, it accepts that different scales exist simultaneously, each most consequential in a given situation.

This project thus adds to embodiment literature by emphasizing cultivation as a process of coconstitutive resonances between religious doctrine and community in dialogue with a collection of carefully designed pedagogies, everyday reiterations through quotidian practice, a series of mutually reinforcing ruptural moments, and finally, their crystallization in visceral logics. Further, I look especially closely at institution building, particularly within higher education, as a means of propagating these pedagogies, body logics, and sensory aptitudes. Taken together, the success within pentecostal institutions of pedagogies that systematically engage the sensory suggests a model for mobilization.

Chapter Outlines

Section I_Reciprocity: Chapter I begins with mid 20th century AG missionaries traveling into the field with a great deal of fundamentalist certainty and encountering post-colonial people who read the bible differently. Upon return home, these transformed missionaries travel the US preaching and take positions teaching in the expanding AG higher education network where they can't help but spread their newfound sensibilities. AG thus begins to move from a rigid separatist leaning fundamentalism and premillenialism to a more fluid and expansion focused

[50] Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); Henri Bergson, *Matter and memory* (New York: Zone Books, 1988).

evangelicalism aiming at a kingdom theology. In other words, evangelism works both ways – it is reciprocal. Chapter II shows this reciprocity generating the "Battle of Bethany" between fundamentalists and an emerging evangelical stream within AG that resulted in the closure of Bethany University in 2011. It details the crisis pedagogy by which students are pushed to face secularism head-on. Chapter III looks at Bethany's cultural fluidity and explores the history of evangelical debates over the effectiveness of either fundamentalist separatism or evangelical outreach as strategies for survival and growth. Overall, this section develops the notion of reciprocal encounter between organizers and the organized and reframes the fundamentalist-evangelical divide to pivot around the sensibilities encouraged by separatism or evangelism rather than theological disputes over premillenialism or biblical innerancy.[51]

Section II_Cultivation: Chapter IV watches AG participants solidify their faith through sensory experiences within a carefully cultivated sensorium. Their sense of God's presence comes via sensory aptitudes that incite a recurring visceral appraisal of faith. These body logics travel such that pentecostals and charismatics such as the Promise Keepers experience their potency. This chapter challenges Thomas Csordas' phenomenology of immediacy,[52] arguing that cultivation is required for experience. Chapter V looks more closely at AG training mechanisms. In particular, it explores

---

[51] Ammerman, *Bible Believers*; George Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991); George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[52] Thomas J Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable: Embodiment, Alterity, and the Theory of Religion with CA Comment," *Current Anthropology*. 45, no. 2 (2004): 163.

AG narratives of yearning and yielding as well as text designed to teach pastors to induce their flock to experience tongues as connection with the Holy Spirit. Chapter VI explores the concept of cultivation from three angles. First as a pentecostal language tool, cultivation is the primary model for missions effectivity; second, as an analytic that describes the increasing systematizing of the sensory throughout the evangelical movements of the 19th century and the emergence of modernity; and finally, it explores the possibility of cultivation as a theoretical project that joins Kirby's "corporeography," Bell's "ritualization," Tsing's notion of entangled scales, and Luhrmann's learning to develop a more precise theoretical use of cultivation that suggests a collective and historical volition in the nurturance of sensory aptitudes.[53] Section II closes with an exploration of scale effects that suggest a recognition of multiple constructed and contested scales could make for a more precise and less paternalistic anthropology.

Section III_Mobilization Philosophy: Chapter VII explores the relationship between pentecostals and agency. It argues that much of western philosophy is conditioned by a concern over challenges to human agency, an agency-anxiety that extends from Kant to more extreme versions among post-structural thinkers. This anxiety produces outsider perspectives on pentecostalism in which their somatic practices are either critiqued for lack of agency or valorized as an irrational, but agential, escape from the modern grid. Meanwhile, pentecostals share the concern over human agency, but invert it to worry that humans do too much. Their practices

[53] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*; Tsing, *Friction*; Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*; Kirby, *Telling Flesh*.

thus involve deep rational thought, highly cognitivist philosophy even, while also emphasizing yielding, and collective mimesis and effervescence, which taken together decenters liberal notions of autonomous agency. I then challenge recent portrayals of sectarian religious groups that rearticulate agency such that seeming passivity ought to be understood as agentive within its own grammar, as each tradition stands on its own.[54] I suggest that arguments for incommensurable traditions can carry some weight when reframed as a distinction between local and global scales of analysis. I argue further that in exploring agency, scholars might pay more attention to the ways agency is not a thing to be had, but rather demonstrates a relationship of hierarchical power between groups.[55]

Chapter VIII looks at the resonance between pentecostal and post-structural valorizations of event, resistance, and agency. It suggests that they share a postliberal romanticization of an originary flow. It challenges Alain Badiou's event and Brian Massumi's immediacy as lacking the entraining necessary and thus missing much of the work that makes for a "radical" experience.[56] Most crucially, because pentecostal resistance is often aimed from the far right, I point out that there is no particular politics to resistance or the event per se, for to simply push against control is apolitical – the politics depends on where and how you push. However, events and

[54] Saba Mahmood, *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005); R. Marie Griffith, *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
[55] i.e. Mel Y Chen, *Animacies Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012).
[56] Alain Badiou, *Being and Event* (NY: Continuum, 2005); Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*.

resistances are both crucial elements of mobilization. As such, the distinction between politics and mobilization emerges as pivotal.

Outline: Conclusion

This dissertation centers on pentecostal missionary evangelism. From the reciprocity of missions encounter to the Battle of Bethany, missions are a force for change within AG. And as a deeply systematic approach to nurturing sensory aptitudes among converts, AG evangelism is a force for change in the world. Given the massive increase in AG participants over the past century, this is difficult to deny. Further it seems an important element within the Christian Right. And yet, I conclude with the implication – very subtle, yet perhaps portentous - that maybe in the West, pentecostalism and evangelicalism is on the decline. We know that AG growth in the US has slowed to some degree. We also know it has continued in poorer parts of the world. So, I ask, how do these changing numbers relate to the choices around organizing strategy made by pentecostals and evangelicals? Did the evangelical burst into cultural politics mean an initial rise and now decline as they lose their subcultural protection? In other words, is the Bethany strategy a success or failure? Further, is the growth of "nones" – people with no religious affiliation - in the US a harbinger of secularization to come? If so, how soon? If not, what does this mean for the political-theology of pentecostalism and for the resilience of the Christian Right? This chapter thus traces recent data on church growth and politics in the US so as to make tentative analyses of the trends.

Finally, I look at the cultivation of feeling among pentecostal missionary trainees and notice that this careful and systematic approach to nurturing activist dispositions and sensibilities differs vastly from the rest of higher education and secular organizing more generally. I suggest that successful prefiguration requires cultivation – of concepts and relationships, but feelings and bodies too.

Preface: Notes on the History and Historiography of Pentecostal Missions

Although pentecostals certainly caught a tremendous wave of globalization and development by resonating closely with both modernization and its resistances, I will focus on the organizing practices that make them distinctive. These practices attach to the aura of the West but also serve as outcry against the alienating fissures of modernity and not simply in conceptual terms. In fact, they provide an embodied challenge of experience, via rupture, perhaps a version of the "sacred,"[57] in which the discomforts of objectification and alienation are foregrounded, engaged, and somewhat dispatched, in a deeply systematic cleansing and refiguration. Paraphrasing Marx, Christian Lalive d'Epinay calls pentecostalism, "on the one hand, the *expression* of real misery, and on the other a *protest* against real misery. It is the sigh of the creature who has been overwhelmed, the feeling of a heartless world, as well as the spirit of an age deprived of spirit."[58] Pentecostalism, like romanticism, phenomenology, and post-structuralism agonizes over, and replies to, something akin to the rationalization of modernity, if conceived a bit differently. Thus, preoccupations with agency, freedom, and the relationships between control and

[57] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959).

[58] As d'Epinay writes, "[pentecostalism's] rise is parallel to that of the Marxist–socialist movements. They, like it, were born of the same one and the same need, both were nourished by the same rebelliousness and struggled by and large for the same clientele, but giving them very different orientations… [pentecostalism] is, on the one hand, the *expression* of real misery, and on the other a *protest* against real misery. It is the sigh of the creature who has been overwhelmed, the feeling of a heartless world, as well as the spirit of an age deprived of spirit'… Is it not a paradox to find one protest just purely religious and spiritual and another purely social and political being born on the same terrain and developing in a parallel manner?" Christian Lalive d'Epinay, *Haven of the Masses: A Study of the Pentecostal Movement in Chile;* (London: Lutterworth P., 1969), 35.

spontaneity are, to a large degree, shared across these intellectual-sensory currents. Perhaps then pentecostalism performs, "one small part of the widespread, long–term protest against the whole thrust of modern urban–industrial capitalist society."[59] Yet, not all protest movements so effectively grasp the energy of modernity so as to inspire such massive and sustained expansion – most don't.

Thus, I emphasize the peculiar tensions within AG learning mechanisms and cultivation technologies that seem to distinguish their evangelism from other less successful mobilizations. In particular, I describe a persistent ability to engender fluidity within the most rigid of practices and to bring a semblance of solidity to the most excessive of formations, together manifesting institutional and somatic structures that systematically cultivate multiple experiences of discontinuity – revitalizing, infuriating, and empowering.

Further, due to the reciprocity engendered by vulnerable-making missions encounters and the tensions of the entanglement between systematicity and the sensory within practices of evangelism, pentecostals inhabit a continuous process of redefinition. They generate a folding in, or turning under, through revival and schism, encounter and challenge, a process that refigures and invigorates from inside. Thus, cultivated within AG's massive institutional bureaucracy, and likely within other forms of Christianity, we find sedimented collections of practices and sensibilities that activate mutability, uncertainty, and change – the sense of all-encompassing renewal, of a higher power's calling, and of the need to expose one's

[59] Robert Mapes Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 223.

self to others for the sake of true evangelistic love. All are systematically integrated into the bones and bodies of practitioners via the rhythmic cellular thrumming of flesh, church, and doctrine. As such, relatively ephemeral sensations, ideas, and moments of testimony solidify into, and emerge from, more consistent and durable sensibilities, dispositions, aptitudes, rites or sensory vernaculars. They gain traction when congealed as tradition, and garner even more solidity when tied to training texts, doctrine, or scripture thus forming the crystalline structures that enable rupture, and nurture the ephemeral. A great deal of this motility is accomplished through conversion, immediate experience of spirit, schism, and battle. For pentecostals systematically nurture a deeply embodied experience of rupture as transformation that, ideally, permeates much of their lives and makes for a dynamic movement.[60]

---

[60] A few definitions as I use them:
• Evangelical: a Protestant movement emphasizing the bible, Jesus, born-again conversion, and activism. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*.
• Radical evangelical: the collection of evangelicals in the 1800s who emphasized ecstatic ruptural experience. Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).
• Fundamentalist: evangelicals emphasizing premillennial dispensationalism, innerancy and separatism.
• (neo)Evangelical/ Evangelical: the evangelicals who emerged from fundamentalism in the 1940s and replaced their world-denying focus with an effort to evangelize through US culture.
• Pentecostal: a group with very similar theologies to the others, but emphasizing the importance of experiencing gifts of the Spirit, especially speaking in tongues and healing. These include fundamentalist and evangelical strands of pentecostalism.
• Charismatic: people not from the initial pentecostal formations. Starting in the 1950s, they imported pentecostal practices into their churches. They are generally included when I speak of the contemporary pentecostal movement more broadly. Spittler, Russell, "Are Pentecostals and Charismatics Fundamentalists?," in *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture*, ed. Karla O Poewe (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1994), 103–16; Ammerman, *Bible Believers*; Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*; Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*; Dayton, Donald, "From Christian Perfection to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost,'" in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan (Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1975).

Early History

The culture and political theology of pentecostalism transformed in the past 100 years. Emerging at the turn of the century as a multi-racial religious movement sporting a radical critique of wealth, and worldliness (including nations, genders, and races), by the late 1920s, much of pentecostalism had segregated and the white elements in particular embraced a far more fundamentalist and less theologically and physically fluid approach to politics and culture. In fact, a furiously rigid emphasis on innerant bible readings and premillenialism (impending eschatological destruction) increasingly came linked to an image of missions as a Western civilizing project in which mid-western whites might save people of color throughout the developing world.

However, unlike other fundamentalists, pentecostal attachment to rigidity always came entangled with the destabilizing flamboyance of spiritual experience. Further, their avid insistence upon multi-year long evangelism sorties pushed many of their most fervent practitioners towards increasing cosmopolitanism and openness to change. By the end of the 20th century this internalized contingency inspired AG to modify its guiding political theology and educational practices. To some degree, they embraced worldly compassion, cross cultural sensitivity, and a far more fluid sense of theological purity. Yet, this move was – and still is – far from a done deal.

One can track the emergence of pentecostalism through its theological roots – the new birth, evangelicalism, the four-fold gospel, Oberlin Perfectionism, and the

Keswick Higher Life[61] - some of which can be traced to a blend of West African and European colonial religiosity in the Americas.[62] One can even go farther back to Martin Luther's notion of scripture and "experience also"[63] which was then democratized and expanded by John Wesley. Pentecostals thus emerged from several branches of 19th century "radical evangelicalism."[64] Then in the early 20th century they affiliated theologically and culturally with fundamentalism, and later with (neo)evangelicalism, what most people now call simply evangelicalism.

Yet, my concern is less with theology than with pentecostal practice and their attitude toward the body, soul, community, and evangelism. As Martin Marty argues, the practice of tongues is the pentecostal distinctive, not the doctrine.[65] Pentecostals built their practical theologies from Charles Finney, Wesley and other radical evangelical traditions and then AG developed an unusually effective systematic institutional and pedagogical structure for spreading them.

By the late 1800s, radical evangelicals had developed a set of practices that broadly encouraged visceral experience of devotion. These enabled participants to experience a powerful spiritual connection that inspired a rupture against previous

---

[61] See Wacker pp1-2 for a broad overview. Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001.
[62] Walter J Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988).
[63] Martin Jay, *Songs of Experience: Modern American and European Variations on a Universal Theme* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 21.
[64] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001.
[65] Martin Marty, "Pentecostalism in the Context of American Piety and Practice," in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan (Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1975).Tongues may have been practiced in early church extensively till 3rd century and continued in the orthodox church, among Ranters and Quakers in Britain and some Mormons and Shakers. Margaret M Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads: Charisma and Institutional Dilemmas* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989), 38.

commitments.[66] Wesley accepted, as he put it, that "I feel my heart strangely warmed," although he was unsure how to relate the sensory to the theological. The most radical of his successors, "actively encouraged ecstatic weeping, laughing, jerking dancing, prostration, and, on rare occasions, even tongues."[67] These moments became highly visible signs of transformation. Beginning with baptism, radical evangelicals added layer upon layer of ruptural experience, each defined somewhat differently, but each inviting a similar logic in which God participated in everyday experience, often in ways that broke with the everyday. By the late 1900s in addition to baptism and sanctification, B.H. Irwin's fire baptized congregations preached fire baptism, often experienced through tongues, and then also "lyddite," "oxidite," and "dynamite" baptisms, a series of further ruptures each occasioned by bodily signs and providing further spiritual progress.[68]

Thus, pentecostals emerged as the avatars of a movement whose central pole of vitality depended upon the ability to cultivate ruptural moments, experiences that opened participants to deep refiguration of ethos and sensibilities. The seeming human capacity to feel deeply outside the norm, what scholars have called "religious experience," "the holy," the "numinous," or "alterity" are crucial to this process.[69]

---

[66] Robbins argues that this tendency towards rupture is an essential element of the Christian and pentecostal ethos. Joel Robbins, "Continuity Thinking and the Problem of Christian Culture: Belief, Time, and the Anthropology of Christianity.," *Current Anthropology* 48, no. 1 (2007).
[67] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 54.
[68] R. Michael Thornton, *Fire in the Carolinas: The Revival Legacy of G. B. Cashwell and A. B. Crumpler* (Charisma Media, 2014).
[69] Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*; Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry Into the Non-rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958); Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable."

For part of the power of "experiences deemed religious"[70] involves their capacity to be experienced as unmediated, immediate, spontaneous, and yet, at the same time have them directed, and carefully channeled within a tradition. As such, those who accomplish spiritual experience seem especially prone to refashion worldly commitments, both politically and theologically.[71] This means that personal rupture often instigates collective action, argument, and schism and, on occasion, massive cultural experimentation. For instance, one precursor cited by pentecostals, John Alexander Dowie, formed a theocratic city north of Chicago with 8,000 residents and 200,000 members aspiring to a class-less, pacifistic society, committed to racial harmony and gender equality, encouraging interracial marriages, and criticizing colonialism.[72] More generally, radical evangelical circles criticized the wealth animating Gilded Age magnates, the "civilizing" impulses behind Western imperialism, and even the gender roles within Western Christianity. Early pentecostals were almost universally pacifist, often multiracial, and often led by women.[73] By the turn of the century, many evangelical camp meeting and choirs were called pentecostal and centered around practices encouraging rupture and transformation.[74]

---

[70] Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered*; Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable"; Otto, *The idea of the holy*.
[71] Gauri Viswanathan, *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998).
[72] Allan Anderson, *Spreading Fires: The Missionary Nature of Early Pentecostalism* (London: SCM Press, 2007), 37.
[73] Paul Alexander, "An Analysis of the Emergence and Decline of Pacifism in the History of the Assemblies of God," *Peace Research Abstracts* 41, no. 4 (2004).
[74] Dayton, Donald, "From Christian Perfection to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost,'" 47.

That rupture inspired evangelism meant it provided incentive to reach out, to expand into the unequal reciprocity of new and unexpected relationships. Pentecostals leapt from their conversion experiences to travel the globe with excited messages of faith.[75] These missionaries thus inadvertently became mediators between cultures channeling cultural flows in both directions. This reciprocal process thus adds to rupture as another key to the continued mutability of a Christianity concerned with convincing others of its significance.

100 years later, following a century in which pentecostals swung far to the right in their fundamentalist phase, James Smith reclaims the radicalism of early pentecostalism arguing that, "the revolutionary activity of the Spirit always disrupts and subverts the status quo of the powerful."[76] Akin to the destabilizing effects of all conversion,[77] Smith suggests that the rupture of radicalizing experience may provide pentecostals the impulse to break, separate, and disrupt - nicely structured within a ritual but not Turner's *communitas* for the sake of continuity,[78] nor Durkheim's ritual as consolidating values,[79] but instead a tension that inspires constant bickering, battle, and rupture, change and vitality. And yet – the catch – in pentecostalism we have a mostly conservative movement.

---

[75] Anderson, *Spreading Fires*.
[76] James K. A Smith, *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2010), 45.
[77] Viswanathan, *Outside the Fold*.
[78] Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process : Structure and Anti-Structure*.. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969).
[79] Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. (New York: Free Press, 1965).

Pentecostal Emergence: Chaos Within Order

While liberal theorists critique pentecostals for a lack of autonomous agency with their subjectivities controlled by God, preachers, and rigid doctrine, and poststructuralists praise them for their ruptural agency, for pentecostals the worry is that modern hubris involves an excess of human control. Their fear is organization, and the instrumental rationality of the modern. Pentecostal concern about agency manifests most clearly in a tension between the structuring of human endeavor through organization and bureaucracy against the seeming openness of guidance by the Holy Spirit.[80] This strain results in constant schism. It began that way:

Just before the turn to the 20th century some white Midwestern Christians gather to pray. Inspired by the impending millennial shift, they challenge church doctrine that relegates immediate experience of the supernatural to apostolic times. Instead, their Bible reading sees the renewal of "strange tongues" as both a sign of purification and prefiguring Christ's return. Charles Parham invites a search through the Book of Acts for the evidence of spirit baptism, and a small group of followers spend weeks praying, singing, and waiting for the spirit to fall and tongues to emerge. On New Years Day 1901, Parham places his hands on Agnes Ozman who finally breaks into ecstatic prayer, a conflagration of sounds, resonant of speech, but certainly not English. It seems the millennium requires all to hear the gospel of tongues, so "missionary tongues" – xenoglossollalia - in which folks apparently speak languages previously unlearned - sparks evangelism.

[80] "From its origins, the church has lived in the state of enduring tension between the charismatic and institutional, freedom and order, emotion and intellect." Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 10.

Oddly enough, from 1902 to 1910 revivals evidencing similar experience erupt in Korea, Canada, Great Britain, Holland, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Chile, India, Estonia, Sweden, Wales, Ireland and then the most famous one in LA. While there are certainly some connections between them via pamphlets and roving missionaries, some scholars suggest that they arose spontaneously and simultaneously.[81]

In fact, for much of the movement, any semblance of planning or preparation signals a dead or dying Christianity. While diligently striving for the experience of tongues, Parham boasts that he never preps a sermon. Instead, it is pure spirituality.[82] As such, pentecostal revivals often appear unplanned: "It was perfect bedlam, and pandemonium reigned supreme," and "there was no particular cult or method practiced," Donald Gee explains, "if there was one thing above another that marked the meetings it was their amazing diversity."[83] As Ronald Kydd writes, "when we raise the question of organization, we are touching up on what was perhaps the paramount fear of the early pentecostal. With the exception of the devil himself, I have not found anything in the sources which is condemned with the passion that organization is."[84] Skepticism of planning and instrumentality permeated pentecostal subcultures.

---

[81] See especially Allan Anderson, "Revising Pentecostal History in a Global Perspective," in *Asian and Pentecostal: The Charismatic Face of Christianity in Asia*, ed. Allan. Anderson and Edmond. Tang (Oxford, UK: Regnum Books International, 2005), 154–8. Also Paul Pomerville, *The Third Force In Missions: A Pentecostal Contribution To Contemporary Mission Theology* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1985), 49; Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 25.
[82] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 114.
[83] Donald Gee, *The Pentecostal Movement: Including the Story of the War Years (1940-1947)* (London: Elm Publ. Co., 1949), 30.
[84] Ronald Kydd, "The Contribution of Denominationally Trained Clergymen To the Emerging pentecostal Movement in Canada," *Pneuma* 5, no. 1 (1983): 28. Grant McClung, *Readings in the*

Outsiders, on the other hand, decry the seemingly aberrant practices apparently so little ordered. The LA Times describes, "breathing strange utterances announcing a creed which it would seem no sane mortal could understand, the newest religious sect has started in Los Angeles. Meetings are held in a tumble–down shack… And the devotees of the weird doctrine practice the most fanatical rights, preach the wildest theories and work themselves into a state of mad excitement in their peculiar zeal.[85] The *Times* reporting, however, likely does more to publicize the movement than any other. Others see analogous chaos, "The devotees writhe on the floor like epileptics, leap into the air, chatter, scream, gnash their teeth, or beat themselves over the head… all the time uttering strange unintelligible gibberish."[86] Fundamentalists offer similar critiques of chaos. Even reasoned sociological analyses come off as flagrantly active: "worship is characterized by overt emotional expression and a wide range of unusual phenomena like the loss of feeling in certain parts of the body, falling into catalepsy and trance, visual and auditory hallucinations, clapping, standing, leaping, running, climbing, falling, rolling, and jerking."[87] Highly experiential revivals build a sense of transformation and impending change.

A closer look, however, provides an inkling of structure in the sequencing and preparation for practices: "rapid music gave way to exultant chanting and convulsive

---

Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement, 1984, 191. Blumhofer agrees, "resistance to a centralized authority was a matter of belief almost as much as the gospel, for many vowed never to revert to "dead" denominational forms." Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *The Assemblies of God: A Popular History* (Springfield, Mo.: Radiant Books, 1985).

[85] Los Angeles Times 1906 p1 cited in McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*, 3.

[86] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 101.

[87] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 11.

jerking of body limbs – followed by trance and, not surprisingly, abundant perspiration…"[88] Meetings from 5am till late at night, repeated every day of the week, clearly involve more than waiting. And then there is the broader context. For the 1905 Welsh revival and the San Francisco earthquake[89] excites a sense of imminent rapture and a special revival campaign in LA and the surrounding mountains.[90] The mission stays open 24 hours a day with meetings running continuously from 10 am to midnight.[91] And the exertion pays off.

Although well concealed amid declarations of spiritual immediacy, the effort towards learning skills to render spiritual experience possible always threatens to leak into full recognition. One early pentecostal testimony begins with a typical call for release: "We must fully surrender the tongue to [the Holy Spirit's] control…" Yet, the systematic creeps in. "It takes some time for most people to learn how to do this."[92] Wacker thus shows effort and trial as quite central to pentecostal narrative. He writes, "Many, perhaps most, spiritual memoirs began by referring to years of intense yearning for an 'enduement of power.'"[93] Many preach conviction in tongues even before experiencing it – this is not simply a response, but rather, a rationalized exploration of visceral possibilities.[94] Even so, neither Wacker nor any other scholars I have read mentions the "fake it till you make it" ethos I encountered among

---

[88] Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 102.
[89] 75,0000 of the "Earthquake Tract" were printed. Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 67.
[90] "By the end of 1905, revival expectations were at an all-time high among these radical evangelicals in Los Angeles–a direct result of the reports of the Welsh revival." Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 47.
[91] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 47.
[92] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 56.
[93] Ibid., 59.
[94] Ibid., 80.

contemporary practitioners (see chapter 5). To be sure, he was reading diaries and not talking directly to practitioners.

By 1906 one of Parham's students – a half-blind black man, William Seymour – leads the Azusa Street revival, with men and women, blacks and whites, in extravagant, visceral celebration of the "infilling of the Holy Spirit," an efflorescence of democratized spiritual physicality. Radical impulses were quite apparent as the prophecy from Azusa shows: "The time will come when the poor man will say that he has nothing to eat and work will be shut down. That is going to cause the poor man to go to these places and break in to get food. This will cause the rich man to come out with his gun to make war on the laboring man… blood will be in the streets like an outpouring of rain from heaven."[95] Sounds like a place on the verge of class rebellion. Later consolidation of the revival, however, brought a significantly more conservative ethos.

Parham visits Azusa where he is horrified and condemns his offspring in the first big schism of the new movement. Race, class, gender, and a seemingly excessive physicality all complicate the process of discerning the Godly from the pernicious.[96] Even so, Seymour's periodical *The Apostolic Faith* reaches 50,000 at its peak in 1908 and missionaries leave LA for India, China, Europe, Palestine, and Africa.[97]

[95] Mike Davis, "Planet of Slums," *New Left Review* 2004, no. 26 (2004): 27.
[96] By the mid 1920s Parham was connected to the KKK. Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 190.
[97] Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 50.

The Assemblies of God

In 1914 – and this may be the biggest schism and shift towards institution building yet – a new group, this time nearly all white men, gathers to channel and contain the movement. The new leaders of what becomes the Assemblies of God join to guide the "chaos" and thus solidify a tension that continues to this day. Seymour and Parham had consolidated the doctrine that speaking in tongues was the "initial evidence of the spirit," and thus, for AG, the presence of God comes packaged as individual sensory experience, but not just any experience. Within AG, tongues is generally public and interpreted by a nearby churchgoer, most often translated with Biblical reference. It is thus open to communal discernment, affirmation, and censure. Further, previously independent missionaries are supported but also contained. They still choose their mission site via the internal "call" but now funding depends upon doctrinal stability and a modicum of fiscal transparency. AG doctrine thus responds with collective discipline to the modern secular and fundamentalist critique of the chaos of radical evangelical sensory culture.[98]

However, by institutionalizing tongues, healing and missions more generally, they create a site for explicit debate over meaning, for schism. AG becomes a tension filled space, yanked between doctrinal and practical consolidation and relatively chaotic, often autonomous, spiritual expansion, a dialectic, as it turns out, highly generative of missions, conversions, and growth. For while AG leaders emphatically claim fluid yieldedness to the Holy Spirit as the overarching principle, almost

[98] It also resonates with the no nonsense valorization of individual senses so common to 19th century philosophies. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*.

immediately, a series of pitched battles over doctrine excite rapid institutionalization, sectarian splits, and massive proliferation.[99] The anxiety that seemingly misplaced human agency can induce is intense.

Concern over the stultifying and unspiritual effects of institutionalization played powerfully from the start. AG's principle of "voluntary cooperation" established a fluid council not a "staid" church or denomination.[100] The goal: "forestall any move on our part toward rigid organization." We, "do not believe in identifying ourselves into a sect or denomination which constitutes an organization which legislates or forms laws and articles of faith and has jurisdiction over its members and creates unscriptural lines of fellowship and disfellowship..."[101] With this ethos in place, the simplest acts of organization inspired vociferous battles. The first AG General Council authorized particular leaders to issue credentials for AG (crucial for free train passes) and to deny them to divorced and remarried persons, and most importantly, formed AG itself. In response, "…sharp, pungent words were spoken. Caustic editorials appeared in pentecostal papers. Prophesies foretold of ruin coming upon these men 'who had dared place restriction on the moving of the Holy Spirit.'"[102]

Noel Perkin, AG director of missions from 1927-1959, argues that AG institutionalized in spite of their initial distaste for organization. "In nature it was a fellowship," he says. As was made explicit in countless tracts and speeches, freedom

---

[99] William W Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1971).
[100] Noel Perkin and John Garlock, *Our World Witness: A Survey of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions* (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Pub. House, 1963), 31.
[101] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 99.
[102] William Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1971), 108.

relied on yielding, not mechanisms of control. "The constitutional declaration first adopted clearly stated that the association being recognized was not something created through organization. Rather, it was an established fact by the operation of the Holy Spirit."[103] Yet, the Holy Spirit did condone a semblance of structure. "Our early leaders recognized that a certain amount of disorder prevailed and wished to remedy it." Perkin cites 1914 AG conference minutes that signal aversion to modern individualism in missions: "Evidenced by past history, all kinds of chaotic conditions have been manifested… individualism has been the human order of the day, every man a law unto himself and consequently scriptural cooperation and fellowship… have not been realized." Here excessive human agency seems unruly. The spirit, by contrast, is tidy, if not bureaucratic. "As we appropriate divine order, we shall experience the divine presence and power." That is, for Perkin, the virtues of structure overrode his anxiety that human intervention might diminish spirituality. "Thus, the Council sought to move from Chaos to order, from individualism to unity and correlated effort."[104]

However, this sort of order also activated rupture, so almost immediately upon AG's formation a revival swept through, inspiring schism, near "complete disaster,"[105] and then increased containment. At one camp meeting, after "a glimpse of the power of the name of Jesus," one participant had, "jumped to his feet, ran through the camp grounds, startling early risers, and wakening those still asleep,"

[103] Perkin and Garlock, *Our World Witness*, 25.
[104] Ibid., 25–6.
[105] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 111.

shouting his new revelation. Across the West Coast, pentecostals were rebaptized via Jesus alone – oneness - not the trinity. J Roswell Flower, AG editor, tried to defuse the inspiration. His letters to other AG ministers warned of "disruptive doctrine" on the way. His warning came too late - they were already rebaptised. A camp meeting in July 1915 saw E.N. Bell, among the most influential of AG ministers, and hundreds of others, rebaptised with 4,000 attending a single Sunday nights service. Nearly every AG leader joined in to some degree. However, by fall of 1916 the fire cooled. The, "remarkable revelation seemed [now] to be based more on subjective feeling than on the objective revelation of the Word of God written."[106] AG's newspaper, the *Weekly Evangel,* called for sharp consolidation: "The time has come for the interpretation of what scriptural teaching and conduct is. The time for sifting and solidifying is here. The time for great shaking has begun, and all that can be disturbed will be shaken into separation from that which is settled into God." Bell repented of being swayed by desire for power instead of true revelation, and the "oneness" doctrine was voted down. In response, 156 of 585 AG ministers left – it was quite the schism.[107] Further, while AG had already formed from the mainly white elements of a previously integrated denomination (COGIC),[108] the oneness doctrine appealed more to AG's few remaining black ministers, and the schism left AG "all but 'lily white.'"[109]

---

[106] Ibid., 117.
[107] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 118–120.
[108] The Church of God in Christ (COGIC) is a now integrated, but primarily black pentecostal church.
[109] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 189.

Soon after the oneness challenge, other ministers questioned doctrine claiming tongues as the *only* initial physical evidence of the baptism of the spirit. In response: more lockdown. AG's 1916 General Council drafted a "statement of fundamental truths," which soon became a prerequisite set of commitments for missionary credentials.[110] Within 3 years of 1914, AG ordained and licensed clergy with careful gradations of hierarchy increasingly restricted to men.[111] The "Church in spite of itself," had begun to bureaucratize.[112]

Aspiring to inhibit chaos, AG eventually built a massive bureaucracy with hundreds of distinct units, each ostensibly self-sufficient.[113] To name a few: Light for the Lost, MAPS, Global Conquest, prison ministry, Teen Challenge, missions to the blind, foreign language groups, American Indians, the deaf, a women's missionary council, Speed the Light fundraising campaigns, Boys and Girls Missionary Crusade. By 1989 AG had 330 Bible schools with over 32,400 students and 2000 schools by 2010. The 380 North American missionaries in 1914 become 1,464 in 1987 and

[110] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 128.
[111] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 107. In 1925 a proposed constitution was voted down and its proponents ostracized, but by 1927 it was adopted and the folks reinstated. With each schism, dissenters left the organization and those remaining consolidated further doctrinal clarity. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 143.
[112] Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*, 29.
[113] In 1919 AG hires a missionary secretary for the new missionary department. In 1937 AG's Department of Education and Home Missions hires a full time director. 1943 uniform Sunday school lessons. In 1949 the General Council debates over whether connecting CBI (Central Bible Institute) to AABC (American Association of Bible Colleges, formed in 1947) would mean ordination could require academic degrees. 1955 foreign missions board forms. 1957 foreign missions advisory board forms. 1959 summer school of mission set up annually.1960 and 1965 standards and criteria established for greater fiscal supervision of missionary projects. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, chapters 11–12.

thousands more from the rest of the globe.[114] The institution building came attendant with a set of structures both for containment and enabling – an increasingly policed set of doctrines and a pedagogy for encouraging gifts of the spirit that is also increasingly textual and explicit.

Growing institutional structure also resonated well with an interest in fundamentalist doctrine. The 1918 publication of *The Fundamentals* gave name to the blend of premillenialism and innerancy that circulated through a tightly knit network of bible colleges and churches. Although fundamentalist emphasis on text grated against the Holy Spirit focus of pentecostalism, AG's outsider stance towards secular modernity, its mid-western white cultural roots, and strong desire to match science with something equally solid had AG leaders calling themselves fundamentalists, even as the rest of fundamentalism rejected them as heretical for their refusal to accept cessationism (the idea that God's spirit no longer acted in everyday miracles and the like).

Further, the perfectionist ethos of fundamentalist innerancy made sense to AG participants who thought scripture could be scientifically demonstrated. Wacker describes the fascination for highly technical cultural production among early pentecostals. Their careful analysis of one section of scripture demonstrates his point: "49 words, or 7 sevens, of which 442, or 6 sevens are nouns. Of the 42 nouns, 35, or 5 sevens, are proper nouns, and 7 are common nouns. Of the 35 proper names, 28 or 4 sevens, are male ancestors of Jesus, and 7 are not." It was a broadly held ethos in

[114] Murray Dempster, *Called & Empowered : Global Mission in Pentecostal Perspective* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 227, 267.

which, "the goal then was precision – first, last, and always, precision," he concludes.[115] Likewise, the common AG description of tongues as "initial evidence" indicated an valorization of scientific rationality. As such, debates over doctrine best resolved through experiment. For instance, after arguing over the need for tongues for the infilling of the spirit, "It was determined that a test case should be made." Missionaries then inspired conversions while explicitly leaving off any mention of tongues, "but it came anyways." For the sake of AG's scientific minded culture, tongues was proven both necessary and spontaneous.[116]

Bible colleges provided exemplary sites for nurturing these highly rationalized dispositions alongside deeply mystical challenges to the status quo. With 85 % of graduates entered into the ministry, bible colleges were highly valued. Paul Hogan, head of AG's missions department from 1960-1989, called them "the greatest contribution to national ministry… These Bible schools are the heart of modern missions."[117] Further, they provide sites for rulemaking. For instance, Glad Tidings – which later became Bethany University - prescribed student schedules from early morning till late at night with Mondays off for cleaning. One free hour each day from 10-11 am gave a touch of flexibility. Rules abounded. Taboos on dancing, gambling, cards, tobacco, alcohol, immodest dress, movies, bowling, circuses, baseball games,

---

[115] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 81.
[116] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 125–6. AG continues this tradition of meticulous systematic assessment. Their yearly reports track conversions, water baptisms by state showing their percentage change yearly and in five and ten year increments as well. http://agchurches.org/Sitefiles/Default/RSS/AG.org%20TOP/AG%20Statistical%20Reports/2014/2013%20Full%20Statistical%20Report.pdf
[117] G. B McGee, "Assemblies of God Overseas Missions: Foundations for Recent Growth," *Missiology: An International Review Missiology: An International Review* 16, no. 4 (1988): 433.

earrings, social parties, eating meat, sweets, wearing neckties, using hair curlers, coca cola, life insurance, doctors, cosmetics, and theaters were common throughout AG and solidified in its Bible colleges.[118] The rules were from God, little discussion brooked. Such "Certitude" and "Absolutism" perhaps provided "retreat from the turbulence of doubt and denial."[119] Yet rigorous limits can invite limit experiences. Rules can lead to rupture. Think of the common pentecostal demand for revealing public confession and for "fasting to the point of complete physical exhaustion."[120] Further, given such stringency, any encounter with difference, within the movement, or outside of it, incited bitter dispute, and splitting - many ended friendships. Wacker, a pentecostal himself, calls it the "ecumenicism of the carnivore." As he says, "everyone was welcome as long as they were willing to be devoured."[121] It is quite a metaphor.

Long these lines, in spite of their concurrence on legalism, and the pentecostal's claim to fraternity, fundamentalists were amongst the most vociferous critics of pentecostal spirituality. The 1928 World Christian Fundamentals Association reasoned that tongues and healing were serious problems: "Whereas, the present wave of Modern Pentecostalism, often referred to as the 'tongues movement,' and the present wave of fanatical and unscriptural healing which is sweeping over the country today, has become a menace in many churches and a real injury to sane testimony of Fundamental Christians. Be it Resolved, That this convention go on record as

---

[118] Cited in multiple conversations and Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 141.
[119] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 23.
[120] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 141.
[121] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 178.

unreservedly opposed to Modern Pentecostalism, including the speaking in unknown tongues, and the fanatical healing."[122] Carl Macintyre, leader of the attack on pentecostals, unsuccessfully tried to keep AG out of the National Association of Evangelicals and isolated from the rest of fundamentalism.

In this manner, pentecostals experience constant border clashes, splits and battles perhaps embodying what Christian Smith calls, "embattled and thriving."[123] Outsiders called pentecostals "the last vomit of Satan"; "founded by a Sodomite,"[124] "[a] disturbing anarchy," and a "satanic disturbance."[125] Further, attacks from the outside were often more than metaphorical: "mobbed by shouting, pushing men; cayenne pepper was scattered in the sawdust; rocks, decayed vegetables, and 'stink bombs' were tossed through windows and into tents; tent ropes were cut, and meeting places set afire… pentecostals were beaten, tarred and feathered, shot at and had their meetings broken into by galloping horsemen. In one section of Appalachia the homes and chapels of pentecostals were dynamited. Some of this abuse was because pentecostal preachers often supported employers against workers in strike situations."[126] And, the rage was reciprocated. In 1962 AG condemned the ecumenical movement. As Vincent Synan explained, "The pentecostals rejected

---

[122] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 180.
[123] Christian Smith, *American Evangelicalism : Embattled and Thriving* (Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998).
[124] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 72.
[125] Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 25. As R. Marie Griffith explains, from inside the movement, there is a felt need to, "daily repudiate those metaphorical hands from the outside culture [which] they feel… are pushing them down, coursing their obedience to social structures that, in their view, reward greed, dishonesty, and sheer ambition and scorn traditional Christian values along with those who believe in them." Griffith, *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*, 16.
[126] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 149–50.

society because they believed it to be corrupt, wicked, hostile, and hopelessly lost, while society rejected pentecostals because it believed them to be insanely fanatical, self–righteous, doctrinally in error, and emotionally unstable."[127] It was a mutual renunciation that, perhaps, provided energy to pentecostal mobilization – it helps to have an enemy.

Even so, in spite of invigorating battles and constant efforts to elude stifling institutionalization, scholars trace declension within AG, at least in the US.[128] Some describe the decline of services, fewer on Sunday night (down from 70-48%), and weeknights;[129] two week revivals shrunk to weekends only.[130] It may be that fewer participants speak in tongues.[131] Likewise, Pentecostal musical practices shifted from leaderless with no piano or organ to a characteristic gospel-pop genre with rock band accompaniment and a growing, but limited collection of well-known songs. AG even produced a songbook series starting in 1930.[132] Observers noticed the change in worship. "The spontaneity of worship is not as obvious in many congregations as it once was…"[133] Thus, by the 1930s "the movement had entered a different stage of

---

[127] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 141.
[128] As Maslow put it, "most people lose or forget this subjectively religious experience, and redefine religion as a set of habits, behaviors, dogmas, forms, which at the extreme becomes entirely legalistic and bureaucratic, conventional, empty, and in the truest meaning of the word, anti-–religious." Abraham H Maslow, *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences* (New York: Penguin Arkana, 1994), viii.
[129] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 145.
[130] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 339.
[131] The stats now say that nearly half of AG participants reported being slain in the Spirit half heard God speak through dream or vision, but difficult to tell what the past was like for comparison's sake. Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 6.
[132] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 350. FYI. Elvis Presley was a Pentecostal.
[133] Ibid., 347.

development; much of the spontaneous element had become ritualized and what had been a fluid movement had largely crystallized into a number of denominations."[134]

Fundamentalism, and perhaps declension, also meant ditching the radicalism of early pentecostalism: no more pacifism, little racial diversity, few female leaders, and almost no critical analysis of class divisions in modernity. Upon formation, AG had immediately eliminated racial diversity by disassociating with COGIC's black leadership. Blacks could only become AG ministers after 1958, and active racial reconciliation waited until 1991.[135] Similarly, by the middle of WWI AG's professed pacifism waned, although it did not lose official sanction until the midst of the Vietnam War.[136] Women had lost access to several levels of the AG hierarchy within 3 years of its formation.[137] By mid century AG was ensconced at the center of the growing fundamentalist network with American exceptionalism, anti-communism, and John Birch politics well respected.[138] Even so, a tension remained which posed the fluidity of individual experience, the collective passion of groups in charismatic prayer, regularly revivals, and the persistent push for change from missionaries returning from across the globe with incipient cosmopolitan sensibilities all against the rigidity of textual home church AG doctrine.

---

[134] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 4.
[135] Joe Newman, *Race and the Assemblies of God Church the Journey from Azusa Street to the "Miracle of Memphis"* (Youngstown, N.Y.: Cambria Press, 2007).
[136] Alexander, "An Analysis of the Emergence and Decline of Pacifism in the History of the Assemblies of God."
[137] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*.
[138] By the mid-1970s AG leaders were at the center of the Christian Right. Sara Diamond, *Not by Politics Alone: The Enduring Influence of the Christian Right* (New York: Guilford Press, 1998); Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors : The Origins of the New American Right* (Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001); Ann Rowe. Seaman, *Swaggart: The Unauthorized Biography of an American Evangelist* (New York; London: Continuum, 2001); Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*.

While revival seems much like political rebellion, in AG the rebel impulse had, at least, rhetorical sanction from top leadership. As such, every few years revival would sweep through challenging institutional order, the doctrine, and often the fundamentalism. Every early schism imagined itself as Spirit inspired revival. Larger revolts emerged in the 1920s and 1930s.[139] In 1949, the Latter Rain revival defied centralized control. Revivalists mandated strict congregationalism[140] and questioned the very existence of AG. As one participant wrote, "all sects and denominations from Paul's day till now exist because of Man's carnality."[141] In spite of the AG tradition of revivalism, the reply from the General Council came harsh. The General Council specified, "six errors" including, "overemphasis" on gifts of the spirit, as well as, "erroneous," and, "extreme," teachings, "extreme and unscriptural practice," and to my eyes a surprisingly general critique of the Latter Rain as somewhat different from the AG consensus. They aimed to strike down, "Such other wrestings and distortions of Scripture interpretations which are in opposition to teachings and practices generally accepted among us."[142] While this particular revival

[139] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 322.
[140] Control by local congregations.
[141] Rudy V Busto, *King Tiger: The Religious Vision of Reies López Tijerina* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005), 108.
[142] The general council denunciation of the latter rain reads: ""Six errors were specified: 1. The overemphasis relative to imparting, identifying, bestowing or confirming of gifts by laying on of hands and prophecy. 2. The erroneous teaching that the church is built on the foundation of present–day apostles and prophets. 3. The extreme teaching as advocated by the "New Order" regarding the confession of sin to man and deliverance as practiced, which claims prerogatives to human agency which belong only to Christ. 4. The erroneous teaching concerning the impartation of the gift of languages as special equipment for missionary service. 5. The extreme and unscriptural practice of imparting or imposing personal leanings by the means of gifts of utterance. 6. Such other wrestings and distortions of Scripture interpretations which are in opposition to teachings and practices generally accepted among us." William Menzies seems to internalize the critique as he describes the Latter Rain quite negatively: "a meteoric movement appealing to the sensational. It succeeded in generating

– and most others – received very clear condemnation, revival, at least in the abstract, was still very much encouraged.

Thus, in spite of apparent declension, and perhaps as a result of constant revival, pentecostalism, and AG, continued to show signs of exceptional vitality. Starting in the early 1960s "charismatics" among Catholics and other evangelicals learned to nurture the experience of gifts of the spirit, taking institutional lessons in slightly different directions.[143] The National Association of Evangelicals became predominantly charismatic and pentecostal.[144] By 1978 *Christian Century* called AG's Oral Roberts one of the ten most influential religious leaders in the US. A 1978 Gallup poll suggested that 19% of adult Americans, 29 million, considered themselves pentecostal or charismatic, Pew called it 23% by 2008.[145]

AG was no exception to pentecostal vitality.[146] By the late 20th century, AG's Department of Foreign Missions ran the largest – in-volume – foreign press in the US, missions in over 124 countries, and AG led one of the world's largest private primary and secondary school systems.[147] And while perhaps no longer approaching

---

widespread hysteria throughout the pentecostal denominations in the late 1940's…" One leader appeared especially theologically dangerous, "a sincere woman but inclined to be visionary." Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 322, 325.

[143] Thomas J Csordas, *Language, Charisma, and Creativity: The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

[144] Some critics say up to 80%. i.e. David Cloud, *The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement: The History and Error* (Port Huron, MI: Way of Life Literature, 2008).

[145] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 7; Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals*. (Washington, D.C.: Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, 2006), 4.

[146] AG in the US was roughly 1.7 by 1980, 3.1 million by 2013. http://www.ag.org/top/About/Statistics/index.cfm

[147] Dwight Wilson, *Armageddon Now! The Premillenarian Response to Russia and Israel Since 1917* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1977), 2.

a "near total level of lay participation,"[148] even as late as 1989, 62% of participants believed they experienced a miraculous healing in the past year, 67% had occasionally spoken in tongues, and 91% reported frequently or occasionally experiencing a "definite answer to prayer requests." Nearly half reported being "slain in the spirit," half heard God speak through dream or vision, and 91% received "personal confirmation" of scriptural truth.[149] Stark and Bainbridge argue that AG's high levels of tension with society inspire 91% to pray often as opposed to 63% in low tension groups. Further, they say 70% spend 2 or more evenings in church while only 8-10 % of mainline folks do.[150] By 2010 81.5% of US counties had at least one AG church.[151] In the US, AG experienced 14.6 % growth in adherents from 2003 to 2013 although much of it was among immigrants who had already converted to pentecostalism.[152] These are US numbers – outside the US AG was vastly more vibrant.[153]

---

[148] McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*.
[149] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 13.
[150] Ibid., 142–146.
[151] ASARB. (May 2012). Ranking of religious groups in the United States in 2010, by county penetration rate. In Statista - The Statistics Portal. Retrieved November 18, 2014, from http://www.statista.com.oca.ucsc.edu/statistics/245441/ranking-of-religious-groups-by-us-county-penetration-rate/
[152] http://agchurches.org/Sitefiles/Default/RSS/AG.org%20TOP/AG%20Statistical%20Reports/2014/2013%20Full%20Statistical%20Report.pdf Other statistics differ slightly: from 617 to 810,000 between 1990 and 2008 Institute for the Study of Secularism in Society and Culture, Trinity College (2014). Self-Described Religious Identification Of Adult Population: 1990, 2001, And 2008 ProQuest Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 2014 Online Edition. Retrieved from http://statabs.proquest.com.oca.ucsc.edu/sa/abstract.html?table-no=80&acc-no=C7095-1.1&year=2014&z=0B39830AF33E5EB08B9134E2C4B57C77BED2DE75. Or from 2.1 million to 2.9 million from 1990 to 2010. Association of Religion Data Archives (www.theARDA.com) see footnote 1 for more detail.
[153] Globally AG claimed 67.5 million in 2013 up from 64 million in 2010. This is from yearly Summary Statistical Reports available on the AG website. http://www.ag.org/top/About/Statistics/index.cfm

Institutionalization also meant systematic thinking about growth. Expanding across the globe, AG developed a missiology – missions theory – centered around indigenous church principles that, in theory, meant yielding power to church leaders in the global south.[154] However, early AG missionaries, nearly all white, mostly men, and from the US, struggled with racism and paternalism.[155] Eventually, the AG missions department ruled that no funds could come from the US to fund, and thus control, churches, missionaries needed to set up self propagating, self-supporting, and self governing churches. Alongside their missiology, AG developed pedagogies for the sensory aptitudes that manifested as pentecostal gifts of the spirit.

Yet, this successful encounter with the outside world pressured for change in AG culture. On a superficial level, technology changed evangelism. Glad Tidings hosted the first AG radio station, and then Jimmy Swaggart, Oral Roberts, Jim Bakker, Kenneth Hagin, and Paul Crouch built a huge AG television ministry through which fundamentalist-penetecostals spread the gospel of imminent rapture, otherworldly salvation, biblical innerancy, and the reactionary politics of the Christian Coalition.[156]

However, while central to the project of fundamentalist expansion, missions encounters – and here is one of the big claims of this project – pushed for deep

---

[154] i.e. Melvin Hodges, *The Indigenous Church Including The Indigenous Church and the Missionary*, Rev. ed. (Springfield MO: Gospel Pub. House, 2009); Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*.
[155] Newman, *Race and the Assemblies of God Church the Journey from Azusa Street to the "Miracle of Memphis"*; Anderson, *Spreading Fires*.
[156] I can clearly describe the dominance of reactionary politics within AG because of the many interviews I did. One can also look at the 2008 Pew Study on pentecostals, as well as a series of books on Jimmy Swaggart and the Christian right more generally. Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals*.; Seaman, *Swaggart*; Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*; Diamond, *Not by Politics Alone*; McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*.

internal change. For at the very moment that AG hit the US national political scene in coalition with other fundamentalists, as the millions in donations from television fundraising ballooned the AG missions budget, a minority tradition was gaining traction within AG missions. Missionaries who returned from the field transformed began advocating for cross-cultural sensitivity and against the US exceptionalism, innerancy, and premillenialism. The first public sign of this dissonance came in the early 1970s as AG missiologists began suggesting a kingdom theology focused on earthly concerns like food for the poor.[157] In 1974 AG leaders participated in the Lausanne Conference where cultural sensitivity and compassion ministries were initially mainstreamed within evangelical missiology.[158]

Because missions were central to AG identity, this pressure for change had effects. When AG bragged, they bragged about missions. When Swaggart spent his millions on things other than himself, it went to missions.[159] Missionaries were the favorite sons and daughters of middle American congregations. These were the purist of the pure, the most deeply cloaked in the fundamentalist convictions of their home churches. Thus, when missionaries spoke - even about their new theologies - it mattered. Further, missions were the locus for the civilizing project. There was little better cover for a transformative impulse than the most imperial, most rigid, and most

---

[157] Douglas Peterson, "Missions in the 21st Century: Toward a Methodology of Pentecostal Compassion," *Transformation* 16, no. 2 (1999): 54–59.
[158] Rodger Bassham, *Mission Theology, 1948-1975: Years of Worldwide Creative Tension--Ecumenical, Evangelical, and Roman Catholic* (Pasadena CA: William Carey Library, 1979); Tormod Engelsviken, *Spiritual Conflict In Today's Mission: A Report From The Consultation On "Deliver Us From Evil," August 2000, Nairobi, Kenya* (Nairobi Kenya: Association of Evangelicals of Africa, 2001).
[159] Seaman, *Swaggart*; Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*.

highly valued institution in a huge conservative bureaucracy. That missions also engendered encounter with new ideas, faces, practices, cultures, and powers challenged the rigid fundamentalism characteristic of AG since the 1920s. In other words, missionaries couldn't help but cycle their changed impulses back home and transform AG more broadly. Further, many AG missionaries on furlough spread their newfound uncertainty as professors at AG universities. By the end of the 1970s, kingdom theology and contextualization (a significantly more sensitive approach to cultures) had permeated AG missions and were beginning to seep into broader AG discussions.[160] However, even with an expanding education network that could effectively spread the "missionary conversions"[161] of AG fundamentalists turned evangelical, it took until 2003 for AG to change its statement of purpose such that compassion ministries joined evangelism as a central goal.

The shifting of dominant dispositions within AG over the past century, from radical evangelical to fundamentalist and then to (neo)evangelical, opened space for today's more evangelically minded pentecostal thinkers to argue that pentecostal political-theology is essentially fluid and social justice oriented. Heather Curtis, for instance, claims that early pentecostal missions succeeded because when compared to mainline missions, pentecostals had less regard for the civilizing mission, the rationalization of advanced missionary science, and were even accepting of a "great

[160] Gary B McGee, *This Gospel--Shall Be Preached. Vols 1-2* (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Pub. House, 1986), 100–103, 217.
[161] Orta, ""Living the Past Another Way."

reversal" of authority from the West to the global South.[162] Her story, however, has limits. It relies on pre-AG sources. Thus, although she recognizes AG's fundamentalism challenges her tale of fluidity, she does not allow that a tremendous element in pentecostal success likely came from exactly the increased structure and constraint brought to bear by AG in its fundamentalist insistence upon rigid form. It seems tempting for pentecostal scholars, like Curtis, to read AG history through an evangelical lens and treat its mid-century fundamentalism and institutionalism as aberration. Instead, I suggest that the movement has always evoked embattled tension; that bureaucracy and the spirit provide a necessary struggle. Hogan portrays the Holy Spirit as motivational and opening: "Where human instrumentality leaves off, a blessed ally takes over. It is the Holy Spirit who calls, it is the Holy Spirit who inspires, it is the Holy Spirit who reveals." Yet, he completes the circle as well, for also, "it is the Holy Spirit who administers."[163] To my mind, in this model, the two impulses, fluid Spirit and rigid calculating administration entangle.

Why Do They Grow?

The question "why do they grow?" was central to nearly every extended survey of pentecostalism. The most common answer – by far – emphasizes pentecostal supernaturalism and gifts of the spirit. Invigorating to westerners, familiar to global southerners, brilliant at appropriating the pagan spirits of the global south, and fluid

[162] Heather D. Curtis, "Pentecostal Missions and the Changing Character of Global Christianity.," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 36, no. 3 (2012).
[163] McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the pentecostal Movement*, 125–6.

enough to resonate nicely with neoliberal globalization, gifts of the spirit likely help explain pentecostal distinction. Further, Joel Robbins argues that the discontinuity of pentecostal practice is key to their vitality.[164] I agree, but with three additions. Growth apparently required: (1) methodical cultivation; (2) the reciprocal encounter of evangelism as contactful incentive to change and expand; (3) and finally, a struggle against the outside world's limits to make rupture meaningful. That is, the rupture of spirit needs at least cultivation, reciprocity, and a world to battle.

Pentecostal practices might engender deep participation and a decentralized movement, perhaps sparking growth. Luther Gerlach, for instance, describes pentecostal spiritual behavior as inherently resistant to centralized power: "the very characteristics of ecstatic religious behavior – ceremonial dissociation, decentralized structure, unconventional ideology, opposition to established structures – which might appear to be marks of a sect of misfits and dropouts, are indeed the features which combine to make pentecostalism a growing, expanding, evangelistic religious movement of change."[165] Likewise, the evangelical missiologist Eugene Nida sees pentecostalism as revolutionary through broad participation and lack of hierarchy: "There are practical similarities between all pentecostals despite organizational differences such as the preparation of leaders through an apprenticeship, the full participation of almost everyone, and the gradation of respect within the congregation

[164] Joel Robbins, "On the Paradoxes of Global Pentecostalism and the Perils of Continuity Thinking," *Religion* 33, no. 3 (2003): 221–31.
[165] Luther Gerlach, "Pentecostalism: Revolution or Counter-Revolution?," in *Religious Movements in Contemporary America,* ed. Irving I Zaretsky and Mark P Leone (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974), 685.

on the basis of function rather than social status."[166] AG calls itself a loose "fellowship" rather than the more centralized denomination and its multiple formations in some countries support this emphasis.

Pentecostal spiritual practice also allows a certain continuity with pagan religiosity. Instead of denying the reality of pagan spirits, missionaries must either defeat them (like Elijah) or refigure them as demon spirits.[167] By recognizing the activity of non-God, non-human spirituality, what missiologists call the "excluded middle," pentecostals open new possibilities in the encounter between the west and the global South.[168]

Resonance with neoliberalism and the modernizing project also might help explain pentecostal expansion.[169] The community support, both economic and around drug and alcohol rehabilitation that is common to pentecostalism seems effective in engendering class mobility in some cases.[170] Further, women in barrios describe men who, after conversion, become better partners in family life amidst communities who offer food and access to employment.[171] And finally, the prosperity doctrine common

---

[166] Eugene Nida, "The Communication of the Gospel to Latin America," *Practical Anthropology* 7 (1960): 633.
[167] Birgit Meyer, *Translating the Devil : Religion and Modernity among the Ewe in Ghana* (Trenton NJ: Africa World Press, 1999).
[168] J Casanova, "Religion, the New Millenium, and Globalization," *Sociology of Religion* 62 (2001): 415–42.
[169] Cox, *Fire from Heaven*; Sturla J. Stålsett, *Spirits of Globalization: The Growth of Pentecostalism and Experiential Spiritualities in a Global Age* (London: SCM Press, 2006).
[170] David Martin, *On Secularization: Towards a Revised General Theory* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005).
[171] Elizabeth E Brusco, *The Reformation of Machismo: Evangelical Conversion and Gender in Colombia* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1995).

to many pentecostal revivals offers ideological support for the transition to capitalist exchange.[172]

Perhaps the most common insider narrative references the success of spontaneity in both spiritual experience and eschatological imminence. Grant McClung calls it the "priority of the event,"[173] by which he means moments of ruptural possibility. He cites Christensen who says, "Pentecostal Christianity tends to find its rise in events which are heralded as a demonstration of supernatural power and activity." Christensen does continue, suggests McClung, to allow for cultivation, when he describes a "mood of expectancy," or "standing on tiptoe, expecting something to happen." That is, in spite of a focus on events, they recognize scales other than the immediate, they see a process, or prefiguration. Even so, the mood and the waiting seem less consequential - the event is what matters.

Likewise, Joel Robbins emphasizes rupture: "how pentecostal discourses and rituals of disjunction work together to pry the present loose from the past..." Challenging anthropology's impulse towards continuity, Robbins foregrounds discontinuity among Birgit Meyer's Ghanaian pentecostals who, "make a complete break with the past," van Dijk's, "project of cultural discontinuity" and Robbins' own work among the Urapmin, who, "call on God to clear out the spirits collectively,"

---

[172] Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff, "Occult Economies and the Violence of Abstraction: Notes from the South African Postcolony," *American Ethnologist* 26, no. 2 (1999): 279–303; Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff, *Millenial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism* (na, 2005).
[173] emphasis in original McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*, 6.

establishing a drastically new frontier for spirituality.[174] Robbins thus develops what he calls an, "anthropology of discontinuity."[175] While I agree that change is key, my study recognizes a third force, a process between stasis and rupture but crucial to both. The relationship between these two – cultivation - is crucial to pentecostal experience. As such, I take Christensen's "moods of expectancy" seriously as context, but also as structured and structuring sensibilities inviting fissure.

Thus, without denying any of the previous arguments for pentecostal growth, I join scholars who emphasize the tensions between systematization and sensory experience, what William Menzies describes as, "somewhere near the optimum in the delicate balance between spiritual vitality and efficient organization."[176] That is, instead of Marc Bloch's juxtaposition of the great "flash in the pan" millennial movements against the "patient, silent struggles stubbornly carried on by rural communities" around material needs.[177] I will show that pentecostals do both. Cheryl Bridges Johns argues that this vast, but methodically reiterated, enthusiasm makes the difference. As she explains, pentecostal worship has most of the elements of traditional liturgy but it is not fixed and therefore is, "constantly being shaped and reshaped by the people of God," a "third way" between chaos and rigidity, with the key element being full participation.[178]

---

[174] Robbins, "On the Paradoxes of Global Pentecostalism and the Perils of Continuity Thinking," 224–6.
[175] Ibid., 230.
[176] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 382.
[177] Marc Bloch, *French Rural History: An Essay on Its Basic Characteristics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966).
[178] Cheryl Bridges Johns, *Pentecostal Formation: A Pedagogy Among the Oppressed* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 89.

The systematizing and containing impulses most identified with innerancy and the mechanics of massive bureaucracy[179] often seem in tension with the fluidity of gifts of the spirit and an emphasis on evental immediacy. Grant Wacker calls it the mutual entanglement of the "pragmatic" and the "primitive."[180] He tells how the primitive, a deep yearning to "know the divine mind and will as directly and surely as possible, without the distorting refractions of human volition, traditions or speculations," meant that pentecostals imagined the pragmatic – i.e. human creeds, articles of faith and systems - as "humanly fabricated, and therefore error-riddled, structures that had to be torn down so the true churches of God could be erected in their place."[181] Even so, Wacker's investigation of early pentecostal narratives found pragmatics abounding in "mundane realities" like budgets, schedules, careful leadership, and incredibly hard work. In other words, his findings contradicted pentecostal narratives and Wacker, born a pentecostal himself, could not tell the spiritual tale without recognizing the quotidian. Likewise, Jon Bialecki's dialectic between charisma and the Bible and Thomas Kirsch's description of spirit and letters, "synchronically" engaged, offer visions of the tensions engaged with pentecostal cultivation.[182]

---

[179] A small group of scholars describe fundamentalist expansion via their innerancy i.e.? Dean Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing: A Study in Sociology of Religion* (NY: Harper & Row, 1972). However, few do the same for pentecostals Robert Niklaus, "Global Report," *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (October 1974).

[180] As he writes: "My main argument can be stated in a single sentence: *The genius of the pentecostal movement lay in its ability to hold two seemingly incompatible impulses in productive tension*." Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 10.

[181] Ibid., 11–12.

[182] Jon Bialecki, "The Bones Restored to Life: Dialogue and Dissemination in the Vineyard's Dialectic of Text and Presence," in *The Social Life of Scriptures Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Biblicism*, ed.

"Cultivation" then could involve thinking through the meat of the dialectic in Bialecki's formulation, or the entangling of Wacker's primitive and pragmatic. It explores a dynamic relationship between scales of analysis, the tensions between structure and agency, or church and revival. But more, it includes the relationship between processes of change and of rupture – not simply stasis and change. Edith Blumhofer notes the link between what she calls the progressive and instantaneous dimensions of pentecostal experience. She cites J.W. Horne who explains that, "sanctification is a progressive work, while entire sanctification is the work of but a moment. There is a moment in which the darkness forever ceases… there is a moment in which sanctification passes into entire sanctification."[183] While this evokes theological nuance I will elide, the processual argument is key, and simple – rupture requires cultivation.

Within the process, then, one can observe intensities, the tight and the lax, dynamics that either propel a movement, or let it wither. Thus, instead of declension narratives in which bureaucracy sings a death knell, I find the vibrating threads of rationalization, the process within the fabric of the sensory. If let fall loose, the organization might shrivel. For, in order to pulse, cells require membranes, shapes

---

James S Bielo (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009); Thomas G Kirsch, *Spirits and Letters: Reading, Writing and Charisma in African Christianity* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2008).Think also of Margaret Poloma, a charismatic, calling it spontaneity with bureaucratization, Everett Wilson told of the prophet against priest. Daniele Hervieu Leger's "dialectic between spontaneity and regulation" and Meredith Macguire's "controlled spontaneity." Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*; Danièle Hervieu-Léger, "'What Scripture Tells Me': Spontaneity and Regulation Within the Catholic Charismatic Renewal," in *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*, ed. David D Hall (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997); Meredith B McGuire, *Pentecostal Catholics: Power, Charisma, and Order in a Religious Movement* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982).

[183] Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 26.

within which to oscillate between moments of break, flow, and continuity. This exploration requires a close look at the actual structures of learning within pentecostalism, the practices and institutions that nurture particular sets of dispositions, sensibilities, and sensory aptitudes. Pentecostals develop their capacities very carefully, and the mechanisms are quite explicit.

Prologue: Section I Reciprocity, Chapter I

These next three chapters tell the story of the reciprocity that makes missions a powerful process for engendering change, perhaps in their target communities, but more certainly in the home denominations that send their most passionate members to travel the world commissioned to persuade others. I describe fundamentalist-pentecostal missionaries traveling throughout the world and encountering increasingly confident post-colonial converts such that missionaries have their previous sense of superiority deeply challenged. This new cosmopolitan humility is then, to some degree, transferred back home to AG as they travel from church to church fundraising and then teaching in AG's higher education institutions. The differences between the evangelical cultural sensitivity taught by these returning missionaries and the fundamentalist pedagogies of their home churches result in division and schism. Bethany University closed partly because of one of those battles. On the surface Bethany's tale appears as a problem with financial mismanagement, but also might be read as struggle between two pedagogies (rote versus ruptural learning and biblical innerancy versus cultural fluidity), and then, approached even more deeply, could invoke a debate between separatist-fundamentalist and expansive-evangelical impulses within pentecostalism. This first chapter of the reciprocity story traces the transformed returning missionary to their impact upon AG political-theology, doctrine and Bethany education.

Chapter I: The Effects of Missionary Conversion:[184]

Transforming Pentecostals from Fundamentalist to Evangelical.

Missions and Theology: Reciprocal Narratives

It is fall 2008. Outside Celia's[185] *window, all who pass are Muslim. After thirty years of learning the culture and joining surrounding communities as a supporter, advocate, and teacher, Celia, an Assemblies of God missionary, finds it increasingly difficult to imagine her friends and neighbors bound to eternal suffering. She tentatively notes Bible passages that blur her previous insistence that unless they are born again, Hell awaits. However, Celia's financial supporters from the US emphasize conversions, not cultural openness. Thus, she avoids discussing her doubts in her regular preaching and fundraising visits to churches back home. Even so, when teaching young missionary hopefuls, and sometimes on the pulpit, her lessons begin to push against core Assemblies of God assumptions regarding the stark divide between Islam and Christianity.*

Missionaries embody connections, flows, and communications. They place themselves in-between, channeling several directions at once. Aiming to remake the most fundamental relationships to the cosmos, to expose, empty, and refill their targets, they ask their converts for extraordinary vulnerability. This yokes them to their converts and missionaries in turn become vulnerable themselves. Thus, the most passionately insistent and highly respected members of tightly enclosed communities expose themselves to vast cultural differences that suffuse their hearts with unfamiliar

[184] Orta, ""Living the Past Another Way."
[185] Missionary names are coded to ensure security.

rhythms and resonances. Returning home, they ritually itinerate—travel from church to church—and stories intimating their emergent pliancy then expand across extended networks of churches, schools, and publishers. Thus, rather than unidirectional orientalist colonization practiced by paradigmatically uncompromising missionaries, we see change—perhaps some among their targets, but certainly in themselves, and some even all the way back home.

While in no sense a defense of missionary complicity with colonialism[186], this paper emphasizes a related process instead: the experience of postcolonial missions encounters caused US pentecostal missionaries to challenge their old assumptions in ways that traveled from the missions field all the way back to their home churches. I build this tale through ethnography and history within the Assemblies of God (AG), the world's largest pentecostal formation. Roughly speaking, pentecostalism involves Christians practicing "Gifts of the Spirit" (usually speaking in tongues or faith healing), whom I characterize as either fundamentalist (emphasizing innerant Bible readings) or evangelical (focused on outreach).[187] Through three years of participant observation in missionary training courses; 100 interviews with missionary trainees, professors, and current missionaries; 150 online surveys of alumni at AG's Bethany University in Scotts Valley, California; and finally, analysis of missiology—missions theory—texts used at Bethany and the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary in Springfield, Missouri, I reveal a reciprocal relationship between missionary experience, missiology, and AG political-theology.

---

[186] Lalive d'Epinay, *Haven of the Masses*.
[187] For detail see note 12.

It is no surprise that missionaries transform themselves through postcolonial encounter. AG missionaries describe leaving the US brimming with theological and cultural certainty and returning humbled, unsure, and refigured. Despite acrobatics aimed at containing change, their new experience of extended missions cannot but challenge AG organization, politics, and culture. AG missionaries' dual role as both cultural mediator and heroic exemplar of orthodox martyrdom channels their newfound cross—cultural sensitivity straight into the heart of a comfortably stolid US pentecostalism. For through missions encounters, the pentecostal worldview often moves from a secluded fundamentalism toward a somewhat more expansive evangelicalism. Tensions then arise within pentecostal communities, inspiring pitched battles over missiology. Bethany University, the first AG bible college, was, to some degree, a casualty of these fundamentalist-evangelical conflicts. Bethany took a culturally sensitive evangelical approach to education and fundamentalists shut it down in 2011.

Yet, in spite of such struggles for containment, AG continues to amend core principles in synch with the pressures of evangelistic outreach, most vividly in its recent acceptance of ministries emphasizing compassion. Thus, unlike previous accounts of missionaries, which emphasize changing others or themselves, I join recent scholars who see the missionary as a cultural boomerang, bringing

transformation all the way home.[188] Through this lens, missions might be a driving force behind the vital mutability of Christianity—in the West. For, in striving to refashion the world, missionaries become one connective tissue joining cultures and peoples in unequal, but nevertheless reciprocal, encounters.

While missionaries always engaged cross-cultural relationships—think of seventeenth-century Jesuits' assimilation practices—the late twentieth century was especially reciprocal. For it included the biggest missions expansion ever, and one with an exceptionally fragile theology. Following WWII, US middle-class prosperity and state support for higher education (i.e., the GI Bill)[189] funded a rapidly growing network of Christian colleges and fundamentalist missions.[190] Missionaries from the US traversed the globe bearing the legalistic orientation of fundamentalist missiology, a rigid formula especially prone to destabilization. This expansion converged with the "Third World" or "Nonaligned" movements during a time when decolonization empowered converts in the global South and their culturally specific Christianities

---

[188] i.e. Heather J Sharkey, *American Evangelicals in Egypt: Missionary Encounters in an Age of Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Alison Twells, *The Civilising Mission and the English Middle Class, 1792-1850: The "Heathen" at Home and Overseas* (Basingstoke [England]: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Melani McAlister, "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner: American Missionaries, The Problem of Racism and Decolonization in the Congo," *OAH Magazine of History* 26, no. 4 (2012): 33–37; John L Comaroff and Comaroff, *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1992).

[189] 33% of AG student enrollment in 1948 were GIs. Also Evangel College was given 68 buildings on 59 acres for one dollar by the US military. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 358, 365. Similarly, *Reveille* was an evangelical newspaper produced by Myer Perlman, teacher at CBI (later CBC) and given free postage by the US government to nearly 15 million copies distributed in 52 months. Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 54 note 11.

[190] Samuel Joeckel and Thomas Chesnes, *The Christian College Phenomenon: Inside America's Fastest Growing Institutions of Higher Learning* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2012).

became increasingly difficult to ignore.[191] Meanwhile in the US, expanding Christian institutions disseminated the uncertainty of missionary encounter, contributing to a refashioning of US fundamentalist churches toward a softer negotiation with the outside world, soon called "evangelicalism." Contrary to the fundamentalist emphasis on separatism, evangelicalism included pentecostals; embraced vast class, race, and geographical diversity; developed increasingly strong connections to political and economic power; and built awareness of cross-cultural encounter.[192] In sum, the scale of the post-war missions-burst, the specific form of its Christianity, the power of its participants, and its enmeshment in a growing institutional network all amplified its reciprocity.

Surviving initial culture shock, missionaries often found that decades in the field incited traumatic revision in culture, faith, politics, and missiology. Returning home, heroic but humbled, they strained to balance their role as curator of orthodoxy with a desire to honestly speak their internal tumult. A culturally informed analysis of missionary encounter, what I call Intercultural Missiology, helped missionaries cope by balancing legalistic theology and the muddle of cultural encounter. I use Intercultural Missiology to reference an extensive literature among non-liberal Christians struggling to reconcile cultural fluidity and theological certainty. This quandary inspired social science–theology blends, including "Church Growth,"

---

[191] Lamin Sanneh, *Whose Religion Is Christianity? The Gospel Beyond the West* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003); Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Coming Of Global Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[192] Ammerman, *Bible Believers*; D Lindsay, *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2007).

"Contextualization" and "Critical Realism," that spread across church networks and expanding Christian educational institutions that schematized and amplified the missions encounter.[193] By the late 1970s Intercultural Missiology had become the predominant approach to mission work among evangelicals. Likewise, AG incorporated Intercultural Missiology into the core of their mission work.

My exploring reciprocity in missions follows from scholars linking postcolonial and missions studies. Over 50 years, missions scholarship proceeded from valorizing evangelism to criticizing colonialism, emphasizing postcolonial agency, and more recently, to recognizing missionary encounter reverberating from periphery back to center. Late-twentieth-century historians rejected previous hagiographic writing practices[194] and anthropologists slowly accepted that Christianity might be more than a veneer layered over indigenous culture.[195] Meanwhile, studies of US fundamentalists and evangelicals proliferated,[196] but de-emphasized missionary participation.[197] Scholars explored pentecostal expansion but

---

[193] i.e. Charles Kraft, *Christianity In Culture: A Study In Dynamic Biblical Theologizing In Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979); Paul Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1985); Donald Anderson Macgavran, *How Churches Grow: The New Frontiers of Mission*. (London, 1959).

[194] Missionaries wrote most missions studies. Within academia missions were largely ignored. (William Hutchison, *Errand to the World : American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 2.)

[195] Bronwen Douglas, "Encounters With The Enemy? Academic Readings Of Missionary Narratives On Melanesians," *Comparative Studies In Society And History: An International Quarterly*, 2001.

[196] i.e. Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*; Sandeen, *The Origins of Fundamentalism*; Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*. Early missions emphases include Allen Koop, *American Evangelical Missionaries in France, 1945-1975* (Lanham MD: University Press of America, 1986); Ralph Covell, *Mission Impossible: The Unreached Nosu On China's Frontier*, 1st ed. (Pasadena CA: Hope Pub. House, 1990).

[197] For exceptions see: Virginia Brereton, *Training God's Army : The American Bible School, 1880-1940* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990); T Scales, *All That Fits a Woman : Training Southern Baptist Women for Charity and Mission, 1907-1926* (Macon GA: Mercer University Press, 2000).

also rarely focused on missions.[198] Aside from missiology itself, few scholars explored missions encounter and reciprocity.

However, since the late1980s, something akin to reciprocity emerged in postcolonial scholarship. Historians refigured the relationships between colonizer and colonized by recognizing a "middle ground,"[199] while scholars in feminist and cultural studies found "contact zones," "hybridity," "creolization," and "meztizaje," accentuating creative resistances to modern discipline.[200] Previous studies had emphasized unidirectional western imperialism: missions as weapon.[201] Now, scholars described Christianity in the Global South as a local domestication of colonialism.[202]

This recognition of agency among converts was critical to grasping the reciprocity of mission work, but missed another important element—the missionaries

---

[198] Many looked at Pentecostalism, i.e. David Stoll, *Is Latin America Turning Protestant? : The Politics of Evangelical Growth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Cox, *Fire from Heaven*; Hollenweger, *The Pentecostals*; Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith*, 1993; Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001; Joel Robbins, "Anthropology of Religion," in *Studying Global Pentecostalism : Theories and Methods*, ed. Allan. Anderson et al. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010), 156–78. A few thought about Pentecostal missionaries: Anderson, *Spreading Fires*; McGee, *This Gospel--Shall Be Preached*, 1986.

[199] Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

[200] i.e. Stuart Hall, "New Ethnicities," in *"Race," Culture and Difference*, ed. Donald, James and Rattansi, Ali (London: Sage, 1992), 252–59; Mary Pratt, *Imperial Eyes : Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992); Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); Homi K Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994); Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera* (San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987). Others question whether generic mixing is useful or resistant—i.e. Charles Stewart, *Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory* (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007).

[201] See Kenneth Mackenzie, *The Robe and the Sword the Methodist Church and the Rise of American Imperialism*. (Washington,: Public Affairs Press, 1961). Stephen Neill, *Colonialism and Christian Missions,* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1966). Rosa Bruno-Jofré, *Methodist Education in Peru: Social Gospel, Politics, and American Ideological and Economic Penetration, 1888-1930* (Waterloo Ont. Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1988).

[202] SeeKarla Poewe, *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture* (Columbia S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1994); Sanneh, *Whose Religion Is Christianity?*; Jenkins, *The next Christendom*, 2002.

themselves. Thus, other scholars began exploring the role of missionaries, now seen as participants vulnerable to transformation, what Andrew Orta called "missionary conversions."[203] Postcolonial research agendas[204] that queried the effects of colonialism on the West replaced the unidirectionality of "acculturation" with "transculturation." Scholars described indigenous resistances reaching across colonial boundaries.[205] For previous anthropologists "reciprocity" analyzed similar ethical concerns about the relative "sidedness" of cross-cultural material exchange.[206] Transculturation expanded the reciprocal to emphasize non-material culture, and unintentional exchanges. While some transculturation narratives emphasized resistance and others foregrounded exchange, all developed reciprocity as a key element.[207]

---

[203] Orta, ""Living the Past Another Way"; T Beidelman, *Colonial Evangelism : A Socio-Historical Study of an East African Mission at the Grassroots* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982), xvii. Jean Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991). V Mudimbe, *The Invention of Africa : Gnosis, Philosophy, and the Order of Knowledge* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988). Geoffrey White, *Identity Through History: Living Stories in a Solomon Islands Society* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991). Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); J Peel, *Religious Encounter and the Making of the Yoruba* (Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2000); Bernd Peyer, *The Tutor'd Mind : Indian Missionary-Writers in Antebellum America* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997); Peter Veer, *Imperial Encounters : Religion and Modernity in India and Britain* (Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001). Martin Marty, *Missions and Ecumenical Expressions* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 1993); John Barker, "Tangled Reconciliations : The Anglican Church and the Nisga'a of British Columbia," *American Ethnologist : The Journal of the American Ethnological Society*, 1998.

[204] Ann Stoler and Frederick Cooper, "Rethinking a Research Agenda," in *Tensions in Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeoise World* (Berkeley: U Cal Press, 1997), 1–58.

[205] Fernando Ortiz and Harriet De Onis, *Cuban Counterpoint; Tobacco and Sugar,* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1947); Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*.

[206] Claude Lévi-Strauss and Rodney Needham, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969); Marshall David Sahlins, "On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange," *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, 1965, 139–236; Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies* (London: Cohen & West, 1969).

[207] Mark Millington, "Transculturation: Contrapuntal Notes to Critical Orthodoxy," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 26, no. 2 (2007): 256–68.

Thus, according to recent scholarship, missions deeply entangle recipients, missionaries, and sending countries. They restructure racial thought,[208] change gender roles,[209] encourage reciprocal migrations,[210] incite new public policy projects,[211] refigure economics pedagogy,[212] affect African American identity, American exclusivity, and war protests,[213] and civilize the English working class.[214] Omri Elisha expands reciprocity beyond missions to include evangelical activism within the US.[215] These projects all affirm the common-sense idea that cross-cultural experiences recenter hearts and minds.

---

[208] Sebastian, Mrinalini, "The Scholar-Missionaries of the Basel Mission in Southwest India," in *Cultural Conversions: Unexpected Consequences of Christian Missionary Encounters in the Middle East, Africa, and South Asia*, by Heather J Sharkey, 2013, 176–202; McAlister, "Guess Who's Coming to Dinner: American Missionaries, The Problem of Racism and Decolonization in the Congo."
[209] Comaroff, *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*; R Beaver, *All Loves Excelling American Protestant Women in World Mission,* (Grand Rapids Mich.: Eerdmans, 1968). called missions the first feminist movement. Also Joan Brumberg, *Mission for Life : The Story of the Family of Adoniram Judson, the Dramatic Events of the First American Foreign Mission, and the Course of Evangelical Religion in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Free Press, 1980); Noriko Ishii, *American Women Missionaries at Kobe College, 1873-1909*, 1998. Patricia Hill, *The World Their Household : The American Woman's Foreign Mission Movement and Cultural Transformation, 1870-1920* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1985). Mary Taylor Huber and Nancy Lutkehaus, *Gendered Missions: Women and Men in Missionary Discourse and Practice* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Line Nyhagen Predelli, *Issues of Gender, Race, and Class in the Norwegian Missionary Society in Nineteenth-Century Norway and Madagascar* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003).
[210] Sharkey, *American Evangelicals in Egypt*.
[211] See Robert Kaplan, *The Arabists : The Romance of an American Elite* (Toronto: Free Press, 1993). Richard Madsen, *China and the American Dream : A Moral Inquiry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).
[212] Bethany Moreton, "The Soul of Neoliberalism," *Social Text*. 25, no. 3 (2007): 113.
[213] See essays by John Saillant, Laurie Maffly-Kipp, Mark Hanley, and Scott Flipse in Grant Wacker and Daniel Bays, *The Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home : Explorations in North American Cultural History* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2003).
[214] Twells, *The Civilising Mission and the English Middle Class, 1792-1850*. See Also: Ussama Samir Makdisi, *Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the Failed Conversion of the Middle East* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); Jeffrey Cox, *The British Missionary Enterprise Since 1700* (London: Routledge, 2008); Esther Breitenbach, *Empire and Scottish Society the Impact of Foreign Missions at Home, c.1790 to c.1914* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009); J. P Daughton, *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism, And The Making Of French Colonialism, 1880-1914* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions And The Making Of An Imperial Culture In Nineteenth-Century England* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999).
[215] Omri Elisha, *Moral Ambition Mobilization And Social Outreach In Evangelical Megachurches* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011).

Culturally sensitive missions also inspire questions regarding modern dynamics between overt and covert forms of power. Over the past few centuries, Christian missions deemphasized overt violence by prioritizing conversion through persuasion and enticement, what Charles Taylor calls the "Age of Mobilization."[216] Intercultural Missiology might fit that narrative. Yet, it also could exemplify Michel Foucault's "discipline" or "biopolitics" in which the subtle apparatus of modernity undergirds insidious increases in bureaucratic control.[217] This paper suggests that instead of simply cloaking a growing power to convert, soft approaches to missions, and the new sensibilities they inspire, significantly refashion the evangelistic objective.

Further, portraying a transition from fundamentalism to evangelicalism might clarify distinctions between them. Both movements valorize the bible, Christ, and born again experience. Fundamentalism in this paper refers to a particular historical set of Christian, agonistic, and rigidly literal sensibilities and a subcultural movement that nurtured them—not a multi-religious sociological construct.[218] Evangelicalism, by contrast, emphasizes outreach and the fluidity of crossing cultures. As Nancy Ammerman writes, "their insistence on separatism most clearly distinguishes fundamentalists from their closest relatives, the evangelicals."[219] I expand her thesis by showing that separatism and extended outreach nurture different sensibilities. It's

---

[216] Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 423–472.
[217] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*.
[218] Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*; Ernest Sandeen, *The Origins of Fundamentalism: Toward a Historical Interpretation,* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968); Carpenter, *Revive Us Again.* Martin E Marty, R. Scott Appleby, and American Academy of Arts and Sciences, *The Fundamentalism Project* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).
[219] Ammerman, *Bible Believers*, 4.

not that fundamentalists don't do missions; it's that effective long-term missionaries may have a hard time staying fundamentalist.

In sum, perhaps sensibility—not theology—separates evangelical from fundamentalist.[220] George Marsden calls fundamentalists "conservatives who are willing to take a stand and to fight."[221] Yet, because evangelicals do fight, albeit differently, and because my interlocutors use the terms this way, I find the key distinction is not simply belligerence, and not theology, but the effects of subcultural separatism on various sensibilities.[222] Further, I distinguish fundamentalist-pentecostals and evangelical-pentecostals from non-pentecostals via the pentecostal emphasis on Gifts of the Spirit (primarily speaking in tongues and faith healing). Pentecostals embraced fundamentalist sensibilities in the early part of the twentieth century and then together with many non-pentecostals shifted from fundamentalist to evangelical approaches to missions and, to some extent, political-theology.

For scholars of 19th century evangelicalism, this is likely confusing. Fundamentalism emerged out of evangelicalism. And now I am arguing that evangelicalism emerged out of fundamentalism? Yes. The broader stream is evangelical Christianity, which formed in the 1800s and bred fundamentalists by the 1910s who separated into isolated enclaves to resist modernity. For the most part, those that stayed evangelical became mainline. Meanwhile, the fundamentalists split

---

[220] Scholars often define evangelicalism by the primarily theological categories of Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*. Others distinguish pentecostal from fundamentalist via theological histories, see Spittler, Russell, "Are Pentecostals and Charismatics Fundamentalists?"
[221] Marsden, *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*, 1.
[222] Marsden emphasizes both theology and belligerence, although he also mentions separatism as common sense delineator of fundamentalism in the 1960s. Ibid., 3.

between a group who continued as sectarian separatists and the group focused on outreach, now called (neo)evangelicals, or more recently, simply evangelicals. However, because these are movements in transition from one to the other, the definitions are processual and thus more heuristic than concrete.

To be sure, the emergence of the evangelical movement out of fundamentalism required more than pressure on the US missionary psyche reverberating through educational and missions infrastructure. Some describe evangelicalism developing from debate over biblical doctrine.[223] Others cite the migration of non-liberal Christians from the Bible Belt to the Sun Belt and the subsequent translation of their sensibilities,[224] the importance of suburbia,[225] the growing service economy, and the shift from biblical inerrancy to gender exclusivity.[226] Perhaps it formed as new generations rejected their parents' rigidity, or out of globalization more generally. Alongside these catalysts, the postcolonial missionary encounter offers another critical engine transfiguring contemporary Christianity.

This paper begins with interviews of current AG missionaries who confirm that their experience engenders the fluidity of Intercultural Missiology, which they then spread throughout the pentecostal network. Then, in tracing the roots of Intercultural Missiology, I describe non-pentecostal-fundamentalist and pentecostal-

---

[223] George Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism : Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1987).
[224] Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt : Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism*, 1st ed. (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011).
[225] McGirr, *Suburban Warriors.*
[226] Moreton, "The Soul of Neoliberalism," 109.

fundamentalist missiologies; both of which find cross-cultural encounters pushing them toward a more open evangelicalism. Finally, I explore the effects of missions' reciprocity on Bethany University and AG more generally.

Assemblies of God

Bethany University's closure in 2011 seemed like a disaster for its community, its cross-cultural project and, my research. Over three years I had developed relationships, gained some serious trust, and cultivated access to students, faculty, and administrators. My field notes include reports of rich cultural sensitivity expressed by participants. But, I hadn't realized that as the appeal of cross-cultural sensitivity grew, so did the fear among AG fundamentalists that the church was slipping into secularism.

In the spring of 2011, word came that Bethany's debt forced impending shutdown. Almost immediately, I found myself awash in cries of foul play. Administrators, faculty, and students all accosted me, pulling me into offices to make the case: "the shutdown was political and theological, not economic." Bethany lost the support of wealthy fundamentalist backers as its education shifted to reflect evangelical concerns with culture, they insisted. Their anger revealed a divide within AG between distinct sensibilities and approaches to missions, education, and theology—between what some called an evangelical and a fundamentalist outlook. Fundamentalists won this battle. However, even as Bethany closed, the struggle continued to play out at AG's center in Springfield, Missouri. There, the liberal arts

focused Evangel College merged with the fundamentalist Central Bible College, which was closed in the process, and again political-theology was the hidden rationale, but with the opposite endgame. Thus, while evangelical promoters of Intercultural Missiology lost the battle of Bethany, they may have won in Springfield, leaving the future of Intercultural Missiology an open question.

Intercultural Missiology does sit awkwardly within an AG subculture dominated by white Midwestern fundamentalist sensibilities. AG formed in 1914 to provide direction to a seemingly chaotic pentecostal movement, and perhaps to separate white from black pentecostals.[227] As Darrin Rodgers, AG historian-archivalist, describes, while initially cultural outsiders, Pentecostals increasingly borrowed fundamentalist norms: "We lost the rich worldview that birthed pacifism, interracialism, feminism, and environmentalism—all these radical interactions with the world that offended fundamentalists."[228] AG evolved an increasingly conservative cultural orientation, finally rejecting faith-based pacifism during the Vietnam War. Their US churches looked much like the rest of the fundamentalist movement, emphasizing biblical innerancy, racial complementarianism, and political conservatism, with members only speaking in tongues occasionally.[229]

Having severed ties with black pentecostals—segregation was "ordained of God"[230] – AG trailed the Civil Rights movement, only developing US cross-racial

---

[227] Newman, *Race and the Assemblies of God Church the Journey from Azusa Street to the "Miracle of Memphis."*
[228] Interview with author Fall 20??
[229] Margaret Poloma, *The Assemblies Of God Godly Love And The Revitalization Of American Pentecostalism* (New York: NYU Press, 2010).
[230] Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center. "Pentecostals and Racial Reconciliation", December 12, 2007.

fellowships by the 1990s.[231] Of the 50 missionaries I interviewed, all appeared white and nearly all were from the Midwest. When asked, the administrator who for over 30 years did entry paperwork for every missionary in AG World Missions easily named the 4 African Americans out of 5,677 total missionaries in roughly 100 years.[232] Thus, as one AG leader explained, given such strong white male headship, "If the 1950s ever comes back, we are ready."

Yet, this seemingly cloistered, middle-American formation stretched across the globe, and brought millions of people of color into a vast, decentralized network—nearly 63 million people. This paper explores white missionary transformation through postcolonial mission encounters with people of color in the Global South, and how those missionaries came home to challenge organization, politics, and culture.

Missionary Conversions

AG missionary Del Tarr was raised in a small-town, white, Midwestern fundamentalist subculture. He remembers, "I was quite the fundamentalist growing up and embraced all the church's narrow thinking. No make up. No movies by Hollywood. My wife was 40 years old before she put on her first earrings."[233] Tarr explains that his fundamentalist-pentecostalism involved "strident legalistic"

[231] Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith*, 1993, 249–50.
[232] AG World Missions had few other missionaries of color. Communication with Gloria Robinette, Assemblies of God World Missions Research.
[233] Unless otherwise noted, all quotes from AG participatnts are from interviews with the author

sensibilities, not the theological dispensationalism and cessationism that characterized non-pentecostal fundamentalists.

However, missions surprised him. "Africa knocked all of this out of us… When you bring your strict legalistic ideas you're gonna' have your worldview blown apart… Missions forces you to change. To make it through your 4 [initial] years—a lot can happen to you." Studying anthropological methods and multiple cultures helped push Tarr beyond the AG norm. "I am [now] on the outer edge of what AG calls liberal, having studied cultural anthropology and internalized probably 15 different cultures."

Tarr had moved from the extremes of fundamentalist sensibility to the most fluid edge of pentecostal evangelicalism. He describes how his rigid sense of theological certainty was cracked open by African approaches to Christianity. "Africa taught me the power of indirection, which doesn't allow a fundamentalist literalist view." Agrarian African Bible readings seemed "closely akin to the original biblical speakers and hearers."[234] The technological precision of the West, by contrast, supports "an intolerance for the ambiguity of parabolic or enigmatic ways of considering information."[235] However, this is not a "noble savage" story valorizing African analyses; Tarr imagines a cross-cultural hermeneutics linking communities searching out truth.[236]

---

[234] Delbert Howard Tarr, *Double Image: Biblical Insights from African Parables* (New York: Paulist Press, 1994), 3.
[235] Ibid., 7.
[236] Ibid., 6.

Even so, upon return to the US Tarr faced difficulty. His new mantra, "tolerate ambiguity," put him at odds with his home culture, those who funded him and saw him as a favorite son. Yet, because his analysis resonated so closely with the experiences of missionary encounter, his impact on AG was tremendous. In 1990 Tarr was hired to direct the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary (AGTS), where he stayed until 2008, helping train hundreds of missionaries and AG faculty.

I initially suspected that Tarr's story was anomalous. Perhaps most missionaries react differently? While preaching for their paycheck missionaries stick close to the center of AG theology, politics, and culture—which is quite narrow. However, in private interviews, I found 50 long-term AG missionaries regularly challenged subcultural separatism and Biblical rigidity, suggesting the basic gist of the intercultural narrative was dead on—mission encounters instigate profound change. Admitting the agency and intelligence of non-Western people meant tweaking fundamentalist senses of conversion, syncretism, Christian exclusivism, literalism, and compassion ministries. It also meant laboring toward credible revisions of previously held truths filtered through newly flexible sensibilities. These struggles were brought home, itinerated around the US, and amplified by networks of churches and institutions, creating tensions between transformative cross-cultural experiences and the compulsion to appear orthodox.

Byron Klaus, a former missionary and a teacher at AGTS, describes how mission encounters unsettles fundamentalist confidence. "Some people are surprised. They thought they had it figured out and were quite comfortable with their system."

Then they crossed cultures. “They got the shock of their life.” He remembers difficult moments: “Theological questions you don’t have answers for. A text people read completely differently. You, with three years of Greek and someone who is almost illiterate has a different reading. And in your heart of hearts you know it is true.” Missions means escaping earlier presumptions.

Similarly, Shane, another AG missionary, expands the notion of mission: “I reshape my world, my priorities. I change everything for the sake of embracing the culture to transform it for Jesus… having to ask myself every day how much of what I do is cultural and how much is biblical.” Communication challenges abound, “You encode one thing and the other decodes differently.” In what increasingly serves as the AG ideal, this uncertain interaction inspires dialogue between missionary and recipient, both “self-theologizing,” interpreting the Bible for themselves and their communities. “We realize that our interpretation might not be the last word, it might be that [hosts] have a better interpretation of scripture than we have,” explained Sheila, missionary in Turkey. Sometime during her 40 years in the field, her horizons broadened.

For James, a missionary to Brazil, childhood within strict AG churches meant no movies or roller skating. This led to even more legalism in Brazilian missions—no cutting women’s hair—and finally to what he called the “flexibility” of California. Multiple seemingly legitimate sensibilities inspired re-evaluation of previous polarities: “it isn’t that one was right and one wrong—the practice was different.” He continued to assert moral absolutes, but rules about clothes, games, and hair seemed

less portentous. Dr. Stewart, long-term missionary to Namibia and Bethany professor, explains, "There was a day in AG that tattoos got you booted out of the church." He laughs. "Some things aren't that permanent. Things that maybe I thought were really important before."

The idea that evangelical conversions involve a personal, autonomous decision can create dissonance between missionary and host cultures. Ellen, an AG missionary, explains that "We [in the US] don't honor anyone but ourselves with our independent, individualistic culture." She contrasts American culture to Hindu culture's high value on community in which conversion is collective. "If the head of house comes to Christ you can pretty much believe the whole family is gonna'," she offered. Further, community hierarchies matter. The "child coming first [to Christ] can be an offense to the parents." And of course, you "can't ignore the village chief." Young Fundamentalist missionaries, immersed in American individualism, challenged the legitimacy of group conversions until Church Growth studies showed success in converting "people movements."[237] Likewise, AG teacher and missionary Felipe challenged a group of Brazilian students offering identical term papers—it seemed like cheating. His anxious "you can't do that," received a surprising riposte: "What do you mean? You want [us] to be better than someone else?" AG missionary to Mexico Shaina came to accept, and help organize, church projects that previously seemed quite sinful. Gambling, for instance, seems inappropriate in US AG but serves as primary fundraiser and relationship builder for AG Mexico.

[237] Elmer Towns, *Evaluating the Church Growth Movement : 5 Views* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 2004).

Challenge to the Fundamentalist Core

Mission experiences can challenge core fundamentalist theologies—like claims to salvation only through Jesus. After 15 years in the Middle East, Shaina asks, "How inclusive is the gospel?" She waits. "In a country that is 99% Muslim I can't help but wonder, 'Is every person around me terribly lost? How narrow is the whole thing?'" It is a delicate moment in our interview, clearly a quandary for a woman deeply committed to missions who holds several degrees in missions theory. Her explanation lacks the linearity of most of her discourse—it is somewhat multidirectional as she reiterates Biblical authority: "I don't think that the Bible gives false hope." And contracts with a question: "but without explicit faith in Christ?" Obviously, and not unreasonably, there is tumult and confusion. She now teaches this tangle as a professor of missions in AG higher education.

Such ambiguity regarding Islam is common and contentious. Over coffee in Starbucks another lifelong missionary turned professor asks, "is there anything wrong with calling God Allah?" The tension in his position—and voice—is immediate. "I'm not going to cross the divide and say all Muslims are Christians or all Mormons are Christians." Pause. "But if you think he—God—is as big as we think?" The question sits quietly. So do we. He brings it home, "the challenge is that there has to be a line somewhere. For yourself there is some kind of boundary: the biblical boundary." Yet how to discern—where does the Bible limit? "But the Scripture tells me I should not be a judge." He laughs. "It is a good thing I'm not God. If I were, there would be heads flying everywhere." It is a joke, but one foregrounding an acute awareness of

the arrogance of judgment, and also its necessity. "I'd have to put 'em back on with sticky tape," he laughs.

Cross-cultural encounter also unsettles the simplicity of biblical literalism, proof text preaching and a highly rationalized theology, all distinctive features of fundamentalist missions. For instance, AG missionary John says Latin American missions include less "emphasis on systematic theology. You may have all your ducks in a row theologically, studied a lot of Greek and Hebrew—nothing wrong with that. But you can't put God in a box." For John, stark distinctions now seem peculiarly North American. "Exactly where is the line between black and white, right and wrong? Most cultures don't work that way. They work with relationships… Americans like black and white, the rest of the world works on multiple shades of grey." He abruptly qualifies, "I am not trying to say 'situational ethics.' There are absolute rights and absolute wrongs." Only fewer than initially assumed. For "[A] lot of things fall in between." And John refigures his approach, "Build a relationship with God, not a theology of God." He explains that a text cannot provide solid, unchanging truth. Instead, relationships engender dialogue. Some things might even stay unexplained. "Who knows the mind of God?... Why heal my daughter and not others?" The consistent reply—"We can't put God in a box. We have to think deeper about these things."

Fundamentalist Missiology

In the early twentieth century, most fundamentalists kept their distance from pentecostals, even though pentecostals saw themselves as fundamentalist. Both groups, however (fundamentalists and fundamentalist-pentecostals), engaged actively in missions, and many eventually shifted from a protective subcultural orientation toward an increasingly world-engaging approach, one element being a coalition between the two groups. In the process, they developed what became known first as (neo)evangelicalism, and then simply evangelicalism.

Evangelicalism's Intercultural Missiology emerged from a mid-twentieth-century moment in which fundamentalist culture and theology predominated in non-liberal Christianity, including among pentecostals. Yet, while fundamentalist-pentecostals often shared innerantist theology and conservative mid-western culture with other fundamentalists, they initially developed distinctive missiologies, which I will now describe. But the large-scale shift from fundamentalist to evangelical had a tremendous impact upon pentecostals who experienced parallel, and entangled, changes in missiology. These next sections trace the broader move from fundamentalist to evangelical missiology before looking to the specifics of the pentecostal transition.

The 1932 Hocking report, *Re-Thinking Missions,* facilitated the emergence of fundamentalist missiology. *Re-Thinking Missions* was developed through research that joined Harvard University and a group of mainline churches and took cultural sensitivity to a new level. Imagining "invisible" missions involving "quiet personal contact and contagion," that might provide education and social service "without any

preaching," in Hocking, service for its own sake seemed true evangelism. Local church control might develop "according to the genius of the place"[238] and instead of battling other religions, Christianity could fulfill them.[239] This shocked the fundamentalist missions world, inspiring powerful backlash. Its unprecedented advocacy of cultural sensitivity had fundamentalists describing the report as a "death sentence" for Christianity.[240] Discomfort with the report renewed fundamentalist support for US cultural exceptionalism, their emphasis on direct evangelism over service or education, and the embrace of a seemingly positivistic scientific method of arguing for Christ via the "logic of facts" (i.e., biblical text). As a result, for a brief period in the mid-twentieth century, fundamentalist missions theory blossomed.[241] Legalistic "proof text"[242] Bible readings and suspicion of cultural exchange reached a pinnacle with Harold Lindsell's *A Christian Theology of Missions* (1949), proclaiming itself "the final theology for Christian missions."[243]

Lindsell said the basic problem with *Re-Thinking Missions* was its uncertainty.[244] "The one demand of the human heart," he explained, "is to find something on which it can depend—something that is unchanging and not just the

---

[238] Werner P Ustorf, *Sailing on the Next Tide: Missions, Missiology, and the Third Reich* (Frankfurt: Peter Lange 2000):86-87
[239]R. Pierce Beaver, "North American Thought on the Fundamental Principles of Missions during the Twentieth Century (A Survey Article)," *Church History*, vol. 21, No. 4 (Dec 1952), 350.
[240] Harold Lindsell, *A Christian Philosophy of Missions*. (Wheaton IL: Van Kampen Press, 1949), 27?
[241] i.e. Samuel Zwemer, *Into All The World: The Great Commission: A Vindication And An Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1943); William Carver, *Christian Missions in Today's World*, First ed. (London: Harper, 1942); Henry Goerner, *"Thus It Is Written" the Missionary Motif in the Scriptures,* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1944); Robert Glover, *The Bible Basis of Missions* (Los Angeles: Bible House of Los Angeles, 1946); Lindsell, *A Christian Philosophy of Missions*.
[242] Reading the bible as if each sentence were a legal aphorism.
[243] Lindsell, *A Christian Philosophy of Missions*., 68.
[244] Ibid., 33.

principle that all things change."[245] Any emphasis on culture relativism suggested that the "one time impregnable fortress standing for an unchanging faith was itself in the process of change."[246] In reply, Lindsell argued for an "inerrant" reading of the Bible. "This is the point which needs to be stressed again and again, the Bible is perfectly clear in every essential point."[247] Science, for instance, Lindsell believed, would ultimately support the Bible.[248] Lindsell's work resonated within an expanding fundamentalist movement.

The growing fundamentalist network of institutions amplified these struggles over missiology. In the 1920s and 30s, fundamentalists failed to take control of mainline denominations and split off from the mainline churches. They nurtured an isolated movement subculture and missionary and educational networks that kept a narrow orthodoxy. Bible schools served as denominational headquarters for fellowships, missions boards, conferences, and Bible translation institutes. Isolation from the mainline nurtured conservative community and the sense that, despite internal divisions, fundamentalists could conquer the world—if they would only step out into it.

Likewise, AG built a strong network around its Bible colleges. Glad Tidings Institute, which later became Bethany, formed in 1919. Early AG Bible schools sent 85 percent of their graduates into ministry.[249] By 1953, nearly all AG missionaries

---

[245] Ibid., 44.
[246] Ibid., 43.
[247] Ibid., 50–1.
[248] Ibid., 53–4.
[249] Gary McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached : A History and Theology of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions since 1959*, v. 2. (Springfield MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1989), 36.

had trained in Bible schools. AG Bible schools grew rapidly: 329 schools in 1988,[250] 2,000 by 2010. Many are quite small, yet, as Hogan explained, "These Bible schools are the heart of modern missions."[251]

While Bible colleges formed to propagate fundamentalist ideology, they also instigated change. When missionaries taught and published on missions theory cultural encounter became a central issue. By 1967 half the AG missionaries on furlough attended graduate school.[252] By the 1970s it was estimated that a little over half the missionaries were teaching in in a national bible institute.[253] AG then built the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary in 1973 to teach cross-cultural communications and missions anthropology.[254] In doing so, AG higher education nurtured an expansive cultural sensitivity, not the subcultural conservatism predominant in most US AG churches.

Meanwhile, fundamentalist institutions bred missionaries. US full-time missionary numbers went from roughly 14,000 in the 1920s to 42,787 by 2001.[255] Some suggest that mainline missions dominated 10 to 1 in the 1930s, but by 1980 as many as 9 of 10 missionaries were conservative fundamentalists. However imprecise

---

[250] By 1959 AG had twice the Bible schools of any Protestant group. Gary McGee, *This Gospel--Shall Be Preached : A History and Theology of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions to 1959* (Springfield MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1986), 199.
[251] McGee, "Assemblies of God Overseas Missions," 433.
[252] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 247.
[253] Wilson 54
[254] McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached*, 154.
[255] Robert Wuthnow, *Boundless Faith : The Global Outreach of American Churches* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 23. Joel Carpenter, "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929-1942," *Church History*., 1980, 72–3.

the numbers, the change was clearly extreme.[256] Similarly, AG missions grew rapidly. A few thousand North American AG adherents in 1914 became over 63 million globally by 2010. The AG foreign mission budget went from $6 million in 1969 to a bit over $200 million since 1999.[257] This meant more missionaries within AG but outside the subcultural confines of US pentecostalism.

Tipping Point: from Fundamentalist to Evangelical

The development of missionary uncertainty via cultural encounter assisted in evangelicalism's emergence from a more inflexible fundamentalism. Conversion from fundamentalist to evangelical sensibilities began when missionaries reached out from relatively closed cultures and encountered diversity, social injustice, and uncomfortable fluidity. However, not until the 1970s did Intercultural Missiology pose a serious challenge to fundamentalist approaches.

The National Association of Evangelical's (NAE) 1943 formation, with Carl Henry, author of *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism,* on its board, signaled increasing interest in global outreach and tolerance. Dr. Elwin Wright, another NAE founder, opened its first constitutional convention with: "we had better frankly admit that fundamentalists have not always been wisely led… We will continue to meet with defeat in our objective unless a new strategy under competent

[256] Hutchison, *Errand to the World*, 175,193.
[257] AG General Council records shared in a phone interview with foreign missions department.

leaders is evolved."[258] Other speakers continued standard attacks on liberals, modernists, and Catholics but emphasized tolerance and flexibility within their organization for the sake of evangelistic outreach.

> Eventually the way we walk will be more effective than the way we talk. Modernists will never be impressed by our loud-mouthed denunciations. They cannot help but be convinced, in many instances, if we go out to bind up the wounds of the broken-hearted, preach deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the eyes of the blind. What this country really needs to bring about a great national revival is not more militant fundamentalists with growing hypercritical and contentious in spirit, but leaders filled with the Holy Ghost and a passion for the souls of men.[259]

Evangelism inspired the NAE to challenge what they called excessive stridency and a lack of compassion among fundamentalists.

Although earlier fundamentalists had rejected AG for spiritual excess, AG leaders sat on the NAE board from the beginning.[260] By 2000, the NAE represented over 21 million people, a large percent of whom considered themselves pentecostal (many more when including Charismatics.)[261] NAE's biggest single group was AG. In this "pentecostalization of evangelicalism," AG's missiology came into conversation with an emerging evangelical one.

---

[258] National Association of Evangelicals, *United We Stand: A Report of the Constitutional Convention of the National Association of Evangelicals*. (Boston: N.A.E., 1943), 8.
[259] National Association of Evangelicals. Conference, "Program of the Third Annual Convention [of The] National Association of Evangelicals ... Chicago, Illinois, May 1-3, 1945." (The Association, 1945), 22.
[260] By the late 1950s Secretary of the DFM Noel Perkin was president of NAE missionary arm Evangelical Foreign Missions Association. Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 13, 129.
[261] Some critics say up to 80%. i.e. Cloud, *The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement*.

Evangelism required cross-cultural encounter. That conservative theology traveled via broadcasting technology (like TV and radio) and entrepreneurial approaches to missions, resulted in vast growth and multiple layers of cross-cultural mixing.[262] Further, increasing professionalization led to missiology associations, book series, journals, and publishing houses—more links outside of subcultural networks.[263] Global missions conferences linked academics, missionaries, and theologians in their awareness of cultural chafing.

Anxiety about the emergence of postcolonial nationalisms and growing Western interest in Asian religion permeated these conversations. Postcolonial Christians also were demanding theological autonomy and taking control of mission schools and hospitals. As missiologist J Kane explained, "Almost everywhere Christianity has been identified with colonialism; and, now that the colonial system has broken up, the assumption is that the missionary is on the way out."[264] The pressure was tremendous as Everett Wilson explains: for post war AG missionaries "there would be a common denominator that all of them would discover very quickly – they would all have to live with change and uncertainty. They were beginning their missionary work in a disintegrating world. Everywhere they would find upheaval and revolution. They would be surprised at the modernity of the great cities of the world and stand aghast at the poverty in those same cities. They would see modern living

[262] Richard Pierard, ed., "Pax Americana and the Evangelical Missionary Advance," in *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980* (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1990), 176.
[263] Wilbert Shenk, *The American Society of Missiology: The First Quarter Century* (Decatur, GA: American Society of Missiology, 1998). Pentecostals formed the Society for Pentecostal Studies.
[264] J Kane, *Winds Of Change In The Christian Mission* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1973), 13–14.

conditions surrounded by unimaginable filth and squalor. As Americans, they would likely be met with attitudes ranging from a mild welcome to outright animosity."[265] Likewise, Hogan described, "the vast revolutionary tides which have swept the world in the last fifty years. These have enormous side effects from which the church abroad has not escaped."[266]

This anti-mission backlash put tremendous pressure on churches to adapt, which they did. For instance, the 1966 "Wheaton Declaration" affirmed limited social action[267] and the use of anthropology to discern inappropriate cultural fusing—a "bulwark against syncretism."[268] In the same year, the Berlin World Conference of Evangelism recognized the increasingly southern character of Christianity.[269] The 1974 Lausanne Congress on World Evangelization bore signs of a seismic shift. Of 2,473 attendees, nearly half were from non-Western countries.[270] The poverty of the global South made service as central a concern as conversion. John Stott, evangelical missiologist, explained, "I now see more clearly that [missions should]… include social as well as evangelistic responsibility."[271] Billy Graham said his highest priority involved "cross-cultural evangelism."[272] Inspiring a surge of essays debating the best

---

[265] Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 90.
[266] Ibid., 95.
[267] Richard Flory, *Development And Transformation Within Protestant Fundamentalism: Bible Institutes And Colleges Within The U.S., 1925-1991* (University of Chicago Dissertation, 2003), 91.
[268] Harold Lindsell, *The Church's Worldwide Mission: An Analysis Of The Current State Of Evangelical Missions, And A Strategy For Future Activity*. (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1966).
[269] Moreton, "The Soul of Neoliberalism," 114.
[270] Rodger Bassham, *Mission Theology, 1948-1975 : Years of Worldwide Creative Tension--Ecumenical, Evangelical, and Roman Catholic* (Pasadena Ca: William Carey Library, 1979), 218.
[271] Ibid., 232.
[272] i.e. Ralph Winter's essay "The Highest Priority: Cross Cultural Evangelism." McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached*, 226.

form of cultural contextualization and its boundaries with syncretism, these meetings affirmed a paradigm shift in missiology.[273]

Meanwhile, Fuller Theological Seminary became the "capital of evangelical missions research" and the primary center for Intercultural Missiology.[274] Amid vociferous debate on campus, Fuller's focus shifted and strict fundamentalists like Lindsell left.[275] In alliance with Billy Graham and the NAE, Fuller incrementally rejected fundamentalist "innerancy" for evangelical "infallibility," a comparatively nuanced reading that held to God's perfection but allowed for metaphor and poetics within the Bible. Lindsell became the exemplar for "naïve" and dogmatic "plain reading of the scripture."[276]

Also at Fuller, from the mid 1970s onward, pentecostalism and evangelicalism became more closely linked. Christians in the global south converted to pentecostalism and pushed Western theologians to drop cessationism—the idea that spiritual gifts ended with the Bible. One Lausanne working group described how "most of the consultation participants from Western societies had come to recognize the realities of the unseen or spiritual realm as a result of their cross cultural experience."[277] Then, John Wimber, of the Vineyard Church, taught a faith healing class at Fuller, giving many students and faculty their first taste of highly visceral spiritual gifts. The class was eventually cancelled, but "pentecostalization" was no

[273] See, for instance, *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* January 1978
[274] Stoll, *Is Latin America Turning Protestant?*, 69.
[275] Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism*.
[276] Charles Kraft, *Christianity In Culture: A Study In Dynamic Biblical Theologizing In Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979), 39.
[277] Engelsviken, *Spiritual Conflict in Today's Mission*, 82–3.

longer a distant but effective means of converting third world people. Fuller's halls rang with debate between supporters of pentecostal spiritual practices and others who called it heretical. By 2003, Fuller renamed its "School of World Missions" the "School of Intercultural Studies."[278] The curricula at Bethany and AGTS drew heavily from Fuller's missiology.

Yet, these changes are not close to fully realized within evangelicalism, pentecostalism or AG itself; evangelical cultural sensitivity is not a *fait accompli*. For this transformation preceded the Moral Majority and the Christian Coalition, and the NAE itself was instrumental in the Christian Right's culture war, which emerged in the 1970s. My argument is that in the shift toward outreach that began in the 1940s, one can trace the prefiguration of expansive concerns only recently emerging in the evangelical world.

Intercultural Missiology

Maintaining a semblance of theological purity in the face of compelling cultural redirection became the central goal of evangelical Intercultural Missiology as taught within new higher education networks. Encounters with postcolonial nationals led missionaries to value flexible biblical translation, yet they struggled to contain this newfound fluidity. Their central sorting posed contextualized cultural mixing (good) against syncretism (bad). Over time, these categories went through a series of shifts that increasingly challenged home church theologies. Note: this is not, at first, a

[278] Intercultural programs now exist throughout Evangelical higher education.

pentecostal missiology – these are primarily fundamentalists turned evangelical.

Evangelical missionary training guides describe the many misunderstandings that made cultural sensitivity necessary. Some tales were repeated text after text: conversion to Christianity means an end to spirits who punish uncleanliness, so the village becomes a mess; missions end polygamy and leave a group of women without economic or social value; a bloody Jesus apparently flies over the land animating hallucinations induced by mushrooms that might emerge from his dripping blood; Judas' betrayal has more appeal than Jesus; or the forgiving Christian God engenders freedom for gross immorality.[279] Or as Del Tarr describes:

> Mennonites—fundamentalist and legalistic—came to Niger, put up a tent in the 1950s to evangelize, and insisted that all African women cover their heads in the tent. Nontribal women wearing nothing but a loincloth took it off and put on their heads.

Something other than simple literalism seemed necessary to avoid such unintended effects. Thus, Fundamentalist missiologists explored social scientific tools that might contain these looming fluid epistemologies – ways of grasping the world. From "Church Growth" through "contextualization" and "critical realism," evangelical missiology borrowed freely from sociology, anthropology, and postmodern philosophy in an extended effort to distinguish syncretism from contextualization. Each of these approaches shared the recognition that culture challenged evangelism.

---

[279] Charles Kraft, *Anthropology for Christian Witness* (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1996), 27; Paul Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1985), 49.

Charles Kraft (not a pentecostal) traveled a path much like Tarr's, only in addition to becoming more flexible, he became more pentecostal en route as well. Kraft went to Nigeria in the 1950s. Nigerian understandings of marriage, spirit, and death all challenged his North American fundamentalist perspective. In parts of Nigeria, there is little differentiation between unconsciousness and death, for instance, which made the resurrection seem a bit less exciting. "I began to realize," he later wrote, "that if I were to face the problems of the Nigerian situation squarely, I would have to become more open than I had been. I… had been taught to fear heresy above almost anything else in the world." Doctrinal rigidity meant missions as proclamation—a method that was often ineffective and polarizing. "I began to suggest rather than dictate… I began to recognize that I did not know all that I thought I knew."[280] Kraft encouraged drums instead of hymns; he used songs composed locally and sung antiphonally without hymnbooks; he welcomed polygamists for worship.[281] He was fired from his missions position for his cultural openness. Later, after returning to the US, his teaching at Fuller Theological Seminary prescribed a "paradigm shift" for missionaries: a second conversion seemed necessary for truly crossing cultures. Here he also began to practice Gifts of the Spirit.[282]

[280] Kraft, *Christianity in Culture*, 8.
[281] Paul Pierson, "Sketching the Life of Charles H. Kraft," in *Paradigm Shifts In Christian Witness: Insights From Anthropology, Communication, And Spiritual Power: Essays In Honor Of Charles H. Kraft*, by Charles Kraft (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2008), xxii.
[282] Kraft, *Christianity in Culture*, 5.

Kraft's "open evangelicalism" aims to account for culture crossing with a flexible, yet theologically coherent, space between the rigidity of "plain spoken" Fundamentalism and cultural relativism. His definition of contextualization translates the form-content distinction from anthropology as "reality-REALITY," referencing "reality" as we know it and the true "REALITY" of the bible. Because humans don't access REALITY directly, to define "supracultural truth" requires a process of contextualization, a back and forth between Bible, reader, and culture. In doing so, says Kraft, we can come close to realizing the transcultural "ETHICAL" standard of the universe.[283]

Kraft's contextualization opposes syncretism in a unique way. For many evangelicals, syncretism simply means diluting genuine Christianity. But Kraft assumes culture mixing is inevitable, so his definition of syncretism is more subtle. It signifies moments when local belief stops moving toward Christianity. Syncretism then is not a particular empirical combination, but rather a broken process of collective conversion; a stagnant instead of dynamic relationship.[284] Here, in suggesting that movement toward Christ is enough, he challenges boundaries between saved and unsaved.

While Kraft met harsh criticism for his approach to theology—see *Is Charles Kraft an Evangelical?*[285]— through his resonance with Donald Macgavran's Church

[283] Ibid., 41,123,129,418,145.
[284] Ibid., 376.
[285] Edward N Gross, *Is Charles Kraft an Evangelical?: A Critique of Christianity in Culture* (Elkins Park, PA: E.N. Gross, 1985).

Growth publications,[286] he influenced a growing field that emphasized cultural sensitivity including many pentecostal missiologists.[287] However, unlike Kraft, who valorized the Bible, later missiologists brought the authority of science down to match Biblical knowledge. As such, postmodern epistemology saw shifting scientific paradigms that allowed evangelicals to claim one of many equally authoritative perspectives. Yet, because this disenabled pretensions to universal biblical authority, a "critical realist epistemology" [288] then emerged to recognize the partiality of communication and understanding, but insist, like Kraft, that imperfection does not deny REALITY. As one scholar explained, "Human minds cannot grasp the fullness of the universe, let alone the fullness of God."[289] In this schema, both science and scripture are the raw materials from which we build partial understandings mediated by cultural paradigms—a claim to truth certainly, but far from plain spoken.

Finally, this struggle over contextualization and syncretism inspired interpretive moves in both receiving and sending cultures such that the complexities of missionary encounter challenged home theologies. Emphasis on recipient cultures, "receiver-oriented communication," and the deep immersion of the missionary—called "inculturation," "incarnational," or "bicultural"—attempted to shed Western cultural frameworks. As one intercultural manual explains, "We have an imperative to present the gospel of Jesus Christ to all people. We have no imperative to present

---

[286] i.e. Macgavran, *How Churches Grow*.
[287] Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*.
[288] For a secular version: José López, *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism* (London: Athlone, 2001).
[289] Charles Hiebert Paul G, "Anthropology, Missions and Epistemological Shifts," in *Paradigm Shifts in Christian Witness : Insights from Anthropology, Communication, and Spiritual Power : Essays in Honor of Charles H. Kraft* (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2008), 18–19.

our culture to anyone."[290] Further, missiologists realized that contextualization affected home churches as well: "We must learn to exegete our own contexts, because these shape the way we understand and communicate the gospel."[291] Missionaries found it increasingly difficult to leave their shifting theologies in the missions field.

Pentecostal Missiology: From Indigenous Church Principles to Intercultural Missiology

Pentecostal missiology travelled a somewhat distinct path from that of other conservative Christians until the mid 1970s, when, entangled through the NAE and Fuller Theological Seminary, their concerns, to a large degree, merged. The early pentecostal "anti-cultural orientation" – what some call "Christ Against Culture" or "Christ Oblivious to Culture" - manifested in pacifism and the insistence that preaching came straight from God with no cultural or historical mediation, but was slowly replaced in AG rhetoric by preference for Roland Allen's version of Indigenous Church Principles (ICP).[292]

ICP, as AG practiced it, ignored subtle cultural questions of syncretism and inerrancy and emphasized local church leadership instead. Likewise, AG focus on the experience of the Holy Spirit also meant questions of language and doctrine came secondary to power. Thus, ICP's concern with the political independence of local

---

[290] Stephen Grunlan, *Cultural Anthropology : A Christian Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), 26.
[291] Paul Hiebert, *The Gospel in Human Contexts : Anthropological Explorations for Contemporary Missions* (Grand Rapids Mich.: Baker Academic, 2009), 12–13.
[292] Dempster, *Called & Empowered : Global Mission in Pentecostal Perspective*, 61. [Add Allen cite here]

congregations allowed AG to elide any internal discussion of theology that might challenge relationships at home. Meanwhile, at its best, ICP gave new converts, mostly people of color, tremendous freedom to develop strong local organizations.[293]

AG missiologists embraced ICP early and kept it prominent for over 90 years. ICP emphasized the three selfs: self-governing, self-propagating, and self-supporting—principles adopted by AG's General Council in 1921.[294] Noel Perkin director of missions from 1927-1959 urged all missionaries to read Roland Allen's writings on indigenous church growth.[295] In 1953, Melvin Hodges, the supervisor and trainer for most AG missionaries throughout the mid century, wrote an influential text advocating ICP.[296] He said the spirit moved local churches and AG should provide them a large measure of independence. As such, missions teachers at Bethany proudly describe their refusal to control foreign churches. Every national AG is independent (New Zealand has two independent AG groups). Only in 1988 did the global fellowship begin to develop consensus-making structures between countries. ICP continues to be central in AG thinking.

Further, ICP adds a layer of complexity to the simple tale wherein rigid fundamentalist goes out and fluid evangelical comes home. Pentecostals often argue that by joining the flexibility of spirit guidance to an awareness of power, pentecostal

---

[293] By the mid-19050s the overseas membership overcame US in AG. Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 14.
[294] "General Council of the Assemblies of God Minutes" (General Council of the Assemblies of God, Springfield IL, 1921), 61–4.
[295] Gary McGee, "Assemblies of God Mission Theology: A Historical Perspective," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 10, no. 4 (October 1986): 168.
[296] Hodges, *The Indigenous Church Including The Indigenous Church and the Missionary*.

missions were culturally sensitive from the start.[297] AG's ICP missiology certainly claimed to allow converts more freedom than the approaches of non-pentecostal fundamentalists. Yet, AG missionaries trained in ICP also acknowledge that their middle American fundamentalist heritage played a role in their actual practices.

In fact, while ICP appeared culturally sensitive and its efforts at decentralizing power somewhat effective, AG missionaries in the field often ignored ICP. It even may have prevented them from asking themselves some of the more awkward questions about twentieth-century encounter. Instead of the self-reflexive awareness asked by Intercultural Missiology, ICP required that missionaries automatically cede power to local church leaders. Thus, to a degree, AG missionaries avoided discussing questions about language, communication, and translation that plagued other efforts to distinguish the syncretic heresy from the contextualized.[298] As such, pentecostal decentralization allowed theological and political creativity in the global South but left fundamentalist sensibilities at home relatively unchallenged. Only later, after AG joined with evangelicals, embraced anthropology, and came under increased pressure from the global South, did these issues become central to AG missiology. At that point, churches at home began to face challenges from missionary-inspired responses to fundamentalist assertions of textual perfection.

However, returning missionaries supporting expanded intercultural concern encountered barriers. For instance, Del Tarr's theological innovation and cultural

---

[297] i.e. Allan Anderson, "The Contextual Pentecostal Theology of David Yonggi Cho," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 7, no. 1 (2004); Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*.
[298] For an exception see McGee, *This Gospel--Shall Be Preached*, 1986, 194.

openness contrasted sharply with the AG home church. His return to the states inspired conflict and his first efforts at developing curriculum were marginalized. For Tarr's book, *Double Image*, is radically suggestive: "Those who hold that the scriptures can be translated and proclaimed 'culture free' are simply naïve." [299] In fact, he encourages, "cultural impact so I can have my theology change." In doing so, Tarr rejects fundamentalist certainty and explicitly encourages risk taking that inevitably leads to mistakes. As he says, "A God of restraint gives you the capacity to reject him. He is willing for me to live in the risk of failure to learn to trust and love him as he loves me. This allows me unimaginable potential for growth because he lets me fail… and serve him by my own volition, not by church rules." Of course, Tarr's transformation wrought political problems, "AG preachers would say this is heresy." His first attempt at building a university was marginalized within AG. Yet, from 1990-2008 he led AGTS, gathering together thinkers interested in moving ICP toward Intercultural Missiology.[300] Under Tarr's leadership, AGTS became a center for AG missiological exploration and education. The most significant project in this thread through the 1970s was Paul Pomerville's 1981 dissertation[301] that argued the Kingdom of God was present – suggesting we should care for the current world[302] – and that cultural sensitivity was, and should be, inescapable in the vital pentecostal missiology he advocated. Pomerville saw pentecostal practices as ineluctably leading

[299] Tarr, *Double Image*, 2.
[300] Recent AGTS syllabi include "Foundations Of Cross-Cultural Ministry" courses teaching Kraft, Grunlan, Meyers, Hiebert, Lingenfelter and Pentecostal inflected Intercultural Missiology.
[301] Originally published as *The Pentecostal Contribution to Contemporary Missions Theology* for the M. Miss degree at Fuller Seminary's School of World Mission.
[302] Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*, 58.

to contextualization. When spiritual experience occurs in different cultures, it engenders an active process of making it fit. "God the Holy Spirit is active in the contextualization of the gospel, and fresh applications of the word to the life of faith in society… The inordinate fear of syncretism so frequently shown by Western theologians towards Third World theologies would be dissipated," if the spirit were freed and all of its "living experience" applied to new encounters.[303] Pomerville directly challenges fundamentalism as overly positivistic, and for that reason, culturally blinded. "A rationalistic, static theology was influenced further by common sense philosophy–highly ethnocentric view of reality…"[304] If Western missionaries would only pay more attention to the active presence of the spirit in everyday life, they might better prepare to engage with the active spirituality of the global South. "The lack of fidelity to the African cultural milieu was directly related to the lack of fidelity to divine revelation in the missionary's own culture first. The area of non-– Western culture that was consistently neglected by the Western missionary in African society with the transempirical "middle world" of spirits."[305] Pomerville even cites Kraft's argument that change is central to distinguishing real revelation. As he writes, "personal truth and revelation are not static.… We need to learn to *distinguish between… Dynamic revelation (and truth) and the information that is inevitably a part but never the whole…*"[306] Pomerville is among the most cited of the new

[303] Ibid., 8.
[304] Ibid., 25.
[305] Ibid., 75.
[306] Ibid., 124–6.

pentecostal missiology with his critique of fundamentalism, and emphasis on contextualization and Kingdom Theology.

Another of the new pentecostal missiologists, Grant McClung, argues that pentecostal practice, by its very nature, encouraged cultural contextualization. "Pentecostalism's emphasis on 'freedom in the spirit' rendered it inherently flexible in different cultural and social contexts. All this made the transplanting of its central tenants in the two–thirds world more easily assimilated." Instead of liturgies, theologies, well-educated clergy, and patterns of strongly centralized leadership that contributed to the feeling that churches were foreign, "pentecostalism emphasized an immediate personal experience of God's power by his spirit, it was more intuitive and emotional." And the practice seems to lend itself to decentralized leadership for they, "recognized charismatic leadership and national church patterns wherever they arose."[307]

These claims to innate cultural sensitivity and power sharing held some degree of truth. Yet, at the same time, missionaries carried powerfully racist and imperialist baggage that a fluid and broadly inspiring pentecostal practice could not easily overcome. McClung, for instance, recognizes that pentecostals often described their "objects" of mission as "the heathen."[308] Pentecostals couldn't help but, to some degree, share in the general sense among missionaries that, in spite of its inherent

[307] Grant McClung, *Azusa Street and beyond: Pentecostal Missions and Church Growth in the Twentieth Century* (South Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Pub., 1986).
[308] Ibid., 114.

violence, imperialism made the world safe for missions.[309] Another of the new missiologists, Allan Anderson, does important work in bringing early missionary racism to light. He tells how Amy Semple McPherson, a famous pentecostal missionary, described China in deeply ethnocentric terms, "the air were filled with demons and the host of hell, in this wicked, benighted country."[310] Or, William Burton who, on one hand said, "the black man is not such a silly, primitive being as some people are painted him," yet also argued that in African society the, "whole social machinery and outlook lies under the hideous curse of a dark, menacing cloud. The supposed influence of the dead upon the living… [which] Paralyzes effort, cramps initiative, and causes its victims to live in a constant state of apprehension and fear."[311] Ethnocentrism was institutionalized in AG mission policies. For instance, *The Latter Rain Evangel* reported that AGs second missionary conference in 1918 resolved to discourage, "the ordination of native workers… except where the matter can be arrange for and looked after by the proper committees on their respective fields and districts." Apparently, a native had "attempted to assert authority over the missionary." The same conference discouraged bringing natives to the US for training and argued that no money be sent directly to "native workers on the field," a racism later easily translated into neoliberal paradigm.[312] Anderson's list of ethnocentric acts only begins what could be a book unto itself, but it makes the point that when recent pentecostal missiologists argue that the practice of the spirit inevitably leads to

[309] Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 34.
[310] Ibid., 233.
[311] Ibid., 242.
[312] Ibid., 269.

cultural sensitivity, they should be taken with a grain of salt. However, both the cultural sensitivity and the history of ethnocentrism made their way into Bethany's missions classes.

Bethany University: God Made Culture Too

In participant observation in Bethany's missionary preparation classes I was surprised by the emphasis on cultural sensitivity and the apparent commitment to theological changeability. In retrospect, it seems Intercultural Missiology had significantly influenced Bethany's pedagogy. For instance, this is from one Bethany classroom:

> "How do I respond to people when I know what they do is evil?" a student asks. She is clearly concerned.
>
> The professor replies carefully—this is a big can of worms. "We need to respect other cultures, but it is difficult. Religion, however, is not culture—ethics are a different matter. It is not ok to be an ethical relativist."
>
> He continues: "I was working as a missionary in a polygamous culture and speaking to a new male convert with four wives in the room. The women would be seen as prostitutes if he left them, so instead of insisting on immediate monogamy, I talked about the emotional difficulties of polygamy—of being the 2nd or 3rd favorite wife. The women nodded their heads. I explained the reasons for the ethic of monogamy in the Bible and I asked them to teach their children. I did not insist that they change right away. Sometimes there is a compromise. God made culture too."

Dr. Stewart's Intercultural Communication class teaches the art of evangelism through thickets of cultural difference. His delicate dance between biblical authority and cultural sensitivity engages religion to trump culture, even as culture comes from

God. Yet, compromise surpasses rigidity, for example, when choosing between polygamy or social destitution. Such negotiation with everyday imperatives follows established pentecostal formulae for missionary success: claim a clear, one-lane highway to heaven even as hybridity characterizes the pragmatics of evangelism. However, the dynamic is not simple—for pentecostals, to meet others partway without yielding core principles involves both flexibility and appropriation.

Cultural sensitivity is often a primary concern for Bethany students. Stories of rigidity and insensitivity among early pentecostal missionaries serve as foil for ostensive receptiveness. As Dinah says, "It kind of made me want to throw up—you just go over and change people's cultures." Onella agrees:

> [They] would have thought my whole culture—Latina—was secular. That was before we found out that it was OK to understand yourself as a person and your culture holistically and still love God through that … [God] created the indigenous culture that I came from… I think of how diverse God's heart is. He created the nations. Like, that's amazing.

Similarly, Daniel says Bethany emphasizes a gentle encounter with others: "The biggest thing that has happened at this school is that my concept of evangelism has radically changed. I came from a youth group where the model was to get in someone's face and say 'repent!' [It's] the lamb of God versus the pig of God." And, the lamb, he says, besides being kinder, may be especially compelling.

However, biblical truth still has a role. Dr. Stewart tries to circumvent imperialist assumptions, yet still evangelize. He doesn't want the message to be, "let

me tell you how it is, me the Westerner. I have all the answers." Instead, he imagines mission as dialogue. "Maybe the answer is committing to as many discussions as you can. The discussion is important, even more than the answers." Yet, biblical principles are distinct. "We have a responsibility to figure out what the kernels are, understand them, and communicate them." Kernels of truth are perhaps less negotiable than cultural norms.

For Dr. Chandler, Bethany missions professor, the "healthy tension" between yielding to God and pursuing active missionary aspirations undoes hierarchy. In his Transforming Missions courses, he emphasizes "following" but also the need for leadership and biblical authority. For Chandler, this paradox resolves when missionaries "surrender their ambition and abandon everything to love." Yielding, however, involves an active deity. "I do not convert people. Christ converts 'em," he explains. The triangular relationship between God, missionary, and potential convert poses human yielding as the agentive act for convert and missionary; God does the rest. Thus, infallible scriptures and Christian exclusivism become compatible with cultural fluidity and yielding.

Students also struggle with the dynamic between belief and cultural relativism. Shannon describes evangelizing: "I'm looking at someone as if they want to be saved. [I ask myself] How dare you say you know the answer?" He seems sensitized to value other cultures. Yet, relinquishing individual control allows another authority, "I don't have the answer but I know someone who does." Upon introspection, Shannon recognizes his conundrum. "If you want to be linear about the

concept, yeah we do have the answer. Living a life of I don't know the answer but I know someone who does…"

Others however, like Aimee, go farther in accepting multiple religions. As she explains, when non-Christian religions provide "fruits of the spirit like joy and peace," they challenge Christian exclusivity. "If you see it in other religions, how can you say it's not? There is a lot of truth in other religions." Iliana imagined a reciprocal missions encounter, "…embracing the differences just like I want them to embrace me. I would offer them the chance to talk about their religion and my religion." Likewise, Shaina added, "I'm definitely open to the idea that there are other religions who see the same God as I do but don't call him by the same name." However, she still advocates evangelism. Janis begins with similar sensitivity, "If you care about someone you really need to hear them." She closes a bit more tightly, "With that said I know where I stand." Dr. Stewart says experience of the Holy Spirit authorizes prophecy and thus leans democratic, even almost—but not quite—relativistic.

One version of cross-cultural sensitivity involves borrowing and refashioning local traditions. Dr. Stewart says local spiritual practices thrive when appropriated by Christianity: the more that Jesus, the Holy Spirit, devils, and angels replace local pantheons without disrupting details of practice, the more conversions.[313] Dr. Albrecht, theology professor, adds, "[Non-Pentecostal missionaries] say, '[spirits] are not real,' [local people] go, 'well where are you from? We got this problem with this

[313] This is quite similar to earlier Christian appropriations of pagan worship sites and styles.

demon. You have no way to deal with oppressive spirits?'" Pentecostals, by contrast, assume that spirits are real and set out to fight them from the start. Birgit Meyer describes pentecostal appropriation in which previous pantheons are not simply borrowed, but actively contested—deities become demons, still powerful, only now evil.[314] Likewise, Bethany's missiology self-consciously embeds Jesus within or appropriates elements from native belief. Dr. Stewart advocates inserting Christianity into local practices. "Instead they could take this [local religion] and put Jesus in it." That is, do not dismiss, but appropriate—a form of partial acceptance, open to dialogue, that still gives Christianity the upper hand. Is this simply hybridity as soft colonialism, or does the end goal, the form of Christianity joined, change as well?

Partially in response to the Intercultural Missiology at Bethany, fundamentalists within AG describe theological "softness" as one example of how "Bethany lost its way." Bethany was closed in 2011.

Tensions Within: Between Home and Missions

Cultural provocation becomes especially poignant upon return home when friction appears between older selves and newly formed missionary sensibilities: "to go is a culture shock, and to return is a culture shock." As such, AG's missionary division views race, culture, social service, and ecumenical cooperation quite differently from its home churches. Missionaries describe the missions division as importantly "more liberal" than the rest of AG. Mel Robeck, AG historian, says that

[314] Meyer, *Translating the Devil.*

until 1965, several mainline churches listed AG missions as partners and shared the same buildings. Fundamentalists campaigned against AG's cooperation with mainline churches. Yet, for more than a decade a semi-secret AG-mainline relationship continued amid various AG denials. Eventually, fundamentalists pressured AG to renounce any ecumenical connection, sever ties, and move their offices. The pragmatics of conversion had given the missions department leeway—for a moment—to tread where other AG leaders dared not. One AG scholar explained, "edgy things are acceptable outside of our normal sphere of activities if they are for the purpose of mission… When you put it in terms of mission you can get away with anything."

Missions incite receptivity to new ideas and a willingness to change that contrasts with the subcultural isolation of AG's home churches. As one missionary in El Salvador explained, missionaries demonstrate an "open mindedness. We get to see a different perspective of what Christianity is." By comparison, her childhood in US AG included "people who don't get out and don't get to see what Christianity is really about." Charlie Self, AGTS professor of Church History, agrees: "the nature of what you're going to do forces you to become a more inclusive person fundamentally." Yet, inclusivity strains subcultural separatism: "living in Arkansas in a segregated county—that is your world." As Dr. Stewart explains, "the missionaries are more flexible; the [church] structure shifts less rapidly." Likewise, Shaina portrays stark differences between bridging cultural divides and the subcultural US AG church:

> The churches are still singing 1960s hymns. In the 1920s or 30s pentecostal culture froze ourselves—a massive cultural barrier. We developed a pentecostal subculture and chose to be pentecostal over missional.[315] Just as missionaries overseas must learn language, culture etc., … [we should] allow ourselves to change. We froze our subculture and created a weird subculture that no one can relate to but us. We gotta be both biblical and missional. Churches that change are criticized for watering it down. I am in the Bible Belt, I don't see AG churches learning the language, expecting folks to jump boundaries. There is a major cultural barrier between the typical AG believer and anybody else. If there is anything our missionaries can bring home it is a spark.

All interviewees agreed that while Intercultural Missiology resonates with their experience, it hasn't fully permeated AG missions.

Since these middle Americans touched by missionary encounter are favored sons or daughters back home, the missions division functions as an internal AG critic, channeling the ambivalence of cross-cultural encounter into the heart of AG's bureaucracy. Missionaries return with changed beliefs, dress, worship, and questions. Back home, they trail newly humbled sensibilities throughout AG by itinerating, teaching missionary trainees, and theorizing missiology. Yet, the pressures to appear orthodox are powerful. "Missionaries don't talk liberal when they come home," explains one missionary. For while the most dedicated of young AG recruits went off to explore, conquer, love, and be transformed, the rest of AG hunkered down in self-protective subcultural refuge, rejecting even the worldview just around the corner.

[315] Missional here means prioritizing missions.

Dangers: Going Native

Thus, the risks of encounter inspire tenacious efforts at containment. I talked with missionaries who usually served from 15 to 40 years within one host culture. They detail severe internal struggles with their own cultural rigidity. Many AG missionaries fail their intercultural ventures; most AG missionaries quit before a second four-year term, and some missionaries suggest that the numbers who quit here are as high as 70 percent. In fact, the missions project is so haunted by the everyday reality of "going crazy" and/or "going native" that previous AG aversion to "humanistic" psychology is yielding to therapeutic support networks for missionaries transitioning back into US churches.

AG Member Care Coordinator Butch Frey's comportment—tall, muscled, goateed, a grey cardigan over jeans and Birkenstocks—and his affirmation of psychology—"if psychology is bunk, then respiratory systems are bunk"—both give lie to the staid Midwest missionary caught in a fundamentalist time warp. In fact, Frey assumes that cultural encounter permeates missionaries. "Missionaries tend to be the polar opposite from what you see in the evangelical world. Living in another culture, working hand-in-hand with Presbyterians." As they "evolutionize," they "tend to see what is important differently from those in the US." Frey's job is to observe transitions. "We watch them change and become open and passionate in areas they never would have dreamed of before—a whole different set of priorities." However, his enthusiasm for change is qualified. While missionaries are "assumed to be more liberal thinkers, it is not always the case," he explains. Frey then

distinguishes registers of fluidity. They are "out of necessity more open thinkers." He pauses. "But theologically?" How precarious is the edifice? He responds: "Some of the time, those most solid in the basic tenets of the faith struggle with what's important. They have a seasoning, a consecration, a sanctification that people recognize." Yet, he says AG's disavowal of such theological struggle produces spiritually stifling rhetorics of stability. Thus, because missions are so provocative, "itineration can be one of the most challenging moments." Here, differences between AG doctrine and rhetoric and missionary experience inspire coping mechanisms. "Some live in the tension. Some toe the company line in some contexts and then have safe spaces where they can be themselves and discuss the deep work God is doing in their lives." At times, the reciprocity of missions encounter goes underground.

Changing Theology at Home

Yet, despite efforts at containment, the muddle of encounter yields very concrete change even beyond new missiologies and pedagogies. Within AG, consequential debates over doctrine on faith healing and over premillienialism and earthly compassion emerged, to a large extent, from missions encounter.

Missions to the sick can challenge faith healing doctrines. To some pentecostals disease equals lack of faith. Thus to be sick, or disabled, suggests spiritual failure. After evangelism among the disabled, one missionary disagrees. Bob, missionary in the US, draws on biblical sources to describe how Moses was challenged in public speaking. He also references how the church is a body in need of

its many parts—without disabled folks the church is disabled. Further, human agency must yield to God's mystery. "God has spastic cerebral palsy—sometimes his body doesn't do what his head tells it to." His work with disabled people inspired a position paper that was reviewed, shrunk, and sanitized by AG's "Doctrinal Purity Commission," who voted to canonize his doctrinal developments.

More regularly, missionaries encounter intense poverty, which interrogates their premillenial assertion that evangelism always trumps service and suggests instead an earthly focus on Kingdom Theology and compassion. Byron Klaus describes "walking the streets of Central America during civil wars. I see parents and realize they want what I want… It changes my perspective about poverty. About walking with a poor." His analysis delves beyond compassion, to recognizing consequential social formations. "I begin to understand structures of poverty and the inevitability of revolution if there is no change." His is no longer an evangelism of pure conversion.

Thus, AG missionaries debate "the book or the rice bowl." In premillenial eschatology this world gets worse, then Christ returns. Here human effort matters little—except perhaps in timing the Rapture. According to many, Premillenialism distinguishes Fundamentalism and its right-wing rejection of social services—the rice bowl.[316] However, postcolonial encounters with intense poverty pushed some AG missiologists to embrace "Kingdom of God" theology, which advocates material

[316] Wilson, *Armageddon Now!*; R Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Timothy Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1925* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976); Sandeen, *The Origins of Fundamentalism*.

progress before Christ's return.[317] AG historian Gary McGee describes Kingdom of God theology in AG missions circles as early as 1963, but very much muted.[318] For instance an incipient form emerged as early as 1963 when Noel Perkin, Director of Missions, made lack of access to adequate food a crucial element of his "Survey of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions."[319] Although, as McGee notes, the "kingdom" is not mentioned as a biblical basis for missions[320] and Perkin assures us that "We are concerned with men's souls more than their bodies."[321] By 1966 Hodges suggested the church might be the "kingdom of God in the earth" which Mcgee argues, "indicated an important trend in pentecostal missiology, for their import was shared by many of Hodges colleagues,"[322] and strengthened a growing list of subsidiary institutions focused on literacy, medical aid, and other benevolent projects.[323] However, as late as 1968, a statement of social concern in the minutes of AG's General Presbytery, argued against compassion ministries, for social ills are caused by man's sinful nature, the real solution in the "power of the Holy Spirit" 201[324] In the same year, Hodges seemed to backtrack and argue against the kingdom of god, "There are those who contend that the Pentecostals view of Christian mission is too narrow, and that emphasis on evangelism and personal conversion leaves much to be desired in the area of men's physical and economic needs. This pentecostals answer:

---

[317] McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached*, 217.
[318] Ibid., 100–103.
[319] Perkin and Garlock, *Our World Witness*, 12.
[320] McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached*, 102.
[321] Perkin and Garlock, *Our World Witness*, 12.
[322] McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached*, 102.
[323] Perkin and Garlock, *Our World Witness*, 54–6.
[324] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*.

Let us put first things first."[325] This ambivalence eventually led to a split between missions and the rest of AG, such that by 1985 the missions department had added "acts of compassion" as their fourth guiding principle along with evangelism, indigenous church building, and training national preachers.[326] It took almost 20 years for this priority to make its way through the rest of AG bureaucracy. For as this focus on compassion grew it inspired rebuttal and strong censure. For instance, a 1988 issue of *Mountain Movers*, AG's missions publication, argued for the dangers of kingdom theology.[327] Douglas Peterson describes the ambivalence of his older missiology teachers, like Hodges, who feared social concern would usurp conversion but who also recognized that convert's bodies matter. It was an uphill and unfinished battle.[328] Even so, AG leaders increasingly engaged with problems of this world.[329] As Hogan wrote in 1989, "in recent years, we have dramatically intensified our efforts in these areas…"[330] The "Progressive Pentecostals" including Bethany professors Dan Albrecht, Everett Wilson, and Koo Yun and graduate Amos Young, now a

[325] A Penteocostals's view of Mission Strategy Melvin Hodges 1968 119
[326] McGee, "Assemblies of God Mission Theology: A Historical Perspective," 168.
[327] George Wood, "Kingdom Now and Missions," *Mountain Movers*, June 1988, 100–111.
[328] Peterson, "Missions in the 21st Century: Toward a Methodology of Pentecostal Compassion."
[329] David Moberg, *The Great Reversal Evangelism versus Social Concern* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972); Michael Wilkinson, *A Liberating Spirit: Pentecostals and Social Action in North America* (Eugene OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010); Murray Dempster, "Christian Social Concern in Pentecostal Perspective: Reformulating Pentecostal Eschatology," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1, no. 2 (April 1, 1993): 51–64; David Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel : The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought* (Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). Dave Donaldson, *The Compassion Revolution* (Eugene Or.: Harvest House Publishers, 2010); Poloma, *The Assemblies Of God Godly Love And The Revitalization Of American Pentecostalism*.
[330] called and empowered p 22

preeminent theologian, all say spirit guidance inspires ecumenicism, social concern, and cross-cultural awareness.[331]

In 2003 the rest of US AG finally joined their missions department's use of, "compassion" in their statement of purpose. More broadly, data from 2001 to 2005 US missions document increasing emphasis on human flourishing rather than evangelism.[332] Even the partial acceptance of Kingdom Theology by some intercultural thinkers suggests that missionary encounter refashioned theology. If Premillenialism is as key to right-wing leanings as scholars suspect, the change is significant.

Conclusion

Always in-between, missionaries embody the fabric of intercultural encounter. They describe effective proselytizing as vulnerability and yielding yet also asking for tremendous trust and transformation. That efforts to convert others also work in reverse is the irony of the missionary encounter. The pressures of cross-cultural encounter cause many missionaries to loose their tight grip on the real, especially those equipped with a strong sense of unyielding truth.[333] Those who do survive the

[331] Paul Pomerville, *The Third Force In Missions: A Pentecostal Contribution To Contemporary Mission Theology* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1985). Murray Dempster, *Called & Empowered : Global Mission in Pentecostal Perspective* (Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1991).
[332] Christopher Little, "In Response to 'The Future of Evangelicals in Mission,'" in *Missionshift: Global Mission Issues in the Third Millennium*, ed. David Hesselgrave (Nashville TN: B & H Academic, 2010), 205.
[333] Marge Jones, *Psychology of Missionary Adjustment* (Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1995); Al Dueck, "Member Care," in *Evangelical, Ecumenical, and Anabaptist Missiologies in Conversation : Essays in Honor of Wilbert R. Shenk*, ed. Wilbert Shenk (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2006), 257–

missions field often manage shifts in priorities, practices, and sensibilities through which previous notions of certainty refigure. In other words, going out into the world, meeting other people, and trying to communicate a persuasive message transforms the organizer.

Cultural encounter pressured AG missionaries to refigure nearly every core fundamentalist doctrine—exclusivity, literalism, proclamation, premillenial eschatology, and conversion. In doing so, it opened the door to a theology of compassion and a broader acceptance of cultural difference—perhaps a shift from fundamentalist to evangelical sensibilities. AG missionaries had returned home as both cultural mediators and icons of orthodox faith. This dual position channeled cross-cultural sensitivity into the subcultural center of a seemingly traditionalist US pentecostalism. AG's missions and educational networks then amplified and institutionalized the confusion of the missions encounter and engendered political-theological struggle.

The fluorescence of culturally sensitive communication strategies among recently fundamentalist missionaries likely seem odd because of the ready identification of missions as orientalist and colonialist and the equation of fundamentalist with unyielding. Perhaps then this soft intercultural approach is merely superficial window dressing for modern Christian imperialism—a Foucauldian nightmare of intimate conversion?[334] While this seems plausible, I argue

---

65; "Special Issues on 'Mental Health and Missions,'" *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 1987, 1994, 1997 1983.

[334] This is the question regularly asked of me at conferences.

that the shift from fundamentalist to evangelical pentecostalism involves more than superficial change. Colonial encounters engendered a rich reciprocity, reaching deep into the colonial cultures that spawned missions in the first place. Further, while this paper narrowly traces the transformation from fundamentalist to evangelical sensibilities within AG missions, because other outreach incites similar "palpable risks,"[335] I also join other scholars in developing a family of broader sociological formations that play in multiple contexts—what I call here "the reciprocity of mobilizing."[336] This co-constitutive spirit within organizing projects may explain some of the vital mutability of a Christianity so dependent on missions.

First and most simply, because missions inhabit such a potent space within evangelical networks, encounters—and the confusion they produce—are schematized, amplified, and channeled throughout the globe. As one of the earliest forces of globalization the missionary movement has few competitors for scale. Keeping 32-34 percent of the twentieth-century global population Christian meant churches needed to inspire a huge increase in adherents. Notably, the missions surge of the mid twentieth century had US churches spending $4 billion annually on overseas missions by 2001.[337] Missions took incredible focus and funding.

Missions experiences penetrate home churches because "volunteering for missionary service seem[s] a sure indication that one is a fully consecrated, Spirit-

[335] Elisha, *Moral Ambition Mobilization And Social Outreach In Evangelical Megachurches*.
[336] i.e. Orta, ""Living the Past Another Way."
[337] Up over 50% from 1991. Wuthnow, *Boundless Faith*, 1.

filled Christian."[338] Thus, as the most visibly passionate and committed members of an institutional network that values mission above all else, missionaries with decades of field experience have a powerful voice at home and so, to some degree, their increasing ambivalence infiltrates past subcultural barriers.

Cultural sensitivity is not simply a front for more intimate, and thus intensified, colonialism. Soft practices do more than effect more conversion, they also change the endgame. To argue that all conversion is essentially the same—sensitive or rigid, evangelical or fundamentalist—requires a sharp divide between practice and essence, one difficult to maintain. Is all conversion essentially, ontologically, equal? Yet, if epistemology and ontology exist in a dynamic systems relationship,[339] then perhaps we necessarily remake the essence when we refashion the façade? Or more simply, as I see it, evangelical conversions differ from fundamentalist conversions. Second, much of the violence in Christian outreach emerges as much from tone and self-righteousness as from theological disagreement—many passionate Christians encounter the world kindly. As such, changed sensibility *is* changed politics. Finally, one could say that intercultural missionaries are nice but their instrumental cultural sensitivity lacks respect, since it is not necessarily genuine. However, is the desire to act—to inspire change—incompatible with genuine kindness and cultural awareness? For if action and inaction both inevitably incite politics—as we know they do—then missions are unusual only in their explicitly situated and articulate desire to remake

[338] Carpenter, "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929-1942," 80.
[339] Evan Thompson, *Mind in Life: Biology, Phenomenology, and the Sciences of Mind* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007).

the world. Either we all—not just missionaries—are explicitly activist or instead we do politics unconsciously through neglect, ignorance, or passivity. In this light, the missionary is simply one among many engaged social scientists, if more revealing of intent and better organized in manifesting it. Thus, like feminism, a "committed discipline in its very constitution,"[340] Intercultural Missiology does not simply observe, but instead provides a socially engaged anthropology, searching for a life worth living[341] but also specific routes to get there—with 15-40 years of field work expected.

The missionary is engaged in an activist practice that intensifies the co-constitutive reciprocity of self and other. Intercultural Missiology engenders self-transformation: "a form of mission in reverse, where we will learn from other cultures how to be more Christian."[342] This seems apropos. Missions intimately connect the most zealous and self-certain Christians to stark difference while ensuring that missionaries feel impelled by a deep yearning to be understood, trusted, and believed—the ultimate provocation. What better force for confusing and revitalizing the center? Delonn Rance, AG missionary, AGTS professor, and former Bethany Missionary in Residence, calls it "cross-pollination: The home sending church needs the ambassadors to come back revitalized, the missionary knows they have a spiritual community supporting them… We need each other's different lenses." Paul Tillich

---

[340] Joel Robbins, "Anthropology and Theology: An Awkward Relationship?," *Anthropological Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2006): 287.
[341] David Schneider and Roy Wagner, "Foreward," in *The Curse of Souw Principles of Daribi Clan Definition and Alliance in New Guinea*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), viii.
[342] Darrell Whiteman, "Contextualization: The Theory, The Gap, The Challenge," in *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization 3 : Faith and Culture*, ed. James Scherer (Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1999), 45–46.

says this relationship between Christianity and other religions is "profoundly dialectical, and that is not a weakness but the greatness of Christianity."[343] Of course, this reciprocity infuses all mobilizing. Or, as Spinoza suggests—all being. But the pentecostal church has certainly made a uniquely concerted practice out of it.

[343] Paul Tillich, *Christianity and the Encounter of the World Religions*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), 51.

Prologue: Section I Reciprocity, Chapter II

Reciprocity describes the process by which missions aims to transform their target populations but, more surely, it brings cross-cultural difference home. This manifests in tensions within individual missionaries and on occasion, the sharpening and generalizing of these tensions into battles within the sending organization. This chapter narrates one of those struggles. AG experienced rupture because missions, like any other cross cultural experience, breeds an openness to new ideas and, in this case, ways of being that contrasted sharply with the fundamentalist culture of AG's Northern California-Nevada District (NCN). In the process, a sectarian fundamentalism was challenged by a more expansive evangelicalism. The process went something like this: via the reciprocity of evangelism, the crisis of tongues inspired the crisis of missions encounter which engendered a crisis pedagogy among Bethany faculty, all imagined as moments of productive derailment, or rupture for learning.

Chapter II: A Tale of Two Moderns:
Pentecostal Higher Education and the Battle of Bethany

Developing a national ministry is very much like farming – like the growing of crops. There are two stages in crop development, and too much rainfall (read 'outside help') at either stage is disastrous. One stage is seeding time. The other is maturity. Between seeding and harvesting – during the developmental period – rainfall is necessary, and when distributed in proper amounts proves very beneficial. What about this training stage?... It is at this point that we feel we can make the greatest contribution to the national ministry. The Bible schools are the heart of modern missions. It is in these areas of our work that foreign help is most needed and is the least dangerous." J Philip Hogan, Executive Director of AG Department of Foreign Missions 1960-1989[344]

"The church and the university are incongruent, in the church the only book you need is the bible." AG Pastor interview 2011

This chapter continues the tale of missions reciprocity by describing a battle within AG's higher education network that I suggest was in part instigated by a cultural divide between evangelical and fundamentalist pentecostals. This was a difference not in quantity of religious fervor or attachment to modernity, but rather one that rests on a set of sensibilities and dispositions that can be read in their approaches to learning, to change, and to encounter. This divide both emerged from and resonated closely with the transformed orientation of the missionaries returning from the field who are now teaching in AG's higher education institutions. Further, this chapter

[344] Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 126.

describes the development of Bethany's crisis pedagogy, which engenders jarring contact with the secular world so as to inoculate students to the temptations of secularism. In addition to the reciprocity of mission encounter, evangelical interest in contact with the outside world brings substantial risk.

The following story really ought to be told at least twice. I struggle with two disparate versions - I find myself seriously challenged by the stark difference in interpretation between what looks like two sides of a struggle. However, even calling it a battle is, in a very strong sense, taking sides. For one group describes a peaceful process within a community under stress, but in no meaningful way divided or unbalanced. The other says this claim to unity falsely disguises deeper disagreements what, for many, extends to include dark intrigue, definitely enough to raise hackles. As such, I choose sides insomuch as I recognize two tales, but I do my best to tell them together and entwined.

Each is a tattle-tale. That is, they emphasize the failings of the other. What I call evangelical-pentecostals portray Bethany as a pentecostal university shunned by fundamentalist-pentecostals who control the California-Nevada District of the Assemblies of God and who are appalled at the "liberal" culturally sensitive pedagogies developed at Bethany. Perhaps, Bethany "lost its way" long ago when the faculty adopted flexible approaches to missions and theological education that risk the entire edifice of fundamentalist-pentecostalism. In particular, by developing a crisis pedagogy, which exposes students to the dangers of secularism as well as a

culturally sensitive missiology that values multiple worldviews, Bethany faculty endanger their theological and cultural heritage. And, as I will show, it is true that emphasis on outreach – against fundamentalist separatism – posed problems for two crucial theological commitments – innerancy and premillenialism. (These are two of the fundamentalist core that scholars tend to see as crucial to entangling non-liberal Christianity with right wing politics.)[345]

Fundamentalists fought back against what they saw as the creeping liberalism of Bethany's soft approach to pedagogy and missions and shut it down. The evangelical leaders of the local Bethany community tell this tale of fundamentalist retribution. They see the closure as political, theological, unnecessary, and mean spirited. They also think the fundamentalist perspective is bad for pentecostal growth - innerancy doesn't allow for much dialogue, they say.

From the fundamentalist side of things the narrative differs. These folks hold sway in Sacramento and in the large mega-churches that fund and control much of the NCN (Northern California-Nevada) District of AG - a fellowship of a few thousand pastors and between 130 and 140 thousand participants. They certainly recognize disputes over the role of Bethany – they see teaching the bible as the key lesson, not culture. But they proffer a much more pragmatic tale. In this story, Bethany suffered from bad management, a lack of planning, leadership and anything else that might make for a healthy business. We are talking millions of dollars of debt, simply un-payable. In this story, some of the bad planning might emerge from AG's culture of

[345] Wilson, *Armageddon Now!*; Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans*; Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming*; Sandeen, *The Origins of Fundamentalism*.

immediacy. And, of course, as they explain, Bethany was in the dark woods of the bohemian Santa Cruz Mountains – a riské cultural situation if you ever saw one - but not enough to sink the ship. That was about finances pure and simple.

Both groups agreed that the community was in some sense divided – they question the extent and significance. As one AG leader explained, "The root problem is that 'the Bethany family' has 'two-visions' about almost everything: Shall we be in Scotts Valley or Sacramento? Shall we be a clergy college or liberal arts college? Shall we be accredited or not? Shall we be governed by a district or not? Shall we be residential or online? Shall we be led by a Pastor or an Educator? Shall we have sports teams or not? And a dozen other arguments that most people don't even know about." Fundamentalists portray a small internal debate, for evangelicals it meant a community eating itself.

So we see two distinct tales. However, I suspect that my readers – likely more secular than Christian - will find the evangelical tale of good and bad, anger and retribution, more compelling than fundamentalist stories of bureaucratic malfeasance. So, I want to argue strongly that the fundamentalist version ought to be taken just as seriously. This is difficult, for my portrait of evangelicals will seem so modern, and in a certain sense, progressive – perhaps appealing. After all, they teach students about multiple cultures and critical thinking. They critique inerrancy, which for many is the ultimate fundamentalist absurdity. Yet these evangelicals are not retreating in faith or passion for conversions – in fact, they see their fluidity as key to Christian evangelism. Further, their rhetoric extolling critique is limited. The boundaries to

their immanent frame[346] will not brook any yielding around the essential reality of Christian histories. And finally, the fundamentalist version makes lots of sense – Bethany's management was awful – what university runs without a list of alumni or donors? What university can survive when managed as if end times were around the corner?

In fact, the debate between these groups signals important disagreements with no easy answers. Both want their movement to flourish. Both are deeply committed to non-liberal Christianity. Yet, they differ starkly over strategy. Evangelicals believe the best way to grow is through outreach that necessitates rich reciprocal engagement with outside cultures. Perhaps missions or a higher education pedagogy can explicitly imbibe secular culture so as to digest and expel it? Fundamentalists also care deeply about missions and education. However, they emphasize the protection of subcultural safety. They think we have enough of an internal self to simply read the bible and devise sense and action directly from its text. Thus, while evangelicals reach into popular culture, play Christian rock music, and generally expose themselves to the secular world, fundamentalists try their best to minimize these risks, although they are not averse to the trappings of power and wealth. It seems worth noting that if they aim for continuity, both strategies are likely doomed – one via attrition and the other via appropriation. But that, of course, remains to be seen – and then, continuity is not the only way to build a legacy or change the world.

[346] Immanent frame means an immediately present structure in which to think – here it means that they are within a particular tradition and bound to its logics and expectations

So here I tell the story(s) of the Battle of Bethany in which a group of pentecostals forced the end of a university ostensibly because of its fiscal and management problems, but likely also because of a dissonance with the evangelically minded education offered there. I begin with the closing of Bethany and then turn to the genealogy of two models for AG higher education, Bible College and the Liberal Arts of Bethany (otherwise known as Comprehensive Christian Education). Looking more closely at the Northern California-Nevada District of AG, which houses Bethany, I explore their approach to critique. Finally, I ask if the comfort with critique apparent among the evangelical leaning pentecostals is compatible in the long run with pentecostal church growth, academia, secularism, and/or with deep religiosity. In the process, I question previous tales of fundamentalism as an atavism that serves as the dividing line between evangelical and fundamentalist. Further, I continue to argue that a major engine for change in the AG world is the reciprocity of encounter, this time, alongside, and perhaps emerging from, missions that transform the university's approach to culture, we have the encounter between AG's students and the secularism around them. Thus, rather than emphasize how the pressures of modernity or secularism force change, this chapter shows the evangelical desire to convert and expand creating pressure towards refiguration.

Bethany University

Bethany University appears as a cute, but failed, atavistic utopia deep in the redwoods close to Santa Cruz. They say construction was on the cheap with rapture

imminent. The teensy rough wooden structures of the 1940s and 1950s still dot the campus, although porches have begun to tilt down steep redwood slopes. Rustic, cheaply built, and fallen down - more a summer camp than a university. The outdoor theater is especially stunning, surrounded by massive redwoods and arced by a small bubbling stream. Later construction, the modernist simplicity of concrete dorms, shifted the aesthetic somewhat from summer camp towards college. But today[347] the most impressive contemporary architecture is half finished. Perhaps the largest footing on campus, the new dining hall is a deep rectangular pit filled with one layer of cement with iron rods posting out awkwardly, its promise unfulfilled. Likewise, the Bethany approach to managing a university was also anomalous: nearly complete inattentiveness to fund-raising, or alumni more generally, combined with an intensive patronage system for hiring - one tale commonly told is of administrative positions replete with salary, 1-2 houses rent free, free meals, offices for relatives not employed at Bethany, and 90% discounts for childcare.

In the Assemblies of God, Bethany is well known. In fact, nearly every person I spoke with in AG's central office in Springfield had studied or taught at Bethany. The oldest running AG bible college, Bethany began as Glad Tidings Institute in San Francisco in 1919, but like most Bible colleges aiming for financial aid and federal support, and trying to provide graduates with accreditation necessary for military chaplaincies, they developed liberal arts education and accreditation in the 1950s. Over the next decades, Bethany faculty brought a mystical sense of openness and

[347] Fall 2011

experimentation together with sophisticated academic scholarship and deep faith. The pedagogy that emerged took the sense of ruptural crisis from pentecostal practice, layered it on top of critical thought, and provided a tool for inoculating young pentecostals who were facing the secular world for the first time.

In contrast with Bethany, Capital Christian center is large and shiny. 80-foot tall black rock walls reflect the Sacramento sun. A cross reaches to the peak, almost ominous when lit at night, but now simply towering. Walls turn away at awkward angles, conspicuously modern. From above, 3 triangular structures meet like a jester's hat. If only it sat elsewhere. In the Sacramento suburbs this towering presence offers little but empty parking lots in which to incite obeisance – except on Sundays. Capital Christian Center, for critics, symbolizes wealth, greed, and the emergence of a new form of pentecostalism. Until recently the halls were covered with large photos of Glen Cole, Capitol's pastor and the head of NCN District in the 2000s, a man widely regarded for a vigorous patronage system that linked voting members of the district to Capitol's fundamentalist theological and political agenda. His network continues today, although with less flair, via Jim, the new NCN superintendent along with Cole's son – the new Capitol pastor – as well as a host of family connections throughout NCN leadership. (note – patronage is one practice that both sides of this battle are well acquainted with) A typical mega-church, Capitol seats 5000, includes schools, day care and even a small university outpost, and a

whole host of other community activities, a site for hype, for traveling Christian comedians.[348] It is Bethany inverted.

I am here as an observer at the Northern California–Nevada District Council of the Assemblies of God, about to experience Capital Christian Center as political battleground. As the 1400 pastors file in to the 5000-seat stadium, the discomfort is greater than the strong sense of overkill in empty seats. Here come buzz cut men with goatees, nicely ironed shirts, some ties, an easily recognizable Christian business casual. These folks walk quickly, in small groups, laughing loudly. They inhabit the Central Valley, a conservative haven within AG. Some are wealthy, many poor, but they share working class sensibilities around education, law, truth, and attire. Their alliance across wealth strata resembles (and overlaps with) the Tea Party's coalition building and with Capitol as their center they have been the key engine in NCN circles since 2000 when Glen Cole moved the District Council offices from Scotts Valley – about half a mile from Bethany - to Sacramento.

By contrast, a small group of maybe 40 AG ministers seem oddly out of place at Capital. At least the older ones, with slightly droopy mustaches, hair and clothes a bit unkempt, would seem more at home in a 1970s cop show – Barney Miller? These are the folks I know best, having spent the last 3 years in their classes and on the campus in Scotts Valley. They appear behind the times, and they're quite anxious – with good reason. Today the district council will close their University. This means many things for them: job loss, heritage loss, losing a sense of self. But most of their

[348] Capitol often hosts traveling Christian performers – see their website for details

frustration seems aimed at a lost opportunity. Bethany University inspired hope among pentecostals who imagined that the path from speaking in tongues to a rich, confused, and mystical faith could root in their personal visceral experience yet be available to critical historical interrogation. In essence, they affirm the confluence of the mystic and the scholar – perhaps something akin to 17th century Jesuits. Instead, today at Capital Christian Center, the district council came to close the doors on a very particular version of critical thinking, solidify a straightforward inerrant faith, and more importantly for this paper, a rote pedagogy for reaching it.

This seems a defeat for evangelical versions of higher education in AG. And there is tremendous rage at the defeat. Oddly though, when it comes time to ask questions and pose challenges, the room falls silent.

The Shut Down

Early in the day, Jim Braddy, the AG California-Nevada District Superintendent tutored under Cole, comes to the platform, somber, tears in his eyes – alligator tears if we believe his detractors – and presents the case. "We are here today to make a final decision about this beloved institution. The choices are few. This without question is the most difficult meeting, faced with the most difficult choices this Corporation has had in its history." He quickly moves into a metaphorical ward off - the pose of protection. "The human tendency is to assign blame." He will not blame, he says – he is suggesting that we should not as well. The problem is not

politics, but fiscal mismanagement and growing debt, he explains. “I insisted that we not kick the can down the road.”

It is a strong image. I am curious if his audience of pastors, adepts in metaphor and the linguistic turn, find it compelling. A can, fully used, dirty trash in fact, likely batted by a young boy, his goofy lack of seriousness keeps it moving – fun, but not sober. Braddy again: “We cannot kick the can down the road any further.” The grey-blue flickering of phones light up across the hall. On Facebook, I could follow what turns out to be a storm of critique, but I don't have an iPhone. I catch it later. Braddy continues, “a reality growing for at least the past 25 to 30 years. 1 million credit to the General Counsel, 1 million to the bank 1.3 million to Accounts Payable, 628,000 to salaries. 1.5 million future cost estimate, total is $15 million debt, insufficient tuition and donor revenue, problem with borrowing, the County Bank revokes a $1 million line of credit.” … ” The numbers pile up. After 5 minutes, we are immersed.

He continues, it is an “indisputable truth… We just plain ran out of money.” And then he guides us through the money trail again: from the 1986 near closure, to years of debt accumulation, a 2008 almost-merger with Azusa or Vanguard[349], the 2009 fire destroys Bethany’s café, 2.5 million for a new one. Finally, in June 2011 a creditor files a lawsuit demanding foreclosure. Yet, throughout, the district, via Braddy, had Bethany’s back. The message that matters: We had your back. “Since 1995 the NCN district gave 9 million to Bethany.” Pause. “Any questions?” Silence. No questions.

[349] Two other AG universities on the West coast.

Yet, pentecostals live on miracles. Where is God in this tale of technocratic failure? Bethany's President Reverend Shelton speaks the question. Unlike Braddy, his tale is sublime, entangled in mystery and portent. "Two potential donors emerged in February… a letter of intent… we thought we would produce funding… another group emerged… intimated up to 20 million over 2 years… 38 pounds of documents sent to the donor…" I wonder, how big a brief case? "Neither donor performed…" They prayed and pleaded, called for a "miracle Monday." But to no avail. Shelton appears distraught. "I tried hard, sorry I failed." He too defends against political backlash. "Some say the pastors were alumni that spoke against Bethany. This," he says, "is less than true." Yet, he admits there were conversations. "Individuals spoke to pastors who said '[Bethany's] life is over we should let it go.'" Shelton swears to hold these conversations secret. "Most don't know who it was." And they never will. "It will remain with me to my deathbed." If this sounds a bit dramatic for a story of a university budget crisis I am not surprised. For when God is involved, some things find extra significance. Shelton told how the donor described implacable problems for Bethany and no will to fix. He finishes: "Why did the donor step back?" He pauses. "You have to ask them." For with true faith, there is a time to yield control, "At some point you simply reach a point where it's in God's hands." In other words, all this effort, this struggle, the 38 pounds of documents, is within a broader pattern of deeper meaning, also indecipherable. "We are not here today because God was surprised by what happened. We believe in an omniscient and omnipresent God. Those things simply did not produce the fruit…"

Two years later I talk with the man who closed Bethany. Jay Herndon is still second in command to Braddy and tasked with managing the details of Bethany's closure. As he explained "I closed Bethany. [Shelton] was there until June. After that he left and I was in charge… the stuff we discovered was frightening." Herndon proceeds to detail fiscal failure, and administrative mismanagement. "We discovered $150,000 of un-cashed checks hidden in boxes and desk drawers from alumni. They were never put in the bank. We discovered that the financial aid department was a mess – two years later, we are still trying dig out and close it down, facing massive fines … We were warned by the IRS of 3 million dollar fine for failure to pay payroll taxes, and so forth." Brazenly, I suggest the closure had something to do with Bethany's culturally sensitive missions education and crisis pedagogy. Herndon is abrupt and definitive. "That is a ridiculous statement." His case is compelling: many comprehensive Christian colleges (the AG terminology for liberal arts) continue within AG. Vanguard University is way more experimental than Bethany ever was, he says. "First, lots of schools had a similar model with mission education. Nobody hated Bethany for that reason. Bethany didn't close because people hated it. People loved it." It was simply the financials. Bethany owed 11 million dollars, he said.

Even the struggle over the best site for the campus, which Bethany faculty describe as a failed fundamentalist power grab, and deeply destabilizing, can be narrated in terms of raw numbers. As Herndon explains, "the decision was made in 1989 to move to Sacramento. Scotts Valley property values were high and Sacramento's were low." With the funds from Bethany's sale, they could buy a much

larger campus in Sacramento. But, they moved too slowly. "Market conditions changed and basis for that decision was eroded." In the liminal moment, waiting for sale, Bethany's caretakers stopped attending to their money. If soon to realize a windfall - why worry, explained Herndon. "We let it go, and within a period of 3-4 years our debt went up to 7 million dollars." By then, the sale was no longer viable. The way Herndon tells it, one could read the death of Bethany in the financials of the mid 1990s. With about a million dollars per year of interest on the debt it was "a hole we could not get out of." Others I talked with describe Bethany missing the boat on a shift in Christian higher education. Booming in the 1960s and 70s as it was one of the only liberal arts conservative Christian colleges in the country, Bethany drew students from all over the world. Yet, as they went into debt, they refused opportunities to grow their extension education and also dropped significant bible requirements thus becoming less appealing to a growing group within AG looking for theological emphasis with flexible course offerings. In other words, Herndon may be right, this may be about bad economic choices. Yet, at the very end of his interview, after we have been talking for nearly a half an hour his response to my political-theological narrative softens, "There are ideological reasons why we closed." But, not decisive ones, he avers.

Returning to the closing ceremony, Shelton does not detail all the failings of a university designed for the ephemeral spirit and not for long-term funding. He doesn't mention the alumni staffer whose main role on campus was as emotional support for young students. A very sweet person by all accounts, but of the only 1400

names in her alumni list, 900 were bad addresses, and there is little reason to think that anyone regularly contacted the other 500. A common protest on the Bethany Alumni Facebook, " I know I was never asked or tagged to give and help… I wasn't asked---way back when it would have helped. Go figure." Shelton knows these stories, as does everyone in the room. But he merely gives the gist – It was a management fiasco.

Afterwards, Braddy calls for a vote. As recommended by trustees, the resolution: "to dissolve or vacate the Bethany Corporation whereas Bethany University no longer has the financial capacity to fulfill its mission, and the Board of Trustees is ordered the discontinuation of teaching operations." The floor opens for comment. Again no one replied. Unless, of course you were on Facebook, where the debate ran fiery hot.

The Other Story… Facebook

Online discussions gave a clearer sense of the affective divisions within AG. We are all familiar with the freedom to troll that makes websites so exciting, and painful – this sense of openness on the web may, to some degree, overcome the "culture of fear" described by many NCN participants. As votes closed Bethany, the alumni page buzzed with recriminations. An AG lecturer posting from inside the conference pled for dialogue, "Friends, I sit here in this meeting... astounded that no

one is asking any questions..."[350] Non-voting members had been asked not to testify. "I am not permitted to speak... I can do nothing to try to get any answers that so many of you want... " Yet, hope was not lost. "Perhaps more discussion after the vote is announced... July 7 at 3:29pm via mobile."

Throughout the next weeks the Facebook site saw some very angry posting: "if the $15mil [debt] was a sudden development... or the result of a natural disaster or a bad economy, I could see the validity in 'not laying blame'... [however] this situation is MAN-MADE... it's not conjecture... the truth will be coming out... God will NOT be mocked anymore..." explained one faculty facing layoff. In several cases, Jay Herndon provided damage control, arguing that the district had done its very best to keep Bethany alive and well. Those criticized for lack of care, he explained, "are the top financial supporters of Bethany. They give more to Bethany than all other churches put together… we've reviled out biggest supporters." The response was pointed: "No, it was a slow, calculated death. I think that it is time for new leadership in the Northern California/Nevada district."

An AG alum added a sinister lilt to the discussion, "there are many faculty and staff who have very specific details but remain (mostly) silent due to fear of retribution or rebuke." A faculty agreed, "Shall I let go and disregard the many many individuals (most of whom are/were credentialed ministers and missionaries) who still contact me telling me of further abuses by 'pastors' and 'leaders' in the NCN? There are some very sinister forces at work here... I will not stop working and praying

[350] Quick note – I do not use names of facebook participants unless they were NCN administrators using the site for official communications.

against the 'principalities and powers' that are hard at work in the NCN." Principalities and powers describe the enemy of pentecostal spiritual warfare – a theory of demon possession entwined closely with a critique of the state.[351]

It was certainly a tragic thread. After the first day of out and out recriminations, the evening of Bethany's closure a resistant minority sentiment congealed:

> There are just a couple of comments that I should write before I sign off of here for the night after the day of Bethany's death. First of all, thank you to those who wrote to me directly, too afraid to speak their minds on this site because of the politics of the AG. I understand your fears of retaliation. And for everyone, I just... ask that you ask the Lord for guidance on how to proceed with your search for answers, and exactly how to move forward. This was a sad day, and in the spirit of Martin Luther, let's continue to question our leaders… and to fight for transparency… our leadership did a phenomenal job of flushing a Christian University down the toilet while smiling and telling jokes.

The site was visited by hundreds of Bethany alums, some of whom had just graduated, but the vast majority who had left 10-40 years previous and now pastored and taught throughout the AG system. Some were the adminstrators responsible for closing the school, others faculty about to be laid off and many students in search of a new education. Thus, Facebook became a primary site for sharing information and for heated debate around all elements of the closure. It also made space for fond memories of college romps and struggles over contemporary issues.

---

[351] C. Peter Wagner, *Confronting the Powers: How the New Testament Church Experienced the Power of Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1996).

Posts challenged district leadership claims of a closure driven by fiscal concerns. Apparently, Bethany administrators regularly pled for financial support to a district less and less inclined to meet the need. As one alum, now pastor and AG faculty elsewhere, wrote, "Since the District has faced enormous financial troubles and indebtedness in their own right from moving to Sacramento and then with the failed insurance and investment programs—it seems that Bethany is no longer viewed as an asset." Another AG faculty told it a bit more harshly, "The NCN has a history of destructive financial failures this past decade between health insurance, IPIC pyramid scandal, and now a college $15 million in debt and in ruins." I was told that the NCN district had experimented with two finance schemes, one around health care and another that turned out to be a pyramid scheme, both of which lost the district some, ostensibly large, amount of money in the 1990s.

Perhaps the District had aimed to close Bethany? "I experienced first hand the half hearted commitment to Bethany from the NCN youth office… a video… that outright made fun of the school that was played at all NCN camps one summer- and there were many inuendos made publicly about how terrible the dorms were etc. I have too many experiences to list." Perhaps also, the move to consolidate power in Sacramento kept the school unstable? The impending move "was kept alive for thirty years [and] was Bethany's demise." Faculty describe hearing the news of a move, with no location specified, and then waiting, for seven years, while enrollments dropped and debt ballooned in the face of increasing uncertainty.

At some point Facebook rancor inspired threats to shut the site down. One Bethany faculty appealed, “if there is going to be talk of closing this forum down simply because you don't like the honest, rigorous inquiry of fellow alum, then would someone please make a list of what is and is not okay to say? Will someone make a list of who we can and cannot question? And will someone please, for all of our sakes, make a list of things that we can and cannot talk about here? Speak ex cathedra, and save us the facade of a democratic forum. Or, maybe let social media be social, and let it reflect the real concerns of its members.” The site was not closed, not to members, although eventually researchers like myself could no longer easily log in.

Calls for civility rang out. As one alum wrote, “frankly there are some on here that with the tone of their posts may as well be striking out with knives or guns with their words. They don't ask for answers, they demand them - and only the answers they want or think should be given and any that differ will be condemned.” Another complained that, “The conclusions people leap to are never optimistic, or allowing anyone the benefit of the doubt but presume fraud malfeasance or devilish activity.” He continued, Bethany has closed, “Don't Like It, Tough. Suck it up. That’s life; life sucks... Asking tough questions sounds noble, but it achieves nothing. You will not get the answers you want. You will not get the closure you demand. You will just be frustrated and angry, encourage others to be likewise angry… it is works of the flesh disguised as righteousness. Stop it.” This inspired histrionic rebuttal. “There has definitely been fraud, malfeasance and devilish activity at work during (at least) the

last 10 years in the NCN and the affairs of BU [Bethany University]… [We] have seen and heard despicable things done and said in the name of God by 'pastors' and leaders'… this is righteous indignation… it IS hating what GOD HATES and loving what God loves!!" Jesus and online freedom to troll make a potent combination. Facebook revealed the schismatic pentecostalism of the early century just underneath modern pretensions to quite civility.

A few days after Bethany closed the site administrator weighed in with a meta-analysis. "Nearly 1200 of the 1600 members of this page have been around for most of the last 14 weeks. We've posted about 160+ photos. We have nearly 2000 posts and over 5000+/- comments. There were nearly 1000 comments on July 7th [closing day], 500 more in the last two days." Then she called for peace.

> We have debated, argued, substantiated our opinions and beliefs with scripture (sometimes the same one for both sides of the debate)… Some of us are LOUD and emphatic, some quiet and hopeful and many are in the in between space on that continuum… We've done "I wish I could-a; would-a, should-a" We've also done, "they should-a, how come they didn't do…., what we're they thinking!!!, oh, they weren't thinking!!!"… We have now blamed every conceivable entity, group, person, dept, advisor, leader, pastor, the District, AG, city/county officials, administrators for the loss of Bethany. God got blamed also. Some of us blame ourselves personally. Some believe the actions of Leadership was right and true… We have prayed, my have we prayed, wrote poems, shared poems, tributes and songs… We've made phone calls, created compelling calls to actions, sorted out questions to ask, created a video or two. We dug deep into our pockets for dollars we believe we are compelled by love to give. We've made requests, some of them courageous. All of this effort expended out of our love for our Bethany, the redwoods, our sacred place. This has been our effort to save Bethany. And now… our Bethany is no more…We cannot un-ring this bell… we are in grief, sadness, and anger.

To some the close was inevitable, "The district's doctrinal, theological, and denominational loyalties have been in conflict with Bethany ever since it became a liberal arts college. You can't have free thinking, revolutionary minded profs and students connected to a denominational group and not have that conflict." The overarching narrative, however, described a war lost as, "they finally managed to shut us down." The economic failings were real, but perhaps they were the effect of a carefully crafted whispering campaign such that fundamentalist donors in the Central Valley found it common sense that Bethany had "lost its way." Fundamentalist children seemed unsafe in a site for liberal arts education and thus the wealthy donors in the NCN like Buzz Oates and his progeny, had been fighting to move or close Bethany since the 1990s. In 2011, they finally won the battle.[352]

Apparently, though, I had missed the first efforts to stop this. It wasn't immediately that all resistance retreated to Facebook and left the District Council a mask of silence. The previous District Council had been somewhat louder – a group at Bethany prayed while others testified and exhorted throughout Capital Christian Center. I had come across the pageant of civility that followed the war – or at least its banishment to social media.

However, the NCN story is not the only one within AG. At the same moment that Bethany was closed for good, Evangel College merged with the Central Bible

[352] One interesting quality of the Facebook criticism was their ephemerality. The most damaging critiques were often retracted or redacted within a few hours. Also Bethany's close inspired an outpouring of love and affection for the site and its alums, replete with lots of scanned photos from the 60s and 70s. It was quite a bitter-sweet moment.

College, a significant setback defeat for the alliance between mega-churches and inerrancy. Evangel, like Bethany, epitomizes the liberal arts version of AG higher education. CBC was the one solid example of Bible College pedagogy in the shape of a significant university. When they merged, Dr. Carol Taylor left the presidency of Vanguard University, another liberal arts college within AG, to lead Evangel. In other words, in the NCN District, liberal arts pedagogies lost the fight, but in Springfield, AG's center, they won.

Evangelical Higher Education

Evangelical higher education grew under the radar, but became a major force in AG and the contemporary US more generally. Everyone knows the university as a defining institution for late 20th century US middle classes and secular liberalism. Public universities became the site for coming of age, of protest, of critical thought, and of support networks for capitalist research and enterprise. The scale was vast and higher education has become de rigeur for a rapidly growing bevy of careers. Less apparent however, was the simultaneous emergence of a tremendous network of evangelical institutions of higher education. Some of the same post war funding and prosperity that built the secular universities was quietly channeled elsewhere as the GI Bill brought substantial funding to what had previously been a network of small Bible Colleges connected by a shared theology of innerancy and an aversion to what they saw as modern.

AG higher education certainly received its share of government support. The Evangel college campus of 68 buildings on 59 acres was bought for one dollar from the military.[353] Reveille, the missionary newsletter produced by Myer Perlman teacher at CBI in Springfield (later CBC) received free postage from the US government which delivered 15 million copies to US troops over 52 months.[354] And AG collected tons of support from the GI bill. For instance, GIs provided a full 33% of AG student enrollment in 1948.[355]

Recently, evangelical colleges have expanded far more rapidly than their secular counterparts. According to the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, the one hundred or so, "intentionally Christ-centered institutions" that count among their affiliates grew at a faster rate than other major US colleges and universities. From 1990 to 2006, all public four-year campuses grew by about 13%, all independent four-year campuses (including many schools with broad religious or denominational connections) grew by about 28%. But schools associated with the CCCU grew by nearly 71%.[356]

More than simply enrollment, however, the same years saw a massive, and quite systematic, effort to develop an evangelical support network within higher education for both teaching and research. Their goal: respectability for evangelical scholarship, and, of course, a better position from which to spread the gospel. Private foundation and trusts began to invest in evangelical publications, research projects,

---

[353] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 365.
[354] Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 54.
[355] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 358.
[356] Joeckel and Chesnes, *The Christian College Phenomenon*, 11–12.

and individual scholars. Howard Pew an oil magnate, and Robert Lynn from Eli Lilly pharmaceutical, the marketers of Prozac, started the Institute for the Study of American Evangelicals at Wheaton College. Lily invested more than 171 million in religious institutions in the first half of the 2000s.[357]

Pew, who funded *Christianity Today,* the best-known evangelical magazine, in 1985 convened a group of evangelical scholars to for the Evangelical Scholars Program. This group included AG historian and participant Grant Wacker of University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (also Harry Stout of Yale, Timothy Smith of John Hopkins, Joel Carpenter of Wheaton George Marsden of Calvin Nathan Hatch of Notre Dame George Rawlyk of Queens and sociologist Robert Wuthnow of Princeton and James Davison Hunter of University of Virginia).[358] For folks unacquainted with scholarship on evangelicalism, this list includes many, if not most, of the most prestigious names in the field today.

In the 1990s more than 15 million of Pew's dollars flowed towards integrating evangelical and intellectual life including conferences, research, scholarly publications, graduate student mentoring, and campus lectures. Pew also funded "centers of excellence" for the academic study of religion. In 2000, the Atlantic Monthly ran, *The Opening of the Evangelical Mind* an article describing a "determined effort by evangelical–Christian institutions to create a life of the mind… Evangelical scholars are writing the books, publishing the journals, teaching students,

[357] Lindsay, *Faith in the Halls of Power*, 81–82.
[358] Ibid., 81.

and sustaining the networks necessary to establish a presence in American academic life."[359]

And the numbers reflected their efforts. In 1990, 30% of the work of these funded scholars was published in secular outlets, by 2001 the figure was 80%.[360] Between 1990 and 2005 the membership of the American Academy of Religion increased from 5,500 to 10,300 members, in roughly the same span, the enrollment in mainline protestant divinity schools grew 20%, the Society for Christian Philosophy formed in 1978 and grew to 1000 by 1994, with about 12% of American philosophers.[361] A concerted effort at integrating, or re-integrating, Christianity and the academy, paid off.

However, fundamentalists, including those within AG, had initially seen modern education as a threat. As Patton explained, the relationship seemed clear: "The church and higher education are incongruent, in the church the only book you need to read is the Bible." Fundamentalists had formed in direct opposition to Higher Criticism and the Social Gospel, both of which emerged from mainline education institutions. The social gospel was certainly part of the context that the Azusa Street revival (emergence of pentecostalism) protested, but pentecostals were especially hostile to education for other reasons. Richard Dresselhaus – one time executive presbyter of the AG – wrote, "across the spectrum of leadership within the Assemblies of God is a frequently articulated concern that the academy might be

[359] Alan Wolfe, "The Opening of The Evangelical Mind," *Atlantic Monthly* 286, no. 4 (2000).
[360] Lindsay, *Faith in the Halls of Power*, 81.
[361] check numbers - Schmalzbauer and Mahoney, "Religion and Knowledge in the Post-Secular Academy," 2008.

party to compromise on doctrines held as inviolable by the church."[362] Rich Israel, former Bethany professor now at Vanguard, describes as "myth," but well disseminated myth, the tale that educated people kicked pentecostals out of their churches calling them "psychotic or demonic." Further, the practice of speaking in tongues, prophecy and faith healing all leaned away from modern learning – many pentecostals left on missions trips with simply the gift of tongues and a Bible. Yes, AG did work to contain the excess of pentecostal enthusiasm, but their initial sense of adequate structure - i.e. a 10 person Bible College - would make a modern university look like a behemoth.

Thus, at first, AG Bible institutes focused on preaching and missions, not liberal arts education; two years, not four. In the 1920s and 30s they offered no general education programs, not Hebrew, not Greek. As late as 1949, Marilyn Abplanalp's – former Bethany student, daughter of former Bethany president, and current leader of AG Alliance for Higher Education - father recommended to the AG General Counsel that all pastors ought to have four-year degrees. He was booed off the floor. Even so, by the 1950s AGs Evangel College created a liberal arts program. Bethany moved from 3 to 4 years and by 1972 AG ran nearly 20 US colleges, all but 3 with some level of liberal arts accreditation. And they were building a seminary.[363]

Thus, AG transformed its relationship to higher education. As a current AG leader and educator explained, a "large percentage of folks were suspicious that

---

[362] Richard Dresselhaus, "What Can the Academy Do For the Church?," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3, no. 2 (July 2000): 319.
[363] Interview with Marilyn Alplanapb

higher education would lessen spiritual passion. They'd seen church leaders turn away from basic Christianity when educated." The refrain was simple, "Why do they even need an education, can't they just rely solely on the Holy Spirit's leading like we did?" But times were changing. "Now more and more people have broken the stereotype that was the straw-man. We can be educated well and hold spiritual passion. George Wood (AG President) is the first with an earned graduate degree. Jim Bradford is the first secretary with a degree - he is a rocket scientist." Wood, a former lawyer a JD, Thd and the first PhD in AG's top leadership is regularly called a "consummate academic." Almost everyone I talked with in Springfield mentioned Bradford's scientist pedigree – both a sign of change and of its continued intrigue.

Multiple factors push AG towards more higher education, aside from the broad trends in the outside culture. A general increase in education among US AG participants is pushing for learning beyond the bible: "churches with lawyers or scientists in the congregation want to know that the pastor took a course in Hebrew or hermeneutics." Second, mission sites now call for a new kind of missionary. According to many in AG, missions sites no longer want missions majors, but "secular" majors instead, a little bit more well-rounded, "most of our schools now have more general education, Liberal arts students are much more sensitive. We need that for missions."

Yet, at the same time, the church is still quite ambivalent in its support for higher education. As one of AG's leaders of higher education explained, "Part of our problem in the AG is that 85% of all AG churches gave NOTHING to AG higher

education last year, plus our alumni giving is woeful, for the most part." This is especially a problem in a fellowship producing pastors and missionaries, folks who rarely make good alumni donors.

Further, AG continues to struggle to reconcile scholarship with explicit positionality. Their embodied and situated stance, what evangelicals call presuppositionalist, means that pentecostals cannot take on the mantle of abstract objectivity. And they likely wouldn't want to. They situate themselves fiercely within a missionary tradition. Aiming at converts, they aim to remake the world along particular lines. Thus like Marxists, feminists, Muslims, and perhaps anyone with a body,[364] but bodies controlling whole universities, they actually inhabit an immanent world of theorizing, one in which enables a host of creative interplay with spiritual experience and prayer at the center of critical thinking processes, but in which some questions – i.e. is there a God? – are out of bounds.

Education and Church Growth

Byron Klaus argues that not only is education possible for a pentecostal, it enhances church growth. After graduating from Bethany in 1972, Klaus spent 10 years planting churches and elementary schools in urban Latin America. Until recently he taught at, and was president of ,AGTS. As he explains, "some argue that education and participation are not compatible." He disagrees. Klaus continues, "I am a both-and person. God can use both my left and right brain. One can have a

[364] Joan Wallach Scott, *The Fantasy of Feminist History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011).

passionate heart and a sharp mind." Further he is practical. "There is a positive correlation between investment in education and vigorous churches. That was our missionary strategy... In Nigeria there is a vibrant Assembly of God church with 3.5 million adherents and one US missionary." Why? Bible Colleges. Klaus helped guide nearly one third of the Nigerian leaders through an intensive masters program. Out came, he says, "probably the most vibrant indigenous church," within AG.

Charlie Self, another AG scholar at AGTS, agrees that increased education hasn't diminished passion for spiritual encounter: "self renewing keeps us out of stasis, out of the ossification that happens in most other movements. In a world questioning certitude pentecostals are best equipped to evangelize. We have certitude but love the romance of ecstatic experience and encounter… when integrated with mission, the piety remains strong." In other words, pentecostals may offer an unusual place for hybridity. "Pentecostalism is out-of-the-box, it's the liberal arts of religion," he explains. According to Delonn Rance, also at AGTS, pentecostals integrate spirit and scholarship: "pentecostals try not to bifurcate research versus spiritual discernment. They do surveys and research, but listen for the spirit in the midst of the data." While prayer can certainly make for a thicker denser rationality, can this effort to include spirituality at the center of liberal arts exploration include a vigorous critique?

Bible College vs. Liberal Arts College

Bethany's demise was, in part, due to simple competition with schools easier to access, to manage, and that offer a simpler form of bible education. Citing easy access to online education, evening classes, and 2-year degrees, Braddy, and others, simply built other smaller competitor colleges within the NCN district. Without Bethany's accreditation, they were cheaper, and their location in the Central Valley made them available to families suspicious of Bethany and its proximity to Santa Cruz. In fact, while closing Bethany, Braddy himself had just begun a stint as professor at a small bible college housed in Capitol Christian Center from where he immediately hired Bethany's missions professor.

Bob Stallman makes the case that the rote pedagogy of the bible colleges might work better than liberal arts learning for pentecostals. Stallman describes the Bible College as deeply resonant with pentecostalism: "Quick-start people into missions and ministry.. [it is the] ethos of pentecostalism… pray, get a burden, and just go out do it. We don't normally sit around debating things before we do it. We just go out and do it… " In other words, think practically about education. "A lot of people don't think coming to a Christian liberal arts school is the best place to get trained. The sophistication in terms of theology in the Bible is not necessary. You don't need a PhD in Bible. Just go and read it." Stallman continues, but less emphatic. "*They* just think it's pretty evident. Just go out and read it… Academic study might not be all that helpful, and it's kind of expensive…"

Even so, Stallman allows that liberal arts education has value: "Part of knowing the book is knowing what people say about it. A student said it is immoral to learn evolution because it is a lie, 'I don't want to go into the devil's living room to hear those conversations.'" Stallman recognizes that this moment of contact with the outside world provokes revision in the simplicity of innerancy. Instead of truth only in the Bible, truth inhabits relationships in the outside world. "We know that all truth is God's truth." Sounds clear enough but… "The stance of the interpreter is critical. In fact, a Christian understanding of philosophy or liberal arts helps. It's really embracing all of what we do." And he explains, "We use a Christian understanding of math. They say it's just numbers. What does God think about healthcare?" In other words, all of life is spiritual, so an innerancy that ignores relationships and quotidian activities is missing something crucial.

The debate continues. Today AG runs 19 Universities in the US but over 400 small-unaccredited church-based colleges and 2000 colleges worldwide.[365] According to Braddy, in the US, as many students attend the smaller Bible colleges training for vocational ministry as all the liberal arts schools combined. He recognizes 12 church-based Bible colleges in the NCN district alone. As Braddy explained "there is a dynamic tension, education is considered the source of 'liberalization' of the church, watering down the church. Yet, there's a strong feeling for biblical training."

Competition from Bible Colleges is not the only difficulty facing AG liberal arts colleges. The current structure of most higher education differs massively from

[365] Interview with Jim Braddy, 2012

the model that bible colleges inherited from the church. Initially, Bible College leaders were chosen for their spiritual gifts and their preaching, not business acumen or willingness to listen to a group of individualistic academics who expect a voice in decision making. Most early AG College presidents didn't have degrees in higher education, let alone academic credentials. As Marilyn Albplanalp, said, "it used to be the ideal president was a famous minister." For instance, "CM Ward came in to run Bethany" however, "it was a fiasco." One former Bethany student, now professor at another AG bible college, describes the shift to liberal arts education as "a PR ploy" that failed in part because the leadership confused education and preaching. "They hire pastors and missionaries to be presidents, men who don't know anything about higher Ed or about administration of an education institution. They think it is a church." In this story, the typical Bible College is a site of serious mismanagement. "[We have] cronyism, racism, sexism, mismanagement, like a little kingdom. Leadership is a reward system, hire the best man at their wedding 1998. To roomful of PhD's the President says 'my son-in-law will be director of development but 'this is not nepotism.'"" They make mistakes in academic judgment, she thinks. He described the extent to which evangelism was layered on top of education at the AG college he taught in. "2012 to 13 was named year of evangelism. Every class must have an evangelism component: Shakespeare, biology, chemistry…" In his eyes, this was clearly absurd. More to the point, it meant a constant tension between the liberal arts and the bible college impulses.

Bethany Lost its Way: Bethany and NCN district story

The battle between Bethany and Central Valley Bible Colleges reaches back to the 1960s, when the first competitor bible schools surfaced, closed, and resurfaced again, funded by Central Valley entrepreneurs frustrated with the liberal arts turn in Scotts Valley. These bible colleges found support from increasingly wealthy mega-church donors, most notably Buzz Oates, the 5th richest man in California. Oates, his family, and a group of meg-church pastors and wealthy donors played a pivotal role in NCN politics, but their influence was magnified by Bethany's geography and its affiliations. Because Bethany was one of few universities supported by only one AG district council, council politics mattered tremendously. And when in 2000 Oates' protégé Cole won the fight to move the district council offices from Scotts Valley to Sacramento, the cultural barrier of the Santa Cruz Mountains loomed large. Thus, when word got out that Bethany faculty were challenging students to think critically, it didn't require a massive outcry, just the slow withdrawal of funds. Oates and Braddy led an effort to bring Bethany to Sacramento, but a lack of clear planning, delay, and faculty discontent them off – the Scotts Valley campus was too lovely, they had built homes on the adjacent Tabor Drive. But the rift doomed the school. By 2010, of the 400 churches in NCN, less than a third gave money to Bethany, and their children increasingly enrolled elsewhere.

Bethany had become a site for suspicion amongst Central Valley funders. For instance, when students brought a Planned Parenthood representative to debate abortion, "word got out that they supported Planned Parenthood," and parents in the

Valley complained to their pastors. Likewise, theology faculty Ku Yoon's interest in the divine mother in Christianity became a punching bag for anxious Central Valley parents whose churches funded Bethany. By the mid 1990s a concerted effort to move Bethany to Sacramento and contain its seeming theological excess was well underway.

Jim Braddy is generally cited by Bethany faculty as an enemy of higher education, or at least of Bethany, as among those who tried to move Bethany to Sacramento, and failing that, one who supported bible schools in the district and the shut down. Yet Braddy argues the opposite, "We [NCN District] have more Bible schools than anyone… we always valued education." Of a sort. He carefully distances himself from the politics of Bethany's closure. "I have had little to do with Bethany's shut down." He pauses. "Some say it lost its way." At first the lost path seems logistical or bureaucratic, not theological: "no focus, a really small school, changing presidents, bad location, good market but not marketed very well, a multitude of factors, internal management issues, the fire of 2009 was a contributing factor, it exposed other issues." Yet, after a bit, the theological dispute verges towards the surface. He continues, still not claiming his perspective, but perhaps articulating deeper issues: "many hold the perception that Bethany was long no longer providing pentecostal education… NCN felt they lost control of the liberal element coming in." Many? NCN? These are the actors here. As the president of NCN, it is unclear where Braddy fits in the story. Perhaps, he continues, Bethany is a place with, "folks losing faith." Yet, after a while, Braddy reveals a fully developed critique of the crisis

pedagogy used at Bethany. As he says, Bethany's liberalism needs containing. He describes "students being challenged with their faith…" – the crisis pedagogy developed by Bethany professors as inoculation against the secular world. He likely helped to contain it. As he explains, "The Bethany Board in 1992 tried to make sure that we did not challenge belief in a way that reaffirmed…" The last word is lost, drops off, he doesn't quite finish the thought. I am guessing we can. He does, however, sum up: "I would agree with Everett [Wilson] 'folks need a well-rounded education' but there are those that feel that theology started to take a back seat." In other words, Bethany's crisis pedagogy was a problem. Braddy is careful to attribute critique to others, yet his challenge is quite clear – a pedagogy that engages students too much with the outside world is risky.

At the conclave to close Bethany, Braddy and other speakers explicitly avoided the phrase "Bethany lost its way." Yet, it hung heavy over the room, blinkering across cell phones in the crowd and across the state. The narrative is simple: liberal arts education fueled by the desire for accreditation secularizes – think of Harvard or Yale. Missionaries only need the Bible. Anthropology and other liberal arts projects are more than a waste, but a distraction and even perhaps a danger. Dr. Stewart Sr., a long term missionary to Africa, was less careful, "It [Bethany] was a great school," he said. "I think it had lost its way. It was there first to train missionaries, pastors etc. Liberalism comes in to meet government requirements for accreditation. Folks like myself are more conservative." Stewart Sr. was the District Superintendent before Cole and, far from an enemy of Bethany, was famous for saving Bethany repeatedly.

At one board meeting, after determining they needed to raise 1 million dollars in the next short period, Stewart kicked off the fundraising by donating his full upcoming year's salary. Yet, he has a nice grasp on the argument to shut it down.

The key thing to notice: as this tale is told it tends to shift valences, from simply financial and logistical then increasingly about political-theology and pedagogy. Bible training might be more effective than liberal arts education. "The leadership of the district and bigger churches felt like sending our kids to Bethany might not accomplish as much as local training," explained Stewart Sr. However, local here is a code for fundamentalist, innerant, less cultural sensitivity, and conservatism more generally. Even Charlie Self, the exemplary pentecostal scholar, critiques Bethany's loss of direction. "Bethany's gift to the world was the most creative leaders of movement. The worst pieces: lack of organization and," here is the key, "confusion over mission." Self explains that an emphasis on social justice and feminist theology weakened Bethany. Liberalism was a problem. One pastor hired in the late 2000s to try and salvage Bethany's reputation had a hard time of it. "Brad came in as very conservative and was run out on a rail." From the new pastor's perspective, Bethany was a site of intolerance to fundamentalist norms.

Fear and Safety in NCN culture

Bethany was seen as a site for encouraging critique, yet critique, does not sit easily in the NCN district. In interviews with AG participants I was regularly surprised by their anxiety about speaking with me. They were happy to talk theology

or pentecostal history, but when it came to questions of money or the NCN district, lips tightened. It was striking. Tales of retribution and reaction initially came muted, occasionally breaking the surface, only to burst in a torrent after the announcement of Bethany's closure. Rich Israel, former Bethany faculty and now Dean at Vanguard, described a "real fear of speaking," within NCN. In this kind of situation, yielding to God might align nicely with hierarchy. As one faculty person explains, it is "retribution. They say God put people in power. You get up at the district council and voice a critique," and Roberts Rules shuts you down in the name of God, "you get the question called." And get a bad name. "Quote 'you have a bad attitude.' People are in danger of losing their jobs. Censured by leadership. Called to appear before the presbytery. It happens all the time." And he names the most prominent litany of those punished in the NCN: "Heather Kelly, Rick Howard, Dwight Wilson…" It was a list I heard regularly, yet I found it hard to be certain, how safe was this world? Was retribution real?

Dwight Wilson's story is told over the campfire, as it were, among critics of the NCN district. As faculty at Bethany he went to the district council to point out a flaw in procedures for allocating funds. He was disciplined. "They called a mandatory meeting." The message: 'We're driving the bus, Shut up and sit down.' He was fired, and then rehired, but left a ghost story. "The sense was if you are gonna' say anything, it needs to be positive or supportive at official meetings." My interviewees repeated Wilson's name, they might not even tell the story. Few knew the details. But the sense that speaking out invited danger came through clearly.

According to another tale, Rick Howard came before the NCN board for drinking. When asked "Do you drink?" he insisted that all those present answer first. They sent him home. And yet there is more here than fear and distrust. A fundamentalist attitude towards power pushes against the pentecostal potential for priesthood of all believers. As often reiterated, the participatory impulse within higher education contrasts sharply with the "one-party" rule in AG.

Heather Kelly apparently cultivated a perfect storm for herself. As Psychology faculty at Bethany, she was required to sign the yearly affirmation of AG's 16 fundamental truths including biblical inerrancy. It seems she made a mistake. In class, a psychology class, she referenced questions about inerrancy. A student got upset. He told his parents. They lived in the Central Valley, complained to the pastor of a large AG megachurch and Heather was called to the Bethany board to explain. She left Bethany immediately. The tale lingers. When I talked with her 6 years later in her new position teaching at South-East Bible College, she was reluctant to complain or give details, but clearly enraged by the whole experience.

The culture of fear is not limited to the NCN. My interviews with faculty from the Central Bible College, a fundamentalist leaning AG school in Springfield Missouri, involved a great deal of careful word choice, faculty made explicit their felt need to avoid controversial statements. As one Evangel professor explained, "they've got good reason to be cautious about what they say. I have lived in that context and the stakes are pretty high and expectations of loyalty are extreme." Charlie Self added a warning to even the AG president: "part of the AG story is

whispering campaigns. Dr. Wood has to walk a fine line." In other words, the culture of fundamentalist AG, what one insider faculty person calls, "close minded finger-pointing, judgmental Christianity - a list of do's and don'ts," includes the power of fear and rumor. "AG, like any other major corporation, likes to make sure you toe the party line," added former Bethany professor Mark Laird. Critique is not nurtured.

This culture of fear likely has roots beyond simply the NCN district. Margaret Poloma portrays the increasing reprobation incurred by ecumenical or otherwise marginally doctrinal ministers as the 20th century wore on. According to Poloma, in 1976 James Gordon King challenged the doctrine that tongues provided the initial evidence of spirit baptism, and AG's national office mandated a defrocking for the first time.[366] "The Assemblies," as Poloma argues, "like all institutionalized religion, is hard on prophets."[367] She suggests increasing centralized control signals declension. Yet, one could also argue that AG's "oneness" controversy in the 1910s and the latter rain revivals of the 40s were just the most prominent of a regular pattern of revival, perhaps better described as challenge, and then containment. It is difficult to discern if the responses hardened or not, and if they are part of the vital schismatic tendency within AG, or about its increasingly dull bureaucracy.

[366] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 171.
[367] Ibid., 133.

The Inoculation: Crisis Pedagogy

"If it can't stand the secular dogs, it is probably not worth much." Bethany Faculty

Bethany took a somewhat different approach to critique from the rest of NCN and AG more generally. In fact, at Bethany, the notion of edge, or crisis, translated from pentecostal theology where it manifested as spiritual rupture, into academia where critique induced a similar spiritual-academic crisis but one aimed at solidifying previous faith. I heard this pedagogical approach to inoculation spoken by my interlocutors and had to ask again and again – is this right? Is it articulated? Where and by whom? They agreed with the analysis, but couldn't tell me where it came from. I later found an analysis of Fuller Theological Seminary that suggested a very similar project: they explicitly aimed to inoculate their students in preparation for reaching out into the secular world.[368] However, for Bethany progenitors, it seemed indigenous.

As with the Amish rumspringa which includes a widely varied set of approaches to adolescent encounter with the outside world, AG provides no generally accepted method for exposing AG youth, or protecting them from, the dangers of secularism. However, the basic narrative of "induce crisis and hold on throughout," was easily recognized by all to whom I described it: students need to have their faith challenged, deeply, if they are to survive the modern world. Further, Bethany makes

[368] As Molly Worthen explains, at Fuller, "the faculty would train them in the relevance of the gospel to culture, teach them to withstand the secular–humanist onslaught, and send them back into the world as emissaries for the Neo–evangelical worldview." Molly Worthen, *Apostles of Reason: The Crisis of Authority in American Evangelicalism*, 2014, 47.

a perfect site to incite crisis among fundamentalist students, because it is safe. While they flounder, faculty and the student body can hold their hands quite closely in hopes of guiding students through to the more flexible, but perhaps equally theologically solid, evangelicalism on the other side of the secular void.

Thus, both fundamentalists and evangelicals fear impinging secularism, but approach long-term security differently. Evangelicals distrust the seeming security of rote learning. Further, because they find the appeal of secularism quite threatening, they imagine it will incite crisis whether they want it, or not. "Which is more dangerous? To teach students to think for themselves, or just give them a template? What happens when they meet a crisis," asked Abplanalp. This pedagogy with no written form is surprisingly consistent and clear.

Gina L. describes her experience of crisis pedagogy at Bethany in the late 1970s – she graduated in the early 1980s. She remembers her sheltered cohort of AG students, most having seen little of life outside AG circles. At first, Bethany seemed a safe haven, a place with little risk of culture clash. "These kids… many come from very sheltered Christian worlds… many never questioned, but they will at some point. That is what happened to me at Bethany." She remembers a very particular moment of cultivated crisis – not at all random, but clearly planned by Bethany faculty Stan Steward. "My life started to change - he slammed his books down, looked at us and said 'there are no miracles in the Bible.'" She was apoplectic. "I said to myself, I have made a horrible mistake." She considered leaving the university. Yet, "he backed out of it." But, only for a moment. "He would do something in every class to

get us thinking." For Gina, that meant keeping her on edge, a scary and transformative place, and while her take on AG as an institution is now quite cynical, the inoculation worked - she continues actively within the faith. In fact, Gina later came to teach at Bethany and several other AG universities.

Gina sees the creative theology at Bethany as a small beacon of light in an institution trapped in fundamentalist anxieties. "The theologians in AG are like undercover agents in enemy territory. If there is any hope for AG it is in these secret agents and they have no support." It is difficult to reconcile the seeming immutability of official AG philosophy with the desire to question and challenge. "Why are they so different?" she wonders. She ties it to learning. "Why do they study?... so different I don't know how you call it the same." Compared to inerrancy and positivism, questioning seemed stunning. She sums it up: "a willingness to admit we don't know everything." Or as Stan Steward told her, "I would rather err on the side of grace than law." Thus, Steward taught Gina to root her uncertainty in theology. As she explained, perhaps instead of hidden secularism as the basis for confusion, the biblical fall models human limitations. "We live in a fallen world and have choices. We are not hard-nosed fundamentalists with black and white answers for everything. They want to have a right answer for everything and tell others to do it. But we know so little." And a simple conclusion, "humility." And of course she can see how in the context of NCN, this approach would pose a challenge for Bethany. "I bet they've been in the hot seat. Stan was always in trouble. People praying for him," both supportive and critical, "they worried when he went to a liberal Presbyterian seminary

- Princeton." For Gina however, she says the crisis program worked. It was "the best theological education I could hope for [so I can] engage the culture and change the world"

Kadin graduated 40 years later in 2010, but his story is comparable. Kadin's pentecostal roots run deep, his father and great-grandfather helped establish Glad Tidings, which later became Bethany. He left the Southern Baptist Conference for Bethany in search of theological openness although he knew many Baptists saw Bethany as " far too ecumenical, nonjudgmental." After school among Southern Baptists where he couldn't say the words "Augustine" without being reproached for his liberalism, Bethany was a relief. "Faculty members at Bethany were very keen on getting you to think outside the theological box." Even so, he felt most students appreciated the fundamentals, and held a very "high view of Scripture." Many would leave Bethany inspired. Yet, the freedom to think brought challenge. As Kadin described it, crisis pedagogy incited a very public confrontation, a visible moment in which students would hit a wall, find confusion and be thrown off balance. As he put it, "crisis out loud, that is definitely Bethany's pedagogy. Particularly for the Bible and theology department." Yet the process included a close concern for students, they were not left to blow in the wind. Individual faculty ensured students that support was available. "They were giving amazing support for the crisis. Personal cell phones, it doesn't matter when - 3 AM… [they would] answer any and every question." Don Ryle, a Bethany English Professor, exemplified the crisis teacher. He kept his door open, his phone on, and guided like Socrates. "He would never tell

us the answers, simply give us one or two questions. [He] lived on campus, he was easily accessible. Back and forth to his house. Stacks of books and records all over." The crisis had a site, a guide, and a support. The same could not be said for academic performance in Ryle's class. "It was very difficult - only one person ever got an A-."

Kadin's classes with Koo Yun were similar. "He was always playing devil's advocate. The cool thing about Koo's classes was they were always a little abrasive to everyone. Always ecumenical in their abrasiveness - Eastern Orthodox, Catholics, Baptists, AG, Presbyterians - everyone was uncomfortable, but at the same level." And Kadin's conclusion… faith matters. Bethany cemented it for him but as a flexible fixitive. As he explains, "Doubt is an aspect of faith - coming to grips with it…" He leaves this unresolved.

Charlie Self has a more critical analysis of Yun's pedagogy. On one hand, according to Self, Yun could balance a spiritual passion with academic questioning. "He really did embody what Pentecost is. He can preach a fire-breathing sermon on Sunday and explore it on Wednesday." Yet, in doing so, Yun brought students to a place of deep uncertainty. Self isn't sure if they ever returned. "Koo enjoyed seeing students questioning AG tradition." However, perhaps this was not the task expected of Bethany. "Parents were paying to reinforce AG tradition. Koo, in the Ricourian tradition of producing critical consciousness," would challenge all elements of the bible. But, for Self, unlike Kadin, it didn't work. They were not "producing missionaries." That was problem one. Second, parents could not get past the perception that Yun was destroying their child's faith. And further, Self suspects that

some were actually lost. “They’d never get to the second naiveté.” In other words, Self could see the project, and perhaps how it both succeeded and maybe failed as well.

Bethany’s approach certainly involves risk, and as Dell Tarr, former faculty at AGTS explained, fundamentalists tend to be cautious. He describes the anxieties of AG parents imagining, “young folks go to university professors in science.” The parents envision scientists, “just waiting for young people with faith [who]… love to explode it.” Or so the parents imagine. Tarr recognizes that their concerns have weight. “A certain percentage would begin to question it and fundamentalists believe they would lose their Christian worldview and replace it with a secular one.” However, he insists that there is no other way – rote learning is no better. “Instead of trying to find an inclusive way to work things together, not an either-or but a both-and, they [fundamentalists] just chose to ban education. They thought to be spiritual you had to be intellectually inept.” He obviously disagrees. “One can be both educated and spiritual. Moses and Paul were the best educated of their era.” There is risk. However, “The risk is worth something,” he avers. Tarr recognizes the danger and embraces it. “Some would say because it's dangerous, throw it out. I would say because it's dangerous it's likely to be good. Danger is essential. It allows me to listen to someone different than I am for many times longer than a sectarian person. I want to keep the door open. I like danger. I might learn something. I must keep learning. Growing spiritually and intellectually at the same time is what I think the father wants.” In the late 1960s Tarr formed an AG splinter school full of rebels, it

failed, but later he was asked to run AGTS. He now teaches at the Northwest satellite in Capitol Christian Center.

If anyone is well positioned to articulate the Bethany approach to learning, it is Everett Wilson. President of Bethany through much of the 1990s, Wilson helped fend off the last remnants of the move to Sacramento and fought to bring critically thinking faculty to Bethany, folks who would challenge, yet support, AG doctrine. Wilson remembers the battles of the 1990s when the leader of Capital Christian – Cole – worked together with Braddy and Oates to move Bethany to Sacramento. They built their support from Central Valley pastors in the NCN. As Wilson explained, after Cole's "whispering campaign… the pastors didn't support Bethany." When they didn't move, Cole opened Epic Bible College and other locally funded bible colleges in the Central Valley. Wilson calls them "Rote schools [where] we learn the official line." He thinks they fail to serve. "No matter how fundamentalist the person is they still have to fight it through in their own mind. They have to believe in it." Rote learning, for Wilson, means contraction. Contraction that, he suggests, makes conversions and faith quite difficult in a secularizing context. By contrast, for Wilson, "education means you expand." And he ties this expansion directly to missions. Perhaps, he suggests, Bethany's pedagogy responded to the needs of the mission field, not the liberalization of secular society. "I would say much of the quote 'liberalization' of Bethany came because its students who are missionaries came back changed," he explains. Wilson describes the transformation wrought by missions encountering Muslims, Mexican dances, pentecostals who drink alcohol.

"People just have to expand their thinking." And here he begins to tread delicate ground for a leader of a Christian community. "People say it would be impossible for a Muslim to be saved." Missionaries can't help but question this. "Missionaries stay there – [and ask] why should I, could I, send them to hell?" Obviously this challenges AG doctrine, fundamentalism, but and evangelicalism as well. Perhaps Braddy is right – is this too far, too much expansion, for AG survival? Expansion, at some point, seems very much equivalent to dispersion.

Yet, more than missions pushes Bethany's education towards fluidity. For Wilson, the essence of pentecostal spirituality is openness and rupture, crisis pedagogy merely extends the core project. Bethany may have moved through missionary encounter, but it never really was fundamentalist, he says. "We never were legalistic." Wilson chooses to ignore the fundamentalist moment in AG, it seems. He sees crisis as central to pentecostalism, and education. As he says, "Instead of crisis being the end of it all, it is the beginning, a kind of self revelation… without God I won't become what I'm going to be, on the other hand if I let go…" What happens? That is the key to the pentecostal practice of spiritual gifts – a yielding of the body and mind that nurtures spiritual growth. Perhaps education is similar? Wilson recognizes the dangers of this uncertainty, but also the possibilities. As he says, "We must be careful about theology. Most theological statements are nebulous." And then he returns to stability, but without the anxiety of other members of his community. Perhaps the vagaries of language, of theology, of faith, do not mar the immediacy and solidity of faith. "Basic things don't change: is there a God,

Christ, sin?" Crisis is derailment, but not a destruction of the rails. Unlike Tarr's assertion of no safety, only constructive danger, Wilson clarifies the boundaries – crisis only goes so far.

Braddy, as I explained earlier, offers a vastly different, but quite articulate, take on crisis pedagogy. However much he affirms learning, it is something to be approached with care. "This is my concern," he explains. Critique has value, but also risks. " I have done it [critical analysis] not to tear apart the engine but to understand the engine." Critique as a means of understanding the way parts complement each other, not as deconstruction or remodeling. "Not simply take it apart," he says, "but, take it apart and show why the pieces fit together like they do." He thus affirms current dynamics, not change. For Braddy, even higher criticism, often the scourge of fundamentalism, can be retrofitted as a tool for building biblical faith. "Higher criticism was to affirm and put together." For Braddy, critique might build from the mid 1800s approach to science - catalog, classify and we will understand. Otherwise, "don't touch what is sacred." Unlike Wilson and Tarr, danger does not inspire. Finally, notice, that his argument for fiscal problems has been superseded by political- theological concerns. He thinks Bethany was secularizing and liberalizing AG.

Creeping Liberalism

Yet perhaps there is good reason for this suspicion that the risks of crisis pedagogy need to be contained by a more stringent application of the NCN culture of

fear. For what happens to educated fundamentalists? While they do not necessarily lose faith, things certainly change. Bethany's alumni Facebook page often runs off into various current debates within pentecostalism. Queerness, evolution, and manipulation appeared several times as I observed. Thus, in addition to these questions about theology, the crisis pedagogy at Bethany nurtured what would likely be seen by many in AG as creeping liberalism and a set of sensibilities not necessarily more or less modern or scientific, not more or less religious, but definitely differently open to cultural diversity. For evangelicals, some accommodation – of the non-core elements - is the price of expansion. Liberal Arts education is thus merely one element of this evangelistic project. But for fundamentalists it is a key site of vulnerability.

Homophobia engenders tremendous debate among pentecostals in the US and at Bethany where I could observe the general ethos shifting from imagining queerness as a central Christian problem – a major sin - to something more liken to the minor sins of alcohol and dancing. Some Bethany alums, use the web to offer strident critique of fundamentalist anger: "This post[369] is bound to provoke a firestorm of anger from my more conservative friends. If the topic bothers you that much, please just skip this post and go on with your happy, unexamined lives."[370] It linked to an intense sequence of images of the bloodied survivors of gay-bashing and a narrative challenging innerancy, although not faith. This piece evinces tensions in the pentecostal community and yet also an increasing willingness to challenge. "Well

[369] This was an online blog by a Bethany alumni cited on the alumni Facebook page
[370] Our Gay Neighbors July 15, 2011 https://bjanecarp.wordpress.com/tag/gay/

folks, this post is bound to get me in trouble… I believe that lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgendered individuals should be accorded the same rights and dignity as everyone else in American society… I know. I can't believe I'm saying it either… I'm not gay… [However] my two closest male friends are gay. I've hired gay employees, knowing full well it was against 'the rules' at my job to do so." Employment in the AG community is regularly bounded by sexuality. " I've one good friend who's undergone a sex-change. He's doing very well, thank you. In 1988, I approached my *alma mater*, [Bethany] and asked if I could form a group to minister to to victims of AIDS and HIV… I was given a cold stare, plunked down in an uncomfortable chair inside a dimly-lit room full of pamphlets about 'those' kinds of people, and was left alone to really learn what we were talking about. Funny, I thought they were just people; people who were dying by the thousands, in fact… The attitude hasn't changed… Just today I read [on the Bethany alumni forum]: 'So… where does this stop?... Will California then pass laws saying pedophiles are okay and can marry?' I want to ask, when will you stop comparing LGBT individuals with pedophiles and goat-fuckers? Are you that fascinated by sex that you've reasoned this out? You *really* need to get laid. *sigh*… Let it be known, people, I'd rather be 'perverted' than associated with a group of people who did that to Damian Furtch, just three months ago. [picture of gay bashing]…" Perhaps the argument comes down to humility. "Ask yourself if you're 100% sure you're right. Are you really, truly completely right? Do you have any supporting evidence that you're right, other than a gut feeling, and a musty two-millenium-old set of writings?..." Not

especially respectful of the Bible? “Can you really love your neighbor? Or is your brand of religion only good for inciting your congregants to beat the shit out of them… Please. Use your heads–not your reproductive organs or your bibles–to reason this one out. It’s the right thing to do.” In spite of its rejection of the bible as primary authority, it was quite a powerful critique and inspired a storm of response, although interestingly, much of the commentary focused less on homosexuality, than on avoiding the debate. “I am just wondering HOW this page focused on BU Alumni is turning into a debate site for views on homosexuality and gay ordination?” Or, “My 26 year old son is gay. I love him immensely. But I'm not going to express my views or feelings on his sexuality, lifestyle or personal choices on the BU Alumni FB page. Nor am I gonna open a Bible and start quoting scripture. I know you got a BU education... but I'm beginning to think a bunch of you are dumber than a bag of hammers! Wanna talk about ministry, memories, catch up on past classmates? Here's the place. Wanna debate sexual orientation, biblical positions on sin & morality... [go somewhere else].” This is not the argument about homosexuality that one expects to see in evangelical circles – even in the 2010s. It suggests that this alumni facebook page is subject to significant cultural struggle, what fundamentalists would likely see as creeping liberalism.

In fact, in my interviews with Bethany students the approach to queerness leaned to the soft side. Most had gay friends and were quite clear in rejecting their “parents” fundamentalism that likely had done more damage than good, they argued. Queerness was not ok – it was still a sin. However, the responses ranged from “love

the sinner," to a more developed argument with queerness no greater a sin than any other. Certainly not worthy of great diatribes, and for some, simply as much sin as all humans are endowed with. On the other hand, there were still tales of homophobia, and the one out gay alumni I interviewed described a great deal of interpersonal rancor and meanness directed at his queerness. However, the dominant ethos – at least rhetorically – leaned away from fundamentalist rejection.

Likewise, evolution and innerancy often emerged as debate suggestive of a vast refiguring, perhaps inspired by Bethany, perhaps in the evangelical air more generally. In one representative Facebook discussion KS wrote: "The apparent "conflict" with Biblical history has long since ceased to bother me. Jonah is clearly a work of satirical fiction; Job is clearly a work of poetic fiction; why can't Genesis be theological/historical fiction?" CB replied: "If there were Neanderthals then there is no Eden… I'm not saying Adam and Eve never existed or the whole story is a work of fiction. What I am saying is that if we see the creation story as literal truth... it can not mesh with scientific evidence. It was not meant to be read (or more likely heard) as a world history." KS again: "Could our God act in such a way as to prompt a large fish to swallow a man for three days, and produce him alive? Of course. I have zero doubts on that question. But given my judgment about the particular literary nature of Jonah, I don't think the Bible is telling me that He actually did. On the other hand, given the obvious historical character of the Gospel accounts, I'm even more confident that the Bible fully intends to tell me that Jesus rose from the dead: and I

rejoice at being the recipient of such good news."[371] Often this openness appears to be as much about evangelism strategy as about belief: "When a pagan comes up to you and wants to argue evolution, it saves a whole lot of time to just tell them, 'I believe in evolution too. Now, let's talk Jesus.' Otherwise you'll waste hours at Mr. Toots [a Santa Cruz café] debating with UCSC students over adiaphora when you could be giving your testimony."In other words, as the notion of the essentials winnows through encounter, innerancy and anti-evolutionism lose some of their cache as core beliefs. Even the fundamentalist president of Epic Bible College, Dr. Ron Harden, argues for a connection between outreach and theological minimalism. Missions inspire sifting. Missionaries, he explains, "focus on the majors," the key elements of theology, "they major on the majors - and they dont major on the minors like 'I believe in speaking in tongues and you don't.'" It seems that tongues slides out of the center in Hardin's analysis.

One alumni even challenged the pentecostal cultivation of the sensory as manipulative: "My theology professor, when I was at an AG school (Valley Forge) once explained that there a few factors that significantly contribute to a mental state of suggestibility... 1) variations in lighting, 2) variations in volume, pitch, and tone, and 3) variations in temperature... 'church services' are (whether knowingly or not) organized and structured in such ways as to provide all of those factors. The modern 'altar-call' and its 'uses' are little more than emotional and psychological manipulation...." Apparently, he thinks it backfires, for, "ANYONE wonders why

[371] Bethany Facebook August 9 at 5:01pm

61-88% of 'church' kids wind up wanting nothing to do with that type of group?!?"[372] One can see how fundamentalists might be concerned with the increasingly fluid theologies.

In fact, the shifting terrain has begun to permeate even Capitol Christian Center, the home of AG fundamentalism. Glen Cole's son Rick Cole took over in 1995, but only began shifting the tone in the mid 2000s. A Bethany graduate, Rick is evangelical in sensibility, calls his church emerging, and has been criticized for appearing soft on homosexuality after he kicked some anti-gay protestors off the Capitol campus. As a reporter recently wrote, "Pastor Rick Cole has transformed his church from a bastion of right-wing values to the hub for a kinder, gentler approach to God. If you don't believe us, just ask his dad."[373] After Bethany closed, Rick arranged for Capitol Bible College to affiliate with Northwest University AG's comprehensive Christian college in Seattle. Dell Tarr was hired as director and now runs regionaly acceited undergraduate provider for the district with over 100 undergraduate students.

What Makes for Fluidity? Reciprocity? Or Spirit?

An important note: describing missions reciprocity and outreach as means of turning interaction with the outside world into engines for cultural sensitivity and crisis pedagogy runs counter to the AG narrative - the faculty at Bethany talk differently. For them, change rests on spirit, not encounter. When in the past 40

[372] Ibid, August 17 at 10:44am
[373] Nancy Brands Ward, "Capital Christian Pastor Leads a New Kind of Church," *Sacramento News & Review*, July 24, 2008, http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/capital-christian-pastor-leads-a/content?oid=697201.

years pentecostal scholars began to claim their pentecostal roots as essentially anti-fundamentalist, Bethany became a site for nurturing this perspective. As Dr. Wilson explains, "Most pentecostals could be called fundamentalists, but I don't really feel like a fundamentalist." The key to this sensibility – certainty. "They have all the answers. I don't have any of the answers." Dan Albrecht agrees, "pentecostals don't make really good fundamentalists." Spirit gets in the way of solid literalism when we emphasize experience over text. "Sometimes they can be rigid [but] you always have this same kind of problem with spirit groups, they never want to admit it. There are parallels with the early Hasidim, a spirit group. You believe in Torah. It is central, but then there are these ways that the spirit works with Torah. It is not just a word that's locked in, it's a living word … [pentecostals] will argue that scripture texts are as important to them as anyone else and in America scripture is more important to pentecostals than… to probably the rest of Christians except the fundamentalists who would say… if they can cite a verse… that takes care of the rest of the debate… [It is] that propositional modern thing… [In fact] that's the irony. They're [fundamentalists] modernists and they're fighting the modern world but they've already accepted all their weapons, so they are done logically. It doesn't work, they just don't know it." For Albrecht, a fundamentalist hasn't yet explored the contradictions in their world view that are not so prevalent in a more fluid, spirit based pentecostalism. For him, change comes from spirit, not encounter.

Other Caveats

I painted a pretty stark picture of differences in approach between fundamentalists more interested in separatism and the protected pedagogies that nurture those sensibilities and the more expansive and risky pedagogical approach of evangelicals. Yet, at times, the contrast seemed less severe. In spite of professions to fluidity among its leaders, Bethany inhabited the harsh world of AG and it was not always the safe space Kadin, and others, described. Even without exploring the homophobia and anti-Muslim sentiments cultivated and very present at Bethany, it was simply a place where critique often - although not always – inspired rebuttal. In other words, cultivation involves pruning as well as fertilizer, and although Bethany provided relative fluidity within AG, it also offered numerous boundaries.

A few stories will suffice: One student explained simply, "My experience at Bethany taught me that one will be ostracized if they ask too many questions to the leaders." Another wrote a story to explain: "I remember in 1987, arguing with 5 friends around a table at Scotts Valley Denny's about Jimmy Swaggart, after "the fall". [Swaggart caught several times with prostitutes] We were quite fervent and loud and opinionated for a couple hours until, a few tables away, a district official wandered up, said 'I couldn't help but overhear your conversation' and proceeded to dress us down for ever thinking about, or considering to judge, or judging Rev. Swaggart. We clamped our mouths shut, and quickly grasped for other topics--English homework, and Bro. Tilus' recent heart attack--to cover the awkward silence.

From that day on, I realized it wasn't good enough to have an opinion at Bethany; it had to be the "right" opinion, or you had to keep your mouth shut."

Another described mechanisms for control over the most intimate elements of life. "I just got out from jail, went to Bethany and was hated upon by some faculty and questioned because of my past. I then started dating my wife. A campus ministries leader (student, who is now an AG minister in the NCN) sent me an email prophetic word that God is wanting me to be single for the time being and to break up with my wife, and if I didn't, He would be breaking it up." Intriguing blend of technology and spiritual connection. "(4 years later we are married)... I go to plant a church and get an email that I NEED to leave AG because I follow the podcast of Bethel, Redding (I never set foot at that church, I just read some books and listen to podcast)." He left AG. "I am a part of another fellowship." Put simply, in spite of its evangelical ethos and it crisis pedagogy, Bethany did not provide chaotic freedom, but rather highly pruned and contained cultivation.

Fundamentalism vs. Evangelicalism

So, how to differentiate between this thing the Bethany community calls fundamentalism and the evangelical? These less than clear cut categories, are regularly evoked in the strongly expressed sense that Bethany cultivates something very much unlike the "fighting fundies" of Central Valley mega-churches. Even so, the distinction is fuzzy - Everett Wilson calls himself a "fundamentalist." For both groups claim literal bible reading, both are deeply involved in reading, praying, and

spreading the gospel, and in this story, both share the pentecostal facility for gifts of the spirit. Thus, if this difference is not primarily theology or spiritual practice, then perhaps it comes down to a set of sensibilities and dispositions – a posture towards the outside world and a posture towards critique and challenge. Nancy Ammerman suggests as much when she writes, "their insistence on separatism most clearly distinguishes fundamentalists from their closest relatives, the evangelicals."[374] Here, I expand her thesis by showing that fundamentalist separatism and the evangelical's extended outreach each sustain distinct sensibilities. While evangelicals are far more interested in cultural sensitivity than fundamentalists, this chapter focuses on the pedagogies that differentiate the two – and by pedagogy, I mean their approach to learning, critique, and challenge. Fundamentalists leading the NCN district take criticism very seriously, as an affront, and they squash it. It sounds like a harsh thing to say, but the culture of fear within the NCN is powerful, but with seemingly good - meaning logical and well thought through - separatist reasoning. For fundamentalists, faith is belief, critique is heresy, and challenge presents a slippery slope. Evangelicals at Bethany work with critique differently. It becomes a means towards strength and flexibility in the face of secularism. And, of course, it only allows internal questions. Critique will not take us outside the church, or so they aver.

In other words, the battle of Bethany posed sensibilities as combatants, quite reminiscent of contemporary national politics where a rough and tumble working class culture now enfolds both poor truck drivers and entrepreneurial billionaires

[374] Ammerman, *Bible Believers*, 4.

within the republican party while posing itself in opposition to the democratic effete – educated, uncertain, and femme. As with the quotidian notion of class in the US that is no longer a signifier of wealth or power, but rather of an affective approach to government or bureaucracy, the conflict in AG emerged between the holders of working class and of educated sensibilities. Yet, with both groups college educated, the workers far wealthier than the educators, and the real divide posed between cultural subtlety (perhaps accommodation) and rigidity (perhaps reasonable boundaries), theological curiosity and protective separatism, between potentially unsafe expansion and shielding contraction. As such, the tensions around doctrine and fluidity that propelled pentecostals through a frenzy of collective growth over the previous 100 years had crystallized, for a moment, as a form of warfare. Further, while expansion might signal diffusion, and separatism suggests impending disappearance, the battle between them might exemplify productive derailment, or constructive fighting, inspiring what Christian Smith describes as, "embattled and thriving."[375]

Conclusion

This chapter argues that reciprocity of encounter generates change and tension within AG. It transforms missionaries who develop culturally sensitive liberal arts pedagogies and, at least at Bethany, reciprocity also meant both the emergence, and the active element, of crisis pedagogy where the risk of encounter with secular ideas

[375] Smith is talking about battles with the outside world, I think it likely applies to internal struggles as well. Smith, *American Evangelicalism*.

is both inevitable and crucial for inoculation against the thrills of secularism. This process in which shifting missionaries breeding shifting pedagogies also sediments in an emergent collection of sensibilities that Bethany faculty and students describe as an evangelicalism distinct from the fundamentalism of others previously, and currently, within AG.

However, I wonder how to differentiate the success of the softer crisis laden approach at Bethany from the rote learning in local Bible colleges - what are their strengths? what does each do well? I imagine one might remember here how fundamentalist, and in this case evangelical as well, rigidity plays out with sexual abstinence. They certainly try and keep folks from having sex outside of marriage. And perhaps it works. They average their first sexual intercourse about 5 months after the non-religious of the US. But, then there are effects: such as a much lower use of contraception.[376] Does that serve as an analogy for all rote learning? I am unsure.

However, instead of assessing effects, which would require a sociological study of a different sort, this paper initiates a series of questions and possibilities that emerge from this battle between evangelical and fundamentalist sensibilities. How does crisis education work? And perhaps more importantly, what does its increasing influence mean for AG and the pentecostal movement? Does the growing interest in higher education signal a softening of fundamentalist posturing? Does it mean

[376] More specifically, these studies refer to what they call evangelicals – who are not differentiated from fundamentalists in the way I have in this paper. Interestingly, mainline Protestants and Jews wait even longer than evangelical for first sexual intercourse, but use contraception more regularly. It also shows that evangelicals and Catholics are especially likely to use contraception only some or none of the time. Mark. Regnerus, *Forbidden Fruit: Sex & Religion in the Lives of American Teenagers* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2007), 127, 145, 158.

diminished spiritual intensity? Is there room for religion in academia and vice versa? Further, is true critique possible without breaching the bounds of a movement, in this case, Christianity? So, of course, then what is critique? By accepting the bounds of the movement, does immanent critique (situated critique from a subjective position) foreclose questions of greater intensity or challenge? Does it assume the incommensurability or impossibility of communication and challenge across movements where the conversation is situated differently? Is there anything possible other than immanent critique?[377] Also, is crisis pedagogy a critique or merely a mechanism of interpellation?

Perhaps as Dr. Stewart argues, the sensibilities required for effective higher education deeply oppose fundamentalism. As he see it, "model one: liberal arts. How to think, how to research, to go on the edge and explore and get lost for a moment, to have the carpet ripped out. It changes your behavior." He calls it "true learning." And opposes it to, "model two: order, indoctrination, preaching, sixteen truths," and a sarcastic finale, " how you look." Or, as Everett Wilson explains, "Berkeley? Stanford? [both his alma maters] It is difficult to do this education and be a fundamentalist." Yet, he calls himself a fundamentalist. Just not one who "defends the faith using propositional arguments." Perhaps also, rigid inerrancy is not required to hold fundamental truths. "Any truth is likely to be many sided, Bethany was not fundamentalist for a long time. But we still believe the Bible to be inspired word of God." Gina hinges the difference on sensibility. "The fundamentalists added a

[377] That is, can we ever criticize from outside our narrow tradition? Would we like to? Or is this the objectivist dream?

strident tone, they become harsh and legalistic." By contrast, "evangelicals distance oneself from the fighting fundies. At AG for the most part, we believe strongly." Yet, "we don't have to be more strident." Is this a shift in tenor, tone, education, and or political theology?

Perhaps then the divide between evangelical and fundamentalist involves the core definition of human learning? Maybe this is less a fight over the expected outcome, for both sides aver kindness, generosity, and deep religiosity. It is more a struggle over the sensibilities needed for effective evangelism? Fundamentalists worry that a loose education breeds loose people, loose morals, and a loose society. Evangelicals, by contrast, see the loose as the flex in a rolling ship, enough to survive the battering waves, but not enough to yield the hull, or the journey.

Chapter III: How Does One Grow?
Debates Between Fundamentalist Separatism and Evangelical Expansion

Reciprocity provides both the risks and hopes of outreach. We have seen the expansion of AG, but also the transformation of the missionary and the university both deriving, in part, from the danger of encounter. This chapter explores the ensuing cultural hybridity at Bethany and its potential for fulfilling the missionary promise within AG.

To do evangelism in the broadest sense, a movement must reach out to expand, perhaps attack or denounce, maybe caress and hold. But with each reach comes contact and fleshy encounter inspiring reciprocal action. Evangelism is especially vulnerable: to contact while deeply interested and attached to moving the other. Fundamentalism even more so: it is difficult to make contact and not flex. Thus, for pentecostals there have been two choices: subcultural separatism joined to moments of aggressive boundary maintaining, the fundamentalist route; or a more sensitive contact-fullness, an evangelical approach – emphasizing the evangelism - but one that risks the boomerang of reciprocal challenge.

Bethany University was closed, in part, because of this debate over strategy. If the fundamentalist distinctive comes down to a family of sensibilities built around subcultural separatism for the sake of defensive survival, Bethany took the other route. Bethany moved towards an evangelical emphasis on outreach and communication, also a survival strategy, but one that risks internal change. The fundamentalists within NCN District found this unappealing - Bethany had lost its

way. This tension between fundamentalist and evangelical strategies within pentecostalism serves as a central divide throughout US AG. Both sides advocate missions, both claim inerrancy and orthodoxy, both see themselves as scholars (one positivistic, one postmodern), both modern, and both might even be resistance movements of the marginalized white populist.[378] Yet, the sensibilities with which they approach these goals differ. It is unclear, however, which will best manifest the simultaneous continuity and expansion hoped for by its practitioners on either side.

This essay begins by portraying the hybridity common to Bethany University among its students but also through pedagogies and promotions materials. I then examine the debate within evangelical scholarship over the best approach to inspire conversion while consolidating previous conversions. I compare strategies between the protective enclave theorists and the expansive efforts to permeate US worldviews. These theories are historical players in the debates within evangelicalism and pentecostalism over strategy. I conclude with a look at arguments that join the tightness of fundamentalism to the expansion of evangelicalism. First, Christian Smith's "embattled and thriving" suggests that the enclave is not merely a place of dissociation, but also a site for vital resistances made more exciting by virtue of their antagonistic relationship to the outside world. Finally, I expand Smith's theory to include the thriving inspired by internal battles as well. As such, the struggle between evangelical and fundamentalist might simply be the latest in a regular cycle of

[378] Ernesto Laclau, *On Populist Reason* (London; New York: Verso, 2005).

conflict within AG; a place where the tensions between the systematic and the visceral, and the ruptures they animate, might engender vibrancy.

Bethany Took One Route: Evangelicalism

> *A small white wigged Caucasian lady, maybe 75, was in deep conversation with a middle aged white man, a careful side part, mid length khaki shorts and white button down shirt with a cream colored tie. It was a scene right out of a Southern prep school from the 1950s and everything I expected of an Assemblies of God - pentecostal Bible college. The mirage quickly dissipated as students spilled out of their classrooms into the grassy campus center sporting nose rings, ripped jeans, skin tight leggings, muscle shirts, low cut blouses, bodies blanketed with tattoos and clear racial diversity. – authors field notes January 2009*

The young missionary trainees at Bethany University that I spoke with find the contemporary cultural mix they bring to evangelism inspiring. Their personal tales of conversion and commitment inhabit rich cultural diversity and hybridity. And, while struggling to reconcile the anti-hierarchical ethos of individual spiritual experience with a tradition of Biblical innerancy, they often resolve conflicts with spirit trumping text – they are not, first and foremost, rigid literalists. Instead of rigidity, they suggest that pentecostal expansion rests on a powerful impulse to adjust to, and inhabit, existing cultural forms. It is an ethos, they say, propelled by the highly personal, and broadly available experience of the Holy Spirit, a practice that

might make comfort with emerging cultural forms a powerful inclination. This ethos, or its lack, is also, I might add, the primary distinction I find between fundamentalist approaches to outreach and evangelical ones. In the long run, whether it might signal expansion into the American worldview, or subsumption within it, and if that is any better or worse than separatism, is the question.

Hybridity was a central element of contemporary Bethany's public culture. Administrators, however, exemplify older fundamentalist-pentecostal fashion, small senior women with died blonde hair and matching suits – not too much makeup. Pictures of Bethany in the 1960s show a distinctly straitlaced community, sporting side parts, ties, and long skirts. For the students today (2011), however, if its not ripped jeans, then skin tights with bulging metal belts, or maybe hip hop gear, even the occasional heavy metal t-shirt or tattoos and dyed black hair. The curriculum provides Bible study and missions training as well as standard academics hybridized with a spiritual angle. Edward Said's Orientalism and Victor Turner's *communitas* help explain missionary trajectories. Center-periphery theories from sociology are translated to describe the biblical Jerusalem and the Galilee.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the missionary on the front of Bethany's latest flyer is not dressed as a prototypical conservative Christian evangelist – he's in a wetsuit. In fact, the one repeated image shows their "surf ministry," a group of men in wetsuits walking out through the waves. As they write, "Who do you surf for? Whether you surf waves, concrete bowls or the Internet… this group of students is ready to include

you on the mission of learning more about surfing, the sub-culture and the need for Jesus out in the 'line-up.'"

Likewise, Bethany missions students are activists who see themselves out to transform the world along with themselves. And they sit in the tension between religious and worldly projects. Many students aspire to realize very concrete changes here on earth, the "Every day is earth day" t-shirt was not especially notable. On the other hand, one student I spoke with, Chris describes criticism he received for exploring an activist conference at nearby UC Santa Cruz. He was asked by faculty to keep the seemingly dangerous secular perspective separate from Bethany's religious approach. Even so, campaigns around sex trafficking, child slavery, homelessness and of course, religious persecution against Christians, all serve as rallying points for Bethany students - social justice campaigns that might not pose too direct a challenge to AG's conservative past and their parents.

Their activism means they can't help but be immersed within a highly recursive or looping type of analysis – every question has intellectual but also spiritual, and therefore highly personal, implications. The personal is political… and spiritual. It seems to me that there is no better way to inspire a group of searching teenagers to participate in an academy than by convincing them that their academic work has global as well as personal significance. Every class, every choice, can be read as providing a trajectory towards or away from God. Every detail matters, and evangelism becomes the activism of bible school.

Of course, as with all academic environments, students are intermittently engaged. In one class, throughout a heavy discourse on the distinction between secular and Christian conversions, of seven students with laptops, five were online, watching NASCAR racing, digital poker, online shopping, with one man online simultaneously watching four different young women. On the other hand, the small community creates an intensity in which many students thrive. While many, "sit around in their dorms and play video games until 3 in the morning" others see Bethany as a place that encourages genuine caring, where you can "go next door for prayer."

I spent a lot of time in the library, the cafeteria and the picnic tables in the center of the campus. While DJ's blasted hip-hop mixed with music from the Red Hot Chili Peppers, Sting and The Temptations, I talked with students wearing Hard Rock Café T-shirts, shaved heads, small goatees, and of course, the Midwest working class moustaches and baseball caps. My goal in this chapter is to think through, and challenge, the theorization of the ways of being engendered in this small pentecostal world that seem to have such a far-reaching impact. As some described breakdance testimonials in missions to South Africa and others trained to sing pop music for Jesus, I was told again and again that pentecostal experience generates a kind of epistemology and cultural flexibility and hybridity that leads to missionary success.

Music is central. During my interviews I heard songs blasting from the chapel as student bands rehearsed between services. At times, it was the richly distorted sounds of heavy metal. Walking back to my car on a clear and sunny California

afternoon I passed a house the size of a large trailer hidden in the woods perched above the parking lot. An Asian woman in her late teens appeared through the leaves on a small wooden porch with an acoustic guitar. The house nearly disappeared in the redwoods. She strummed quietly, switching in and out of falsetto like a 90s grunge band. I wondered how she reconciled their Christian aspirations with the sexualized, rebel culture of their music. According to one Bethany Alumni, she didn't need to: "the ultimate sign of quality CCM [Contemporary Christian Music], even amongst Christians: [is] the ability to pass as secular. Every band's goal was to have teenagers stop their grooving mid-song and exclaim, like a soda commercial actress who's just realized she's been drinking diet, "Wait, this is Christian?""

These tensions run high - between assimilation and isolation, hybridity and purity and across several axes, cultural, political and theological. Margaret Poloma argues that pentecostal blending strengthens pentecostalism. Yet, there is a hierarchy. For Poloma, spirit trumps systematicity. "The instrumental rational reasoning process so characteristic of science and bureaucracy are absorbed into a more dominant sacred weltanschauung."[379] That is, for Poloma, perhaps hybridity is ok, as long the balance of power is tilted away from the instrumental? If this dominant ethos of hybridity is as effective at permeating and renovating outside cultures as its progenitors think, Bethany's pentecostalism is likely to continue its rapid expansion. Yet, if the balance of power tilts the other way - rational - then perhaps blending admits to failure in defending a coherent culture - a sign of impending declination?

[379] [emphasis added, italics removed] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 8.

Enclave Culture

This debate between isolated subculture and expansive hybridity is easy to find among scholars of evangelicalisms – most of them evangelicals themselves. This literature tenuously sits between academic scholarship and activist investigation – far from disinterested. The debate, quite simply, posits two poles against each other: one advocating evangelical expansion; and the other self-protective hibernation, or the separatism I describe as fundamentalist. The problem, I suggest, is that both of them fail in their self-appointed task of preservation, but they fail differently.

Like other fundamentalists, many early AG pentecostals formed enclaves to try and protect fragile beliefs from processes of change. While sending quite a few missionaries out into the world, they often set themselves aside from modern culture and did their best to build a solid wall of strict doctrine. As R Scott Appelby of the Fundamentalism Project writes, "a fundamentalist movement takes original shape as an enclave, a community set apart from larger society and concerned with maintaining boundaries to prevent its members from deserting."[380] In fact, this boundary making might be the crucial factor in defining a fundamentalist community.

Some evangelical scholars say enclaves effectively solidify community. In *Why Are Conservative Churches Growing*, Dean Kelly argues that by maintaining faith and lifestyle standards, fundamentalists exhibit "traits of strictness" - absolute beliefs, moral and social nonconformity, and a missionary zeal – that effectively

[380] R Scott Appelby, "Rethinking Fundamentalism in a Secular Age," in *Rethinking Secularism*, ed. Craig J Calhoun, Juergensmeyer, and Jonathan VanAntwerpen (NY: Oxford University Press, 2011), 233.

protect and nurture their communities.[381] Likewise, other enclave theorists, Peter Berger and James Davison Hunter, describe distinct cognitive content and symbolic boundaries that structure a "sacred cosmos."[382] Hunter explains survival via the separatism of disproportionately older, less educated, lower income, rural and small-town communities. Although he is evangelical, his argument sits well with critiques of fundamentalist agency constrained by the emotionality of poor, undereducated rubes – Hunter just inverts the take home lesson. "The evangelical community as a whole is – perhaps more than any other major American religious body – sociologically and geographically distant from the institutional structures and processes of modernity… Thus, one reason for the survival of American evangelicalism in the modern world may be that social and demographic distance for modernity allows it to avoid sustained confrontation with modernity's most threatening attributes."[383] Hunter worries that education and wealth might dissolve the enclave identity and ultimately argues that the accommodative spirit of late 20th century evangelicalism means the enclave no longer holds its boundaries.[384]

Yet, while these fundamentalist communities aim at subcultural separatism, they also value missions, which can't help but inspire encounter. As Joel Carpenter writes, "Missionaries were the noblest models of all for the life of heroic Christian service; they beckoned devoted, visionary, and adventuresome young people to join

---

[381] Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing: A Study in Sociology of Religion*.
[382] Peter L Berger, *The Sacred Canopy; Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion,* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967).
[383] James Davison Hunter, *American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1983), 60.
[384] James Davison Hunter, *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

them on the front lines of spiritual warfare."[385] This impulse grew through the early decades of the 20th century such that, " by the 1930s… the evangelistic emphasis overrode virtually every other category of Christian work within fundamentalism."[386] Perhaps fundamentalist expansion cultivated the seeds of its own destruction.

Evangelicalism as Change

By 1943, the NAE emerged very explicitly positing evangelism in opposition to enclave culture. It was a strategic move, which poised them for growth and expansion, recognition and power, but placed them at odds with many of their fundamentalist forbears. This network of fundamentalists on the path to evangelicalism developed a critique of their own community and now instead of advocating institutional structures or doctrines, became interested in a broad target - culture. NAE founder, Carl Henry, through his ThD thesis on "successful church publicity," articulated this effort to establish a world and life view, a "*Weltanschauung,*" he described, worth fighting for. His *Remaking the Modern Mind* (1946) challenged modernity, but instead of arguing for separation, suggested that effective evangelism required serious intellectual engagement along with social and political activism. What Christian Smith described as, "a 'space' between fundamentalism and liberalism" in which to build "a distinct, publicly recognizable

[385] Carpenter, *Revive Us Again,* 31.
[386] Ibid., 78.

collective identity."[387] This, for Henry, instead of subcultural separation, meant, "the modern ideology needs to be remade."[388] He called this (neo)evangelicalism.

Henry's interest in culture resonated well with a new focus on para-church and special purpose church institutions instead of denominational organizing. The NAE leadership came primarily from the para-church world of Bible colleges, evangelical publishing, Christian radio, and faith missions, not from denominations. In 1900, US denominations had outnumbered special purposed groups by 2 to 1. By 1950 it was 1.2 to 1, and by the 1970s, 2 to 1, the other way around. Robert Wuthnow credits special-purpose groups with revitalizing American religious life.[389] D.G Hart agrees, "the real vitality of American Protestantism was located in nontraditional outlets where entrepreneurial genius and the charisma of an evangelist or radio preacher was more effective than the staid and bureaucratic ways of denominations.… the heart of evangelicalism was in its decentralized and unregulated pockets that mixed evangelistic zeal with entrepreneurial know-how."[390] AG fit well with this new model, their decentralized "fellowship" had much of the fluidity and possibility that characterized para-church organizing.

Doctrine moved in resonant response. This strategic shift away from denominations had evangelicals looking for broad commonalities between groups.

---

[387] Smith, *American Evangelicalism,* 14–15.
[388] Carl F. H Henry, *Remaking the Modern Mind* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1946), 292,300–301. In Worthen, *Apostles of Reason*, 30–35, 260.
[389] Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), 100–113.
[390] D. G Hart, *Deconstructing Evangelicalism: Conservative Protestantism in the Age of Billy Graham* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 116.

They constructed a "stripped down Christianity"[391] with doctrine limited to infallibility and the details left to local communities. As Molly Worthen explains, "discipleship, more than dogma, was the primary way to follow Christ."[392] Thus, the NAE emphasized the revivalist side of the movement over its sectarian impulses and, in doing so, they expanded massively. However, while aiming to change others, they also engendered tremendous change in themselves.

Though multiple authors agree that the NAE and evangelicalism offered a new and vital approach to non-liberal Christianity, the long-term implications of the move are hotly contested. D.G Hart argues that the shift towards ideology and away from church to para-church institutions meant a decline in clarity, membership, and mobilization.[393] Molly Worthen, on the other hand, sees the expansion and strategic reorientation of evangelicalism as its hope and possibility.[394] They agree that evangelicalism took on new strategies, they disagree about measurements of movement success. Is it structure: creeds, liturgy, institutions, or, on the other hand, does it involve permeating the broader society and mobilizing vast numbers of people, if only to small degree? Perhaps this compares depth to expansion? Which is preferable?

[391] Hutchison, *Errand to the World.*
[392] Worthen, *Apostles of Reason*, 76.
[393] Hart, *Deconstructing Evangelicalism.*
[394] Worthen, *Apostles of Reason.*

For Some It Meant Death

For many, the shift to embrace outside culture, or at least engage with it, signaled an end to the movement. McLoughlin describes with irony how revivalism contributed to secularization. For, in aspiring to, "be all things to all men… [revivalists] inevitably diluted and confused a message which, if it was to have any force, had to be concise, direct, and clear-cut."[395] In this vein, the NAE had built a broad coalition, one that necessarily softened doctrinal purity for the sake of unity – perhaps a "liberal" attempt to separate the kernel from the husk. At times, only one doctrinal affirmation was left standing – innerancy – and this was a relatively new one.

Hart exemplifies the common fundamentalist argument that this simplicity resulted in a movement with no connecting fibers, withering without the structuring of previous church formations. He shows multiple scholars cannot agree that evangelicalism is anything at all. He starts with Douglas Sweeney: "When the fragile unity of the founding neo-evangelicals ended, nothing remained to support the common perception of evangelical unity."[396] Lewis Smedes continues the argument for Hart, "evangelicalism is a fantasy."[397] Even the atheist critic, Steve Bruce becomes useful here, "diffuse religion cannot sustain a distinctive way of life..… The language of discovering yourself and getting in touch with God within can, and is,

---

[395] William Gerald McLoughlin, *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham*. (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1959), 524.
[396] Douglas A Sweeney, "The Essential Evangelicalism Dialectic: The Historiography of the Early Neo-Evangelical Movement and the Observer-Participant Dilemma," *Church History* 60, no. 1 (1991): 82–83.
[397] Lewis Smedes, "Evangelicalism - A Fantasy," *Reformed Journal* 30 (February 1980): 3.

used to justify almost any sort of behavior."[398] Hart sums up his argument: "The National Association of Evangelicals tried but could not contain the gigantic puddle that evangelicalism had become – a mile wide and, depending on the consistency, maybe even less than an inch deep."[399] The transition from separatism to evangelism was complete. As Os Guinness writes: "Fundamentalism… Prided itself on being world–denying by definition. Today… It is become world–affirming in a worldlier and more compromising way than… Liberalism."[400] And, in this context, liberalism is quite an insult.

Of course, this makes sense. How can the evangelical meet the modern and remain unchanged. For Hunter, it meant more than change, it meant yielding: "there is little question as to which of the two gives way to the other."[401] Perhaps the power differential is too great to allow deep contact and mutual survival – one would certainly swallow the other, and it wouldn't be the evangelicals eating.

But…

For others, however, the expansive move is the juice of a vital movement, what it loses in density is more than made up for in extension. In fact, following the late 20th century permeation of society by evangelicalism, the accolades came pouring in. Histories of the US were refigured to accommodate the revitalization of religion in the late 20th century. For instance, historians and sociologists challenged Perry

---

[398] Steve Bruce, *God Is Dead: Secularization in the West* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2002), 94.
[399] Or, "Evangelicalism needs to be relinquished as a religious identity because it does not exist." Hart, *Deconstructing Evangelicalism*, 16, 129.
[400] Os Guinness, *Dining with the Devil: The Megachurch Movement Flirts with Modernity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993). Cited in Richard G Kyle, *Evangelicalism: An Americanized Christianity* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2006), 5.
[401] Hunter, *Evangelicalism*, 48.

Miller's famous story of declination[402] – a descent traced through Puritan half-way covenants and then even more fully realized in the secularization of modernity. The challengers claimed that church attendance went from 17% to roughly 62% between the 1700s and the late 1900s.[403] The argument resonated closely with Foucauldian descriptions of modernity as increasingly intensive control mechanisms.[404] Church participation is likely one of these mechanisms. In this reading of US history, evangelicalism became perhaps the central engine of American culture. For William McLoughlin, "the story of American evangelicalism is the story of America itself in the years 1800 to 1900…."[405] Even more strongly, John Butler describes the new 'evangelical thesis' in recent American historiography. He says, and "evangelical paradigm" has emerged as the "*single* most powerful explanatory device adopted by academic historians to account for the distinctive features of American society, culture, and identity."[406] Likewise, as Michael Young describes the, "*Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement*,"[407] Jean Reith Schroedel and Steven Brint claim, "evangelicals have been at the forefront of nearly all movements for social

---

[402] Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954).
[403] Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, *The Churching of America, 1776-2005 Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2005), 23.
[404] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; David Sehat, *The Myth of American Religious Freedom* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[405] William Gerald McLoughlin, *The American Evangelicals, 1800-1900; an Anthology*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 1.
[406] Jon Butler, "Born Again America? A Critique of the New 'Evangelical Thesis' in Recent American Historiography" (unpub'd OAH paper, 1991). Cited in Harry Stout and Robert Taylor Jr., "Studies of Religion in American Society: The State of the Art," in *New Directions in American Religious History*, ed. D. G. Hart and Harry Stout (Oxford University Press, 1997), 19.
[407] Michael P Young, *Bearing Witness against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

change, both on the left and on the right."[408] These far reaching descriptions of evangelicalism as centerpiece of American exceptionalism became commonplace in US religious histories.[409]

How do scholars explain evangelical centrality in US culture? They base it on the willingness to reach, to change, and to make use of the tools of modernity and the market. "Perhaps more than any other religious type, evangelicals have capitalized on this dynamic and innovative religious climate," explained Richard Kyle. "They've emphasized the experiential aspect of religion and use the most creative methods to promote their faith. In doing so, their numbers have grown dramatically."[410] In other words, here, openness to change is the primary mode for accessing broader society.

Some even see the mixing of church everyday life as appropriation rather than dissolution – the church appropriating the culture. Evangelical sociologists John Schmalzbauer and C. Gray Wheeler, for instance, describe the reenchantment of earthly life, the very opposite of secularization.[411] Others portray the awakening of an evangelical imagination that permeates broader society through literature and other forms of culture. Thinking of CS Lewis, Clyde Kilby writes: "imagination provides the willingness and possibility to get on the other side of the fence. Some people think it's a sin to get another person's shoes. However in so much missionary work that's

---

[408] Steven, Schroedel, Jean Reith Brint, *Evangelicals and Democracy in America Religion and Politics* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2009), 3.
[409] It is worth noting that they often elide the distinctions between (neo) evangelicals of the late 20th century and the evangelicals of the 1800s.
[410] Kyle, *Evangelicalism*, 3.
[411] John A. Schmalzbauer and C. Gray Wheeler, "Between Fundamentalism and Secularization: Secularizing and Sacralizing Currents in the Evangelical Debate on Campus Lifestyle Codes," *Sociology of Religion* 57, no. 3 (1996): 241–57.

what you gotta' do – have real love and real sympathy, and imagination helps do it."[412] That is, the evangelical imagination becomes a mechanism for outreach and for mutual transformation.

Both… Embattled and Thriving

In contrast with either of the previous positions (separatism or expansion as more effective) some argue that the tension between subcultural separation and expansion provides the key to evangelical vitality. Suggesting that subcultures thrive when explicitly engaged against the dominant culture, Christian Smith, another evangelical sociologist, walks the line between the proponents of subcultural enclaves and expansive evangelism. He says that wrestling with cultural pluralism helps born-again Protestants build a "subcultural identity." Smith argues that evangelicalism explicitly aimed to differ from fundamentalism by, "reducing the level of strictness in its organizational culture at all levels…" But "if strictness per se causes religious vitality, then evangelicalism's decrease in strictness relative to fundamentalism should have been accompanied by a diminishing of evangelical vitality. The strictest churches should be the strongest." Yet, in his studies, this isn't the case. In fact, "we have seen the opposite: evangelicalism as a religious tradition enjoys a significant margin of vitality above and beyond that of fundamentalism."[413] Yet, Smith does not accepting NAE's strategic claim of mere fluidity. Instead, he suggests that a mix of subcultural separatism and engagement bring energy to the movement. He cites

[412] From *Christianity Today*, cited in Worthen, *Apostles of Reason*, 123.
[413] Smith, *American Evangelicalism*, 85.

Dennis Covington's description of the modern impetus towards pentecostal snake handlers as a perfect example of the ways that encounter excites a movement. Covington writes: "snake handling… didn't originate back in the hills somewhere. It started when people came down from the hills to discover they were surrounded by hostile and spiritually dead culture. All along their borders with the modern world… they recoiled. They threw up defenses. When their own resources failed, they call down the Holy Ghost. They put their hands to fire. They drank poison. They took up serpents."[414] In other words, for Covington and Smith, neither separation nor engagement alone make a movement live.

Smith's argument might usefully explain some of AG vitality – their sense of embattlement is very much in evidence - although his emphasis on boundary making misses the internal gridding that is also central. For when ritualization is about naming the edge between ritual and profane,[415] or affect is the relationally produced surface impressions that define difference,[416] each of these processes involve margins making the center. And this may be a key to organizing – a strong boundary, Kelly's strict church is strict at the edges. Yet, I suspect there is something to the gridding of the whole – including the center - that is also key to mobilizing. The meticulous teaching of tongues and the training of sensibilities among AG pentecostals is not simply about making the profane sacred, creating an enemy, a set of rigid rules, or an interpersonal affective valence. Instead, it includes a kind of internal emotional

[414] Ibid., 93.
[415] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.
[416] Sara Ahmed, *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

gridding, in which one can recognize moments when affect is more or less thoroughly imbued with, and perhaps enlivened by, the rationalizing grid that it never totally escapes and never totally succumbs to.

Declension - Decline

Pentecostals find themselves in constant battle – often with themselves, often over a perception of lost spirituality. If Smith is correct that critique energizes, then perhaps stories of decline - a central element of the AG narrative – provides an internal challenge crucial for continued revitalization. It certainly seems anxiety producing. Here it is more about internal mobilization than the boundary maintenance with the outside world described in Smith's sociology. As one Bethany faculty explains: "Our core beliefs have had to change. There used to be a sense of urgency, of eschatology, always emphasizing the crisis, the born again experience. We believed in divine healing to the exclusion of meds. We believed in baptism for everyone. It didn't work out to be true - now few people speak in tongues." He is describing the US church. Eschatological imminence was the spark. "That was the fuel in the engine, Jesus coming back immediately." But it didn't last. "The core message grew tired, it just wasn't happening." Perhaps churches turned to gaudy performance to make up for the internal energy. "Looking for fresh message that can put fuel in our tank like that early one. Now it's show-time, sometimes even [literally] smoke… trying to find a fresh message for the 2nd and 3rd generation."

Bob Stallman tells a similar tale of lost possibility: “AG’s big anxiety - that our way of experiencing spirit, tongues, interpretation, and prophetic words is so rare that maybe we are losing something we should be holding onto. Or maybe it's not what we thought it was.” Perhaps it is not an enduement of power for missions, or even a spiritual connection? “We are also losing the super intense quest that used to mark us. What it means to be a distinctive people of God is disappearing.” Perhaps this is due to softening boundaries. “[For instance] folks don't talk about sin, [they are] kind of secretly disenchanted with what used to be really distinctive… and uncomfortable promoting it. “

Dr. Stan Steward tells a similar tale of declension, but closely aligned with the notion that the religious becomes modern and succumbs to the secular. AG in the US is only growing among people of color, but not much, and primarily through accretion, he says. This is due to increasing attachment to worldly wealth and power, a folly he has intimate experience with. Steward pastored a growing mega-church in Nevada until sexual liaisons without his wife led to a hard fall. As such, his critique of NCN demagoguery inflects some personal venom. AG was a successful machine, but now the church is flailing, he says.

It s a critique of worldly wealth, “back in the day when we had nothing, we had explosive growth.” But now: “The superintendent's office has trappings of power as big as the Oval Office.” And he ties it to his experience, “it happens a lot, you became addicted to power, they all tell you how great you are and they mean it. It is more slippery when dressed up in God talk…” Steward understands quite well, this

is not easy to avoid. "It happens to all. You become a legend in your own mind detached from cosmic reality." And then you fall. "But God brings you down. You have a humbling experience." So, whether we see this as a personal therapy session or a reasoned argument, Steward exemplifies one view of NCN leadership that focuses on their wealth and their interest in power. What the story means for the future of AG – either as a narrative of decline, or a call to arms – remains to be seen.

On the other hand, decline has been a central story within the pentecostal movement from the start. Within months of the birth of Azusa, some of its primary activists described the weakening of spiritual bonds. The call for revival – because of decline – was a regular feature of AG publications throughout the 20th century. Frances Stiffler, AG activist, writes a short characteristic blub in the *Pentecostal Evangel* in 1939: "There is not enough life in some of our (denominational) churches to respond to cultivation. Their members are too spiritually sick to even listen to (missionary) promotion speakers."[417] These are fighting word, but also revival words and, most prominently, commonplace AG words. In other words, it is difficult to discern the material of actual decline, or see if the culture of revival simply evokes critique and schism – as a requirement for vitality.

While the question of declension is to some extent empirical – one can ask if the church grows, do people attend etc. – the data lacks clarity. We know that in the US, AG growth was stunning until the 1990s when it slowed except for the accumulation of immigrants, mostly from Latin America, many of whom are already

[417] "Others: a Digest of Christian Thought," Pentecostal Evangel, 1939_01_07, p 7

pentecostal. Further, only a small percentage of AG families now send their kids into the AG higher education system. Of 60,000 AG high school seniors each year, 16,000 enter their higher education program. The reverse is true as well – the subculture is diluted. Bethany, before its close, was only 47% AG, Vanguard is only 30%.[418] These statistics engender suggestions of AG bureaucratization and lost spiritual connection replaced by text, the secular, perhaps the modern. Yet, at the same time, AG continues to expand rapidly throughout the global south. That is to show evidence enough for both declension and expansion. How then to assess the declination critique: A decline due to too much organization? Too little? Did US AG move from Troeltsch's fiery sect to the rationalized church?[419] From faith to unbelief? From poor to rich? From uneducated to academic? Or, on the other hand, is it a manifestation of the internal tension that breeds revival? A tension within US AG? A tension emerging across classes and nations? A tension built on a sense of failed spirituality? It is hard to tell, but certainly ever-present and overlaid upon claims to incredible growth and success.

Conclusion

What makes a movement vital? I suspect it lies somewhere in tensions between the solidity of the church – the institutions, creeds, doctrines – and the vitality of the revival, with its conversions and transformations. It seems that those

[418] Statistics from interview with AG Higher Education staffers.
[419] Ernst Troeltsch and Olive Wyon, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931).

skilled at cultivation hold the two in deep tension, a traction that energizes. Thus, if movements are to persist, and not go the way of staid bureaucracy, they might need to keep the tension alive. In other words, strictness will only take a movement so far, engagement will only keep so much of the original, engagement as resistance is a necessary boundary tool, and all depends on the systematizing of affect.

For the folks at Bethany, and increasingly throughout AG, it is engagement with modernity that will either revitalize or kill their movement. The modern evangelical *weltanschauung* speaks loudly in the lifeworld of these pentecostals, perhaps only eclipsed by the voice of God. They no longer find separatism a viable option, or perhaps even, a desire. And the dialogue that ensues allows pentecostals a means to negotiate – internalize, appropriate, and challenge – modern religious-secular entanglements. My informants, mostly 2nd and 3rd generation pentecostals training for missions in the US, inhabit the core of modernity, and imbibe both its authority and constraints.

Put this way, it sounds like increasing concordance with modernity. Perhaps the young Western missionaries in training I spoke with are leading a wave of dissipation in which pentecostals give up spectacular and rigid modes of resistance such as public speaking in tongues and Biblical literalism and maybe thus slowly fizzle away. However, hybridity and appropriation were central to older pentecostalisms that, on the surface, looked very much askance on the secular culture around them. Aimee Semple MacPherson, and others, happily borrowed modern technologies and cultural forms, all while ostensibly holding the pentecostal line

against the carnal secular and for a literalist, conservative reading of the Bible.[420] If she could blend without losing her sense of self, why not this new generation of pentecostals as well? Perhaps most significantly however, up to this point, inhabiting the modern in this manner has not prefigured pentecostal devolution, instead signaling growth and change, if primarily globally. That is to say, it is less clear whether the pentecostal modern-supernatural combo serves as a Trojan horse to surreptitiously channel supernaturalism across the wall of secularism, or if it is it the dying gasp of a beleaguered tradition deeply attached to remnants of pre-modern enchantment but soon to perish as modernity sweeps the world over.

[420] Matthew Avery. Sutton, *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Resurrection of Christian America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2007).

Prologue: Section II Cultivation, Chapter IV

Pentecostal organizing strategies were highly effective. Thus, in this next section, I explore the sensory aptitudes and dispositions central to AG evangelism and the pedagogies that helped them spread. Throughout the late eighteenth and then nineteenth centuries, radical evangelicals learned to join a deeply systematic approach to organizing their community with increased emphasis on the possibility for nurturing a cultured, civilized, and therefore, godly self. Taking a page from Catholic monastic practices out into the broader church, radical evangelicals established organizing practices that included sustained attention to the everyday dispositions of practitioners and were linked also to powerful religious experiences nurtured through collective worship. Pentecostals built from this tradition of entangling the systematic and the sensory – they called it "cultivation," a language for the relationship between systematic human effort and an embodied yielding to the exigencies of the Holy Spirit.

In institutionalizing and expanding their practice, pentecostal evangelists developed a sensorium, or sensory culture, that supported a cluster of sensory-cognitive pedagogies rendering participants capable of specific experiences which both confirmed their spirituality and were relatively easily taught and held onto, thus made portable. This cultivation of pentecostal "body logics" became a signature element of the movement, what Robbins describes as a "hard cultural form," for its

ability to hold a shape in spite of vast cross cultural dissemination.[421] Its solidity also suggests that while object making clearly involves the crystallization of text as culture, and doctrine, bodies sediment as well. By the mid 20th century, raised hands, and a broad variety of "gifts of the spirit" made for an easily recognizable worship style described throughout the globe.

While these sensory aptitudes could solidify and spread easily, they also formed around pedagogies very consciously taught by preachers and laypeople trained within the massive bureaucratic machine developed by AG. This included thousands of churches and Bible Colleges, as well as multiple publishing houses and media outlets. Their pedagogies involved a systematically taught yielding to the Holy Spirit, but also actively striving for specific sensory affirmations. They came packaged in various lesson forms, from in-church practice to classroom and textbook learning. However, for a movement premised on the spontaneous intervention of a spirit guide, this explicit mechanism for transmission posed a problem, as we will see.

Further, not all sensations were acceptable. Some appeared as frenzied enthusiasm, others mechanical ritual, each exciting the modern anxiety over too little human autonomy, or the evangelical concern over too much. These practices were restrained. Such boundary making - cutting and winnowing of pentecostal dispositions – meant that teachers and communities constantly nurtured, but also monitored, worship and daily practice in an effort to discern the sacred from the profane – the kind of iterative process that Catherine Bell suggests not only

[421] Robbins, "Introduction."

recognizes division, but participates in its formation as well.[422] Further, the boundaries changed. Over the course of 100 years, AG revisited some of its initial doctrinal specificity around tongues and healing and built a seemingly more accessible and colloquial sense that a much more capacious set of visceral sensations might offer similar confirmation of spiritual legitimacy. This expanded body logic permeated beyond its initial pentecostal borders and into the broader evangelical and Catholic world – among those now called charismatic.

Finally, while cultivation suggests a process, and this is certainly a processual account of AG practice, it is a process that includes within it particular attention to nurturing ruptural experiences and consolidating their significance. In other words, however much one emphasizes precursive nurturing, other elements matter, including moments of radical disjuncture and then processes of assimilation and integration that follow.[423] For rupture only sticks when effectively set up and followed up – in bodies, minds, and communities.

The next chapters begin with stories of crystallizing sensory aptitudes among contemporary AG members and their resonance among the Promise Keepers, a charismatic organization. I then move to specific pedagogies of yielding and control disseminated within AG's higher education and missionary training networks. The third chapter in this section explores "cultivation" first as pentecostal language with very pragmatic sensibilities attached and then translated as a descriptor of 19th century

[422] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.
[423] Bruno Reinhardt, "Soaking in Tapes: The Haptic Voice of Global Pentecostal Pedagogy in Ghana," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 20, no. 2 (2014): 315–36.

radical evangelical practices that prefigured pentecostalism. Finally, in building a theory of cultivation, I explore the ways the cultivation of discontinuity might inspire intervention in current theoretical conversations about ritual, phenomenology, bodies and, of course, pentecostalism.

Taken together, these techniques - quite visible within AG, but also among pentecostalism's close cousins, the charismatics - were crucial elements of growth from a few thousand to over 500 million participants in 100 years.

Chapter IV: Pentecostal Body Logics: Cultivating a Modern Sensorium[424]

This chapter will argue that sensations, sensory propensities – and the religious doctrines that form reciprocally with them – all emerge from extended processes of winnowing, cultivating, and training, often with a careful eye to dialogue with a co-constitutive outside. This means an anxious awareness that fundamentalist, and other modern, readings of pentecostal worship can be quite critical. As such, devotions initially considered fluid and ephemeral are increasingly posed and practiced as graspable, speakable, and stable. Finally, while solidified cultural forms certainly metabolize and find traction in particular contexts, their durability might also engender transposition into other cultural spaces as they become what I call body logics, or portable sensory dynamics.

[424] Most of this chapter was published previously as: Josh Brahinsky, "Pentecostal Body Logics: Cultivating a Modern Sensorium," *Cultural Anthropology* 27, no. 2 (2012): 215–38.

More specifically, I follow a sensorium from its crucial institutionalization in early AG practice to more contemporary manifestations and among AG's charismatic cousins, the Promise Keepers. It traces the historical mutations of the body logics central to pentecostal pedagogies of conversion and commitment, especially in their relatively easy transposition to new contexts and ambivalent but productive relationship to modern secularity. In sum, I hope to suggest that religiously inflected sensory aptitudes, and perhaps even mind-body relationships, emerge through a process of careful cultivation and nurturance.

Pentecostal Body Logics

How do Pentecostals describe their certainty in a real and active God? Tanya Luhrmann says hearing God "might be, in some respects, like becoming a skilled athlete" and involves similar "talent and training."[425] Pentecostals are deeply enmeshed in this kind of learning. In building a locus for the connoisseur, sage, and savant of transcendence, pentecostals put intensive study into bodies, texts, practices, and their interrelationships so as to effectively invite experience of what they call the "Holy Spirit." They construct a veritable sports culture within which specific practices of devotion mutate, abstract and expand. Just as baseball caps transpose into hip-hop worlds, pentecostal practices also travel across boundaries – historical, political, denominational - and emerge newly situated yet continuing to hold some of their initial shape, though they may be turned sideways or backwards. These shifting

[425] Tanya M Luhrmann, "The Absorption Hypothesis: Learning to Hear God in Evangelical Christianity," *American Anthropologist 112* 1 (2010): 66.

practices inhabit and help create something thicker and denser; a culture of sensation, or sensorium, a contested realm that nurtures some practices and distinctions while starving, rejecting, or dessicating others.

In the past century, pentecostals expanded their vernacular ethos such that efforts to reach God no longer chiefly rely on stimulating the ability to speak in tongues or heal and instead, are now rooted in generalized sensory experience. The Assemblies of God initially coalesced around a distinctive identity as a spirit-filled fellowship in 1914. Theologically it crystalized doctrines of speaking in tongues and faith healing. Nearly 100 years later, their faith culture continues to hold some of its inaugural impetus to physically based certainty, yet the boundaries between what is and isn't God have changed. My informants describe religious certainty and inspiration in sensory terms: the more visceral, the more believable. Further, they tell stories of specific physical exercises that help energize such intimate experiences of God's presence. They do not limit themselves to the initial AG doctrine of tongues and healing, but instead suggest a more abstract and easily transposed sensibility – the physical as a mode of discernment. Nearly any sensation makes the case. Pentecostals call it "filled with the spirit" - an experience they understand as far more than simply physical. However, in the lifeworlds I explore, the body is central to making spiritual experience portable and authoritative.

In analyzing the cultural mechanics of conversion and certainty, scholars often pose discursive techniques against bodily ones. Susan Harding, for instance, describes the internalization of Christian testimony among her interlocutors. Fundamentalists

imbibe testimony.[426] Luhrmann, however, includes the body in what she calls "metakinesis," an explicitly multidimensional challenge to Harding's sense that discourse is what matters.[427] Yet, differences among their informants are key. Harding studies fundamentalists, a group deeply engaged with texts, while Luhrmann explores a pentecostal tradition with far more interest in cultivating sensation.

Others analyze religious experience through a "third term," hoping to escape mind-body dualisms altogether. Studying faith healing, Thomas Csordas sees bodies and minds join in immediate, holistic experience, what he calls the "preobjective" - a precursor to objectified mind-body divisions. People, he suggests, do not first experience the world through the frozen categories of Cartesian modernity. Instead they are engaged in a multifarious, co-constitutive, processual being "in itself" – not merely more than can be named, but actually previous to it.[428] Alternately, other thinkers escape dualisms by imaging a space either between or adjacent to minds and bodies, sometimes called "affect," sometimes "image."[429] These third term efforts often share a rough political trajectory. As with David Howes' "pluri-sensual" approach, we might "come to our senses," to challenge the violence of Cartesian object making.[430] I find these accounts tremendously appealing. They likely reveal something crucial as to how we actually function at some deep register; the more we understand neurophysiology, the more we can recognize the integration of mind and

[426] Harding, *The Book of Jerry Falwell*.
[427] Luhrmann, "Metakinesis." To be sure, neither Luhrmann nor Harding limit the process – they simply emphasize particular practices.
[428] Thomas J. Csordas, *Body/Meaning/Healing* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).
[429] Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*; Bergson, *Matter and memory*.
[430] David Howes, *The Varieties of Sensory Experience : A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses* (Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1991).

body and the importance of emotion. Also, third-term challenges to solidified hierarchies of race, class and gender seem quite powerful if the challenge is dualistic thinking, which they eschew. However, they also share a universalizing tendency that is likely to miss cultural specificity – culture is less than the whole of reality. If culture involves nurturing gleaning of sensibilities and dispositions, the jump to holism or a middle path is likely premature.

Instead, I take process as the means to dissolve solidified conceptions, and thus hope to understand the reciprocally cultivated, historical, and portable formation of minds and bodies as within a sensorium, Walter Ong's term for a given arrangement of sensory modalities.[431] Charles Hirschkind, for instance, emphasizes the sensorium as locus for "visceral modes of appraisal,"[432] which are vital moral and power imbued formations. As with Csordas, bodies and cultures work upon each other. Hirschkind also foregrounds cultivation - the carefully tended network of ideas, bodies and experiences that supports refining certain kinds of sensory apparatus, thereby suggesting a history of consciously nourished practice, not simply visceral irrationality or preobjective being.[433] Leigh Eric Schmidt strengthens this story of historical formation by showing how regular practice among 19th century evangelicals, both quotidian and sacred, shifted the senses found most compelling to

[431] Walter, "The Shifting Sensorium."
[432] William E Connolly, *Why I Am Not a Secularist* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).
[433] Charles Hirschkind, *The Ethical Soundscape Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).

his informants as well as the interpretations they offered.[434] The "sense-ratios" of a given community clearly change.[435] But this takes time. So although we might make ourselves in our lifetime, it is with the tools, constraints, and metabolic undercurrents of many generations. Further, sensorial genealogies contain specific logics or dynamics between internal elements and it appears that if these logics solidify, they can travel via evangelism. Here I borrow from Webb Keane's discussion of how the abstraction or "entextualization" of culture makes for "portable logics" especially open to transposition.[436] The pentecostal sensorium channels a portable sensory vernacular, a cultivated logic that fashions and entangles mind and body in a particular dynamic.

So when Luhrmann describes charismatics as somewhat physical and Harding tells of fundamentalists rooted in texts, they both describe a peculiar cultivated mode of being. Here, immediate experience, even down to its most visceral, emerges from a preexisting tradition of naming, knowing and feeling. And even the voluntaristic

---

[434] Leigh Eric. Schmidt, *Hearing Things: Religion, Illusion, and the American Enlightenment* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).

[435] From McLuhan in David Howes, *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader* (Oxford; New York: Berg, 2005), 23.

[436] Webb Keane's entextualization and Michel de Certeau's intextuation are models for text imagined as a gridding that makes for portability. While De Certeau adds a paradoxical element to his process, I still wonder why is textualization necessary for gridding, portability or legibility? Why not think of cells or the visceral as grids themselves? I see little reason to take the bodily as somehow more rational or systematic than language, or vice versa. We know there are limits to linguistic coherence – Derridian, Butlerian and Cantorian traces and gaps. And of course there are limits to somatic coherence as well. Neither is purely wild, nor pure constraint. In fact, neither are constrained from the outside. Rather, both can be understood as internally organized for production as much as domination. Further, the ethical question is not the grid, but its purpose – ethics does not emerge by virtue of the relative organization of a body, mind or text, but rather by virtue of relationships between them – are they kind or mean, not reasonable or silly. Webb Keane, *Christian Moderns: Freedom and Fetish in the Mission Encounter* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007); Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (University of California Press, 2011).

elements, the practices of attunement and cultivation, are honed and contained by pre-existing human traditions. In this view at least, there is no preobjective being and the primary locus for inspiration, the site of traction for mobilization, in a given culture – i.e. mind, body, emotion, or holism - varies according to the particular tradition that nurtures and sifts it.

This claim to cultural specificity does not deny the tremendous value in trying to recognize the muddled, entwined nature of human existence. Holism is real. Yet, when we speak, it narrows, when we entrain, it narrows, and also when we feel, it narrows. So, although each of these processes inform the others, their entangled interaction often results in something less multifarious. In this ethnography for instance, I find that my informants form elements of themselves as increasingly concrete, through stories, practices, feelings and, of course, doctrines. That is, they repeatedly solidify their particular pentecostal sense of the forms of experience that authorize – congealing first tongues and healing doctrines and then later a more abstract body logic. Bell's iterative boundary making is expanded here to include the sensory.[437] So, instead of simply mind-body holism, or posing a pre-reflexive category as key to religious alterity and transformation, I suggest that bodies and minds co-constitute through culture (including religious doctrine). As such, they form relationships – hierarchy, unity, duality, a mixture – based, not simply on our shared neurophysiology, but also on the manufacture of mind-body dynamics. In this light,

[437] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.

universal notions of pure discourse, corporeality, or holism seem less analytical than prescriptive.

Of course, any depiction of Christian sensuality deserves deep suspicion - John Wesley's joining of "the image of the beast" to "sensual appetites and desires" has been repeated ad infinitum, certainly among pentecostals.[438] I insist, however, on taking the sensory authority described by my informants as significant. First, because they say so. My main evidence comes from asking, "where does your confidence in God come from?" Moreover, training manuals for ministry exhibit a history of explicit cultivation and contest regarding sensory authority. Finally, some of the pentecostals I talked with recognize – although somewhat awkwardly – that their sensory aptitudes, to some degree, rely on careful tending.

This essay traces the AG sensorium from its formation in doctrine to its contemporary transfigurations and transpositions outside of AG as well. In doing so, I hope to show that this scrupulously cultivated assemblage of doctrines and corporeal traditions mutated significantly while also solidifying an abstracted and thus portable core of sensory aptitudes and logics that serves pentecostal diffusion within modernity.

[438] John Wesley, *Wesley's Standard Sermons Consisting of Fortyfour Discourses ... to Which Are Added Nine Additional Sermons ... Ed. and Annotated by Edward H. Sugden: Vol. 1-2* (London: Epworth, 1961), 230–1.

Case Study 1: Bethany University

Fast forward to 2007: Since 1919 when it began as Glad Tidings, Bethany has been an AG missions training school and its sensorium negotiates the seeming solidity of the AG tradition. Each year faculty affirms the AG statement of faith. And as would be expected, students describe their religiosity as active negotiation with the AG doctrine in which only the presence of speaking in tongues indicates spiritual growth. In reply, by asserting that multiple sensations reveal the presence of an interventionist God, students challenge more narrowly conceived theology. Their logic of sensation, or what I call body logic, escapes the bounds of doctrine to bring authority to broader realms of physicality. Even so, Bethany devotion is relatively low-key. On most days worship lasts only 20 minutes before the preacher takes up the mantle. Students sing, raise their hands and sway back and forth. Dancing is not allowed. Few speak in tongues. Still, the corporeal dominates their colloquial narratives of spirituality.

Again and again I ask: "What gives you confidence that your God is real?" The few responses that focus on either intellectual logic (the world's complexity requires a creator) or practical transformation (believers act better) are drowned out by a cascade of empirical sensory experiences that might be described as supernatural, yet embodied. Through these narratives, Bethany participants voice their consensus that assurance resides in their five senses, with physicality as primary. "The reason I still am a Christian is I've felt God and I know he is there." I am unable to get a clear sense of what exactly he meant by "felt," but his use of the senses as

primary is telling. Aldus is explicit, the feeling is brief, but convincing: "I fell back. Felt I had been shot with electricity. Whether or not I had been manipulated I don't worry about it. At that moment, I decided to come to Bethany." He recognizes the potential for something less than genuine, perhaps manipulation, but his powerful feelings rule the day. Another pronounces her certainty that God is "felt" with such common-sensical assuredness, it seems almost absurd to question further. Sensation here, is in many ways irrefutable.

For pentecostals at Bethany to merely see or hear spiritual language is good and useful, but to feel or to see someone else feeling, is far better. And to feel while speaking in tongues is even clearer as it engages several senses: to feel, see, hear and thus confirm. As one explains, "When I speak in tongues I know I have a living intimate God." Another said, "One kid spoke a word [in tongues] and this other kid starts interpreting it. The guy said 'who just touched me?'" No one had. "'When you touched me I felt a physical sensation tingling or a warmth.'" The multiple sensory tale serves as a model or script for clarity and credence. Disbelief and marginalization offer constant threats from all kinds of observers, even pentecostals. Thus each sensory element adds a layer of potency; the more feelings, the more trustworthy the affirmation of spirit. One student explains,

> In the doctor's chair, I thought I would die. Started praying the Lord's Prayer and heard the words 'Do you really mean it? Do really mean what you are saying?' I said 'Yes.' immediately. Then I physically felt a warmth. Like somebody wrapped one of those hot blankets all around me.

And it permeates the mundane: "I walk around feeling that." Some combine the sensory and the pragmatic, "I felt him inside. I heard him talk to me. I felt the warmth. I've seen a difference in my life." Common-sense narratives evoke the physical as a pivot for God's voice and for life change.

Yet, these are not simple reductions to the senses. Late in my third year of field-work at Bethany I hear more complex responses than initially. Perhaps I now signal more understanding? Students are more comfortable? Some describe discursive interpellation, merging with the Scriptural narrative. Others suggest body-mind holism. A few explicitly disregard rational arguments and pose most everything as straight-ahead faith.

Even so, given the explicit pentecostal effort to attune responsive bodies, it makes sense that off-the-cuff responses to questions of certainty often return to what one student calls a "tangible understanding." As another described, "Sometimes I would say I feel there is heat coming over my body… there's been times like in church services where my hands have become really red." Then she links sensation to spirit: "It'll be because the spirit of God is just covering me." Further, beyond simply tongues, a broad array of sensations matter. "I might cry, I might rock back and forth, or I might speak in tongues." Such tales regularly evoke a moment of realized change, transformation of the deepest recesses of the self. Yet also, this sensory experience is carefully cultivated in Bethany culture and AG texts.

Healing also serves as one of the most common sources of certainty. Dr. Stewart, Bethany missions professor, tells a story of the dynamic between healing and

confidence: “Healing evangelist Robert Fiero was paralyzed (for 25 years) and miraculously healed. Like, he was thrown out of his wheelchair. You can imagine what that does. People’s faith goes skyrocketing.” One student explains, “I’ve had encounters with God. The most clear. The most factual. I’ve seen miracles. Saw someone’s leg grow. People healed from cancer.” Angela offers similar support. “Why believe in God? … I’ve been delivered from depression. I’ve seen my mom delivered from chemical depression. She doesn’t have to take pills. She was bi-polar. I’ve seen extravagant things… I’ve talked to people who have had physical healings.” Pentecostal narratives often include stories of meds tossed in the garbage. “Father looks like he is dying. They got no money for a doctor, no money for anything. But [grandma’s] a woman who has always read the Bible and says… ‘I believe in you and I don’t have anything else. Would you heal my husband?’ And he gets well. She throws all the drugs away.” Pills in the trash a very clear sign of religious predominance.

Healing, however, is seen as a catalyst, not an end. For James, the warm melting feeling that rippled through his body during a prayer session on a freezing afternoon signaled the presence of the Holy Spirit, but was more significant for its incitement to action: it was time to get more involved in his church. As Angela explains, healing is an entry point for a relationship with God. “With all these stories of healings it was more than just a physical story of healing. It was also an emotional thing… [or] something with the character of the person. It reveals how God is a personal God. He doesn’t just want to heal us. He wants to reveal more of himself to

us wants to draw us closer. Show us his character. Show us how he is close." What could be more intimate than physical healing? "There was another girl. She was going through a lot with her family they've had financial problems they've had physical problems, according to her." She experiences the Holy Spirit in her body. "She said it was like a weight taken off of her shoulders: 'I can let this go.'" And now healing translates into personal effectivity. "I can speak authoritatively I don't have to be quiet.' I don't know how to explain it but God just, he does things that aren't possible for human being to accomplish on their own." Personal empowerment, and transformed character rest on an initial sense of certainty engendered by physical healing.

Case Study 2: The Promise Keepers

Pentecostal body logics are portable. Among the 500 million converts across the globe, the vast majority seem to have taken up the physicality along with varied levels of adherence to the doctrinal elements. According to D.B Barrett's - likely exaggerated, but still roughly useful – global statistics, Classical (white) pentecostals, made up primarily of AG, grew from 5,000 in 1900 to roughly 71.5 million in 2000. Meanwhile, the charismatic movement emerged much later, first counted at nearly 4 million in 1970 and then 222 million by the turn of the century. They were joined also by what Barrett calls the third wave, which went from 50,000 to 65 million in the

same time period.[439] Together the charismatics and the third wave make up a large chunk of the global expansion of pentecostalism, which regardless the quibbling over the details, was clearly vast. This next section involves ethnography among The Promise Keepers - a mostly charismatic traveling revival and site where my earlier fieldwork demonstrated the seeming portability of pentecostal body logics.

Thus, we switch sites: A football stadium in the first decades of the 21st century; Anywhere from 10-80,000 men; A weekend of singing, dancing and praying inside while, outside, the parking lot fills with RVs and barbeques. Promise Keeper (PK) conferences run by formula, with an emcee and motivational speakers interspersed every hour and a half by thirty minutes of music, singing and dancing. Each speaker presents his testimony, the emcee leads chants and call and response. Skits and videos of personal transformations, or evangelism in prisons rotate with men on motorcycles, in the military, and occasional Humvees. You can buy Christian insurance, internet filters, movies about Jesus and PK's vast array of books and music, typically, loud Christian rock. As lyrics spring up on 7 video screens, thousands of men stand and sing their love of God. Some dance for hours drenched in sweat, others merely raise their arms and sway.

The two-day conferences generate several emotional peaks - altar calls. Brought to the edge of the stage for an encounter with Jesus, men form small groups, holding each other, crying, singing and chanting. "Jesus, Jesus, Jesus…" Volunteers move through the crowd, collecting written affirmations of renewed religious

[439] Stanley M Burgess, McGee, and Alexander, *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* (Grand Rapids, MI: Regency Reference Library, 1988), 812–813.

commitment and contact information for small men's groups back home. After the last speaker says goodbye, the loudspeakers open up with an incredibly powerful series of booms, like watching fireworks, from two feet away. I close my eyes, plug my ears, and feel the sound pounding my chest.

I spend my time asking, "What makes this powerful? Meaningful? Why do you feel assurance that God is involved?" Men respond with two broad narratives: describing first, the safe all male environment and second, the sensations in their bodies that confirm the sacred nature of the gathering. Most studies of PK emphasize gender, I will explore the body instead.[440] PK is non-denominational, not explicitly pentecostal. However, in their colloquial affirmation of God's presence PK adherents apparently share a faith in sensations. And this is precisely the point. PK exemplifies "pentecostalization" through which pentecostal practices increasingly permeate broader Christian culture.[441] However, unlike the cultivation strategies at Bethany framed by theology, the PK sensorium appropriates popular culture to nourish the sensory aptitudes that inspire certainty.

Founded by the football coach from the University of Colorado, PK draws its rhetoric from sports metaphors and its rallies inspire some of the same feelings that massive sporting events do. Chanting back and forth across the stadium, doing the wave, and cheering for men who respond to the altar call all reference the excitement

---

[440] L. Dean Allen, *Rise Up, O Men of God: The Men and Religion Forward Movement and Promise Keepers* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2002); George N. Lundskow, *Awakening to an Uncertain Future: A Case Study of the Promise Keepers* (New York: P. Lang, 2002).
[441] Some critics say up to 80% of the NAE became charismatic or pentecostal. i.e. Cloud, *The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement*.

and "subcultural" safety of sport. "[The sports arena] is one of the few places that men can ever be emotional about anything and be OK without being softies."[442] Thus, powerful physical sensation can appear mundane and acceptable.

PK also borrows sensate strategies from pop culture such as Christian rock music, multiple video screens, dancing and vast crowds chanting or singing all engage male bodies in worship. The striking quality here, however, is not so much volume or intensity, but repetition. PK conferences include a half hour musical interlude after every hour and a half. Each half hour set repeats roughly the same songs. It is a ritual aimed at the deep unconscious, but via a pop culture easily accessible to mainstream audiences.

The therapeutic language running throughout PK conferences cites ritual sensations as openings for psychological renewal. Encouraged to release tensions, pains and worries, PK men respond with a tremendous outpouring of emotions as they sing, dance, cry and form small groups, holding each other closely. Following the evangelical tradition of AA and the recovery movement, therapeutic culture can foment as well as explain somatic renewal.

Strikingly, fundamentalist critics tend to most clearly articulate the sensate aspects of PK practice, emphasizing healing, crying, trembling and falling as problematic. Sarah Leslie worries that mass rallies with chants, yells and music - especially rap music - might create altered consciousness and thus invoke Gnostic

[442] Randels George and Becky Beal 2002, "What Makes a Man?: Religion, Sport and Negotiating Masculine Identity in The Promise Keepers," in *In With God on Their Side Sport in the Service of Religion* (Tara Magdalinski. ed. NY: Routledge, n.d.), 171.

heresy.[443] Phil Arms describes a "doctrine of extra-biblical extremism that focuses on seeking sensually-oriented experiences and utterances directly from almighty God."[444] He mocks the "miracles" of PK's founders in the Vineyard Church, focusing on their most extreme moments - laughing, barking and roaring revivals.

Yet as Stephen Denby, PK song leader responds, somatic religious experience did not begin with PK:

> For men to be very physically involved in worship, with the running, jumping, clapping, shouting, is not a new thing. It's in the Bible… it is physical because I think men respond that way… It was very physical for Abraham. He had to get up early, he had to gather materials, and he had to walk… The manifestation of worship is very physical.

And, PK conferences do engender powerful sensation. As one participant explained:

> I wasn't expecting it —there were like fifteen or twenty thousand people there, and we were all just worshipping God. Having a good time, doing God things, and guy things, all at the same time… You can feel the—I don't know if it would be the Holy Spirit sensation—but you can feel *something*.

It is this feeling – "something" – that, like Durkheim's collective effervescence, creates a sense of solidity in a highly ephemeral situation. Another participant adds detail: "There's nothing like 60 or 70,0000 men all praying at the same time. It's like it makes your hair stand upon your back, it makes you excited. It's like taking an anvil off your shoulders." Or:

---

[443] Sarah Leslie, *The Pagan Roots of Promise Keepers: Resurrecting Pagan Rites* (Cambridge: SMP, 1995).
[444] Phil. Arms, *Promise Keepers: Another Trojan Horse* (Houston, TX: Shiloh Publishers, 1997), 245.

> It's very emotional and yet it's physical too, it's satisfying. Yeah, it's something that you can feel. It can be in the form of goose bumps, it can be in the form of warmth throughout the whole body.

Hair, backs, anvils, food, comfort, warmth, goosebumps – these are very physical images. Sensation confirms the spirituality of PK ritual.

PK participants develop a sensory vernacular in which the role of pentecostal tongues and healing is taken by a collection of visceral depictions – tingling, warmth, even heat such that one can claim to feel "on fire for the Lord." The most common trope, however, is thick. "During worship, you just felt His presence and it was thick." Or, "Yeah the spirit of God was thick in that place." Another joins the physical, the spiritual and the thick:

> The spirit of God -- you can just feel his power. People were getting chains broken off, people were being set free, people were being saved… [It was] all over your body. You can't explain, it you gotta' feel it. But it's like, it's thick. You just feel your legs your arms, God is all around you… you feel it in your body and you also know it in your heart, in your spirit, man. I mean we got a spirit ourselves, you can feel that in your spirit. You know that it's God.

Certain turns of phrase signal a physicality, observed or directly experienced, that supports metaphysical claims. However, it is unclear what is the cause, the movement, the thinking, the praying, sense of God's immediacy? I suspect some combination of these.

One man describes a personal somatic experience that verifies the supernatural, although not without controversy:

> I have felt the presence of God before… you can call me a nutball, but I have witnesses. One time I had lymph nodes the size of golf balls sticking out of

> my throat... We went on this trip to Mexico when I was young, and this whole church congregation put their hands on me, and thirty minutes after that—and I was seriously about to go to the hospital… I was fine. Since that particular experience, it's been difficult for me to pretend that there is no such thing as God.

These stories evoke a shared culture of the sensory in which ethical, political and religious sensibilities are nourished by the physical and vice versa. While PK participants cultivate physical sensation through the quotidian forms of music, therapy and sports, they ascribe meaning to these experiences that link the somatic and collectivity to the spiritual.

PK events are structured with acute awareness of these sensory dynamics. Unlike Bethany, with its direct ties to AG, a para-church organization like PK does not offer clearly articulated denominational doctrine through which participants can measure their devotion. However, PK is deeply enmeshed in a pentecostal lineage. Of the fifteen members on the PK board in 1999, over half were leaders of charismatic or pentecostal churches. Both founders, the first president, and three of the five speakers at the first conference were members of the Vineyard Church, a "Third Wave" offshoot of pentecostalism renowned for its highly physical worship.[445]

John Wimber, founder of the Vineyard, argued that conversion to Christianity is facilitated by supernatural power manifesting in healing and other sensate experiences. He developed the course at Fuller Seminary to train others in his healing

[445] Chrasta Michael James, "Jesus People to Promise Keepers: A Revival Sequence and Its Effect on Late Twentieth-Century Evangelical Ideas of Masculinity" (PhD, University of Texas at Dallas, 1998), 211, 220. Third Wave is a term used to describe a collection of churches formed in the 1970s that model their practices after Pentecostals although sometimes with different cultural, political and theological leanings.

ministry. In his teacher's manual, *Signs and Wonders and Church Growth*, Wimber offers archetypes for sensory-based evangelism:

> In London recently, two young American girls came upon a Japanese man sitting on a bench. They asked him if he knew Jesus. When he replied that he did not and he was a Buddhist, they asked him if they could "pray on him." He said yes and they laid hands on him and asked the Holy Spirit to come upon him. He immediately began to weep and they asked, "Do you feel that?" "Yes, oh yes" he replied. "That's Jesus," they said. "Would you like to know him?" He said, "Yes," and was converted. Only after he had received the touch of God and responded to him did they tell the claims of Christ.

Doctrine here is secondary, not the key to conversion. As Wimber writes, "Our thesis is that *supernatural power* added to evangelism can bypass the normal resistance of an individual or group… [emphasis in original]."[446] His teachings provide serious investigation into pentecostal body practices and their relationship to conversion and commitment. PK conferences evince this deliberate animation of corporeal evangelism as well. Bodies here function as a crucial medium for verification of the supernatural – a visceral mode of appraisal that traveled from the early Assemblies of God to the Promise Keepers.

Cultivation and Modernity

The anxieties expressed by participants in pentecostal sensoria over their own physicality attest to an ever-present awareness of the critical eye of the modern world they inhabit. For their emphasis on the sensory makes it difficult for them to feel

[446] John. Wimber, *Signs and Wonders and Church Growth* (Placentia, CA: Vineyard Ministries International, 1984), Outline.

comfortably intelligible as the autonomous individuals seemingly required for dominant Protestant and Secular subjectivities. They express anxiety over the potential for being manipulated (lacking agency) and at the same time, a concern that they might mistake God's agency for human (too much agency). Thus, negotiation with modernity manifests in their assertion that individual senses can authorize and a simultaneous critique of collective physicality as atavistic and potentially mechanical.

Oddly perhaps, certainty that is predicated upon sensation might provide authority for a society energized by scientific approaches to reality – remember, early pentecostals even borrowed scientific lingo, calling tongues the "initial evidence" of the spirit. In fact, pentecostals join a long line of philosophers and theologians in constructing what they often call "materialisms" where the senses legitimize in the face of modernity. In the 1800s the young Hegelians debated sense based legitimacy like that sponsored by Scottish and then US evangelical common sense narratives, the producerism of the Populist Party, and later fundamentalists.[447] All offered a material – ostensibly more real, genuine, grounded - response to the "idealism" of modernity. Likewise, for pentecostals, reducing complex spirit to simple physicality aims to communicate about something with little authority in a modern paradigm – perhaps it allows pentecostals to be heard.

However, among my informants, the modern emerges more often as suspicion of collective sensuality and affirmation of individual rationality – they develop their

[447] Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *Protestants in an Age of Science the Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977); Michael Kazin, *The Populist Persuasion: An American History* (NY: Basic Books, 1995); Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture.*

experiences in a negotiation with a critical modern lens that never quite disappears. Thus, some PK participants describe uncertainty over interpreting somatic experience. Their anxiety manifests both as a concern over the ephemeral nature of experience and the dangers of collective enthusiasm:

> You have to be careful… experiences are fickle. We all have experiences, and they can be good, they can be bad, but they're transitory. Feelings are transitory. So what I try to do when I come to these events is to experience them, in the fullness of what that experience is, but at the same time, I'm trying to take in stuff on a rational level… Because I know you can be manipulated in large-scale events or settings like this.

That is, collectively inspired experiences don't last and might even signal a lack of individual agency. Perhaps rational thought adds continuity to fleeting, but powerful, sensations. Others express similar unease:

> I think it's more hype… And if you're not careful, and you get caught up in the hype, then you miss the whole object of the whole thing… I'm not psyched, no. I enjoy listening to the speakers, but I don't get "rah rah."

Here, emotional response undermines genuine spirituality. Further, perhaps the influence of the crowd delegitimizes: "if there was crowd manipulation involved in it, then it's not true worship, then it's not true faith." Faith, in this case, means beliefs freely chosen by individuals and controlled, not by frenzy or mechanical manipulation, but by the Holy Spirit. Groups form a danger zone, the antithesis of modern individualism, but also spirituality. A rational believing individual confronted by the collective possibilities of revivalism finds them anxiety producing.

Several Bethany students respond similarly: "I think a lot of times pentecostals get caught up in the hype and a lot of us have grown up and learned to calm down and not get caught up in the hype and that's why Paul had to write Corinthians because people were getting crazy." Another agrees, "tongues is not chaos," he emphasizes. But tongues is not mechanical either, he firmly asserts. Students often express their apprehension that the cultivation of bodily aptitudes might disrupt the purity of their experience. I ask if they practice or train to speak in tongues. Their reply is often horrified denial.

Yet, such trepidation regarding collectivity – frenzied or routinized - seems counterintuitive after hearing my ethnography of groups systematically nurturing sensory aptitudes that lean ecstatic. And I think it is confusing. Pentecostals go multiple directions - embracing individual agency in choosing conversion, while diligently practicing and studying so as to effectively yield to God's spontaneous "gifts." From an analytical perspective, there is a tension between them that might be productive.

To be sure, their reticence to admit to training also makes sense: when I describe pentecostal training to non-pentecostals they often see it as evidence of false piety – the notion that spontaneity equals authenticity is deeply embedded in our protestant leaning culture. In fact, the apparent contradiction between human effort and God's participation rests on a particular modern vision of religion. Instead of accessing religion through discipline and ascesis, many modern thinkers anticipate an easily evident subtext, something to look for, but not requiring any kind of honed

propensities. If religion engages the sacred, they ask, can it emerge from profane organization, striving and planning? It seems a religiously inflected rendering of modern autonomous subjectivity.

In a similar vein, classic descriptions of pentecostals, from scholars, and fundamentalist critics play especially to fears of mob irrationality among the poor. Pentecostals were poverty stricken, "barefoot hill folk" infested with "hookworms";[448] overly sensual, "with 'rank free lovers' prowling around seducing young girls and wives"; and uneducated, "possessing only a limited vocabulary of very crude stock expressions."[449] Poor people, scholars argued, found catharsis a distraction from their class oppression.[450] Pentecostals, uncontrollable bodies, spiritual excess, poverty and ignorance – all were considered especially terrifying for their lack of autonomy.

Utopian Possibilities

This possibility of cultivating sensory aptitudes appeals to my ethnographic quest for new thinkable ways of being in the world. I see no necessary connection between collective cultivation and falsification. Indeed, any adept trains, and whether in sports, music or spirit, freedom emerges from discipline. It can take years of practice to improvise or let go. So instead of manipulation, cultivation might reveal

[448] W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1941).
[449] Russell P. Spittler, "Corinthian Spirituality: How a Flawed Anthropology Imperils Authentic Christian Existence," in *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism*, ed. Edith Waldvogel. Blumhofer, Russell P. Spittler, and Grant Wacker (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 3, 30.
[450] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*.

the utopian project in pentecostalism – an expression of both collective and individual self-fashioning, a politics of participation in the (ir)rational effort to realize something different – like the Kingdom of God on earth. Further, recognizing the nourishing of particular pentecostal mind-body dynamics over generations implies the potential for multiple other possible arrangements and thus denaturalizes and perhaps destabilizes Cartesian dualities, which seemingly aligns me with phenomenological and third term scholarship, while still refusing to yield my sense of history to preobjectivity. Cultivation, it seems, may be my third term.

Along these lines, some pentecostal leaders work their sensorium with an explicitly utopian bent. Several recent theologians argue that the contemporary charisma of pentecostalism relies on its affinity to a postmodern holism – not Cartesian dualism. These scholars follow Donald Miller who says the pentecostal tradition has "taken a step beyond their liberal counterparts in that they seek a unity between mind and body rather than subjugating all knowledge to the realm of cognition."[451] At Bethany, they call this a "holistic pneumatology" – pneumatology being the study of the Holy Spirit. Faculty in the theology department argue that any narrative of gifts of the spirit needs to recognize more than sensory authority, but minds, bodies and souls as ultimately, but also immanently, enmeshed. Further, they claim that this holistic perspective, in its rejection of modern binaries, is "postmodern," quite appealing in the present moment, but also, like Howes, they see holism as an ethical prerequisite. Posed against ostensive rigidity and violence

[451] Donald E. Miller, *Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the New Millennium* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997), 122.

engendered by fundamentalist arguments for strict textual inerrancy, pentecostal holism might nourish flexible, ecumenical, social-justice loving sensibilities – a radical departure from previous emphasis on conversion to the exclusion of earthly concerns. And although this ethnography didn't find holism in the present vernacular of practitioners, perhaps pentecostal theologians can cultivate something new, eventually replacing the present pentecostal body logic with a utopian vision of sensory holism.[452]

Conclusion

People have been speaking in tongues and healing through faith for thousands of years, but early pentecostals made them goals, central measures of Christian certainty, and they developed systematic methods for cultivating such specific sensory experiences. Like fundamentalist testimony and Calvinist prosperity, pentecostal corporeality provides a means towards spiritual legitimacy. For pentecostals, bodies matter. But more, the significant body emerges from a consciously cultivated sensorium where contested negotiations between doctrine and practice as well as the modern outside invigorate vernacular corporeal logics. Thus, tracing the pentecostal sensorium from early chaos to institutionalization as tongues and healing within the Assemblies of God, and then to the colloquial "any sensation goes" at Bethany and among the Promise Keepers reveals a congealed continuity that

[452] There are those, of course, who argue for an innate dualism - Astuti, "Are We All Natural Dualists?"; Cohen, *The Mind Possessed*.

abstracts the initial sensory doctrine into something more simple, and portable - a body logic that travels.

Epilogue: Making and Transposing Cultures

The processes traced throughout this essay suggest several broader patterns and possibilities for world making and cultural dissemination, what I think of as organizing. Put simply, the cutting and solidifying necessary to produce a hard cultural form might provide extra portability, and also might be the necessary reply to the valorization of holism.

First, the pentecostalization of contemporary Christianity reflected in PK speaks to the vast portability of pentecostal practices – now estimated to involve nearly half a million people globally. One can paint pentecostal expansion in political-economic terms, through deprivation theories or via the glow of modernity within translocal processes.[453] Instead, Joel Robbins emphasizes the ways that pentecostal practice is a "hard" cultural form that excels in crossing vast divides while retaining much of its initial shape – tongues and healing especially.[454] Others who study global pentecostalism also regularly remark at its continuity across time and space. My research affirms Robbins' emphasis on practice, adding only that the actual content of his hard form might need renovation and reduction. Body logics might be even more portable than tongues and healing given the relative ease with

[453] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*; André. Corten and Ruth Marshall, *Between Babel and Pentecost: Transnational Pentecostalism in Africa and Latin America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001).
[454] Robbins, "Introduction."

which a simple physicality unbound from complex theology can permeate cultures. This likely describes Promise Keepers who internalize the pentecostal sensory ethos without its full doctrine.

Second, body logics offers a reply to holism: while complexity and co-constitution are crucial analytic tools, world making also entails exclusions and objectifications, places for solidifying muddle into portable, teachable and practicable simplicity. However, in what I think resonates closely with recent pentecostal theologies, I find something disturbing about my simplification of pentecostal spirituality. Body logics are perhaps a reductive profanation of something deliciously complex and multifarious. Yet here is the key: a reciprocal holistic process also simplifies in its rejection of other possibilities. In forming their sensorium, moving through sensing to speaking and writing doctrine and then back again, pentecostals engage a messy oscillation by which the practices, the religious texts and the actual bodies are honed and refined, and elements of culture congeal, losing some of their polyvalent dynamism. Instead of the holism posed by scholars drawing from Merleau–Ponty and others, pentecostals objectify to authorize ineffable experience, a "strategic essentialism" for religious mobilization.[455] By strategic essentialism I mean to portray a process of intertwining power dynamics by which things are solidified; one process including both the making of essence and a battling over ends, means,

[455] Spivak Gayatri, *In Other Worlds: Essays on Cultural Politics* (London: Metheun, 1987).Spivak's term valorizes resistance. Pentecostals do see themselves as oppressed. However, they don't sit easily in the left/ post-colonial community that recognizes strategic essentialism.

and boundaries.[456] Thus, instead of the whole as the dominant structure in pentecostal practice, it is particular portable sensory aptitudes. Thus, however much I find mind-body holism appealing, it is not (at least, not yet) the pragmatic cultural mode of my informants. Further, recent anthropologies invoke Hegel's cycle of objectification and internalization to suggest that such objectification is simply what we all do; it is the apparently concrete moment in a history of fluid transformation.[457] They describe people freezing surroundings through language. I argue that we crystalize sensory capabilities similarly.

Finally, from my position outside of pentecostalism, the ethico-political intrigue in this story does not reside in specific physical details, and although it may involve the mind-body dynamic created – perhaps holism engenders kindness? It more certainly manifests in the possibilities for world making evoked. In other words, I find it intriguing and hopeful to recognize the malleability of sensoria. However, towards this question, Donna Haraway does the Hegelian anthropologists one better, suggesting not only the inevitability of objectification in world making, but also the ethical necessity of recognizing and fully inhabiting the exclusions, violence and objectification comprising human existence.[458] In this light, my narrative of pentecostal cultivation suggests that realizing expansive imaginaries

---

[456] For if, "essentialism is the condition of possibility for any political axiology," it is also required for all cultural sedimentation. Kirby, *Telling Flesh,* 71. And while "strategic" might imply more intent than is generally observable, I am thinking of strategic as suggesting a concatenation of forces. Derrida points out that all philosophers return "strategically" to a seemingly a-priori origin. (in Ibid., 98.) It is thus a necessary gesture in philosophy, politics, and I suggest culture.

[457] Kramer, *Switchbacks Art, Ownership, and Nuxalk National Identity*; Miller, *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*.

[458] From course on Religion and Science, UCSC fall 2010. And Donna Haraway, "When Species Meet: Staying with the Trouble," *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space* 28, no. 1 (2010).

entails also a contracting and cementing of possibilities; creatively fashioning a mode of existence – a sensory culture - animates not all the complexity of being, but a narrow slice of the real, an objectification nurtured and dreamed into being.

Prologue: Section II Cultivation, Chapter V

Pentecostal cultivation manifests very clearly in the body. In the previous chapter, I explored transitions in the pentecostal cultivation of their sensorium by tracing AG approaches to the body from early chaos to the institutionalization of a doctrine of tongues and healing, and then to more contemporary colloquial sensibilities in which most any sensation verifies the presence of an active God. When Bethany students describe certainty that God exists, most participate in a sensory vernacular, a form of everyday sensory intelligibility and communication, that foregrounds physical sensation as confirmation – a body logic. This physical authority emerges from a carefully cultivated sensory culture where sensate devotion marks spiritual growth. This chapter continues this exploration by focusing more explicitly on the contests that channel appropriate devotion and the training texts produced by AG that consolidate everyday debates into something with heft, continuity, and denominational authority - perhaps the next best thing to scripture, a Mishnah or Sunna for "Gifts of the Spirit."

Chapter V: Cultivating Discontinuity: To Nurture and Contain Rupture[459]

The nudge: Reed's Story

Here is the spooky part… 5 am, driving with the missions team to the airport - 4 team members, me and my wife. Get a call, flights are cancelled, we pray and are booked on a better flight. First obstacle fixed. Halfway through the jet way I get yelled at. 'Come back. We don't have you on this flight.' The rest of team is already on. I tell 'em we are a team, we will meet in a little town in Romania and I need to be with them, I've never done this before. The guy at the counter looks up. He says 'Trust me.' Then [two more times] 'Trust me.' Well, he books us up to first class. I am a big guy – not so comfortable in small seats. Now, I am giddy but looking around, nobody is smiling – where is all the comfort and happiness? I open up to thanking God for getting me there in comfort to do his work.

[In a Romanian church]
Something tells me to lay my hand on this little lady. It is a cold snowy day, even in church we are wearing jackets. I am praying with my hand over her. It is like something pours oil from the top of my head and my whole body warms up from the top down. Not to the sweat, but just a warm feeling. The pastor is speaking in tongues. Romanians around me are speaking in tongues. I had heard it before but never had it interpreted or understood it. Then there was a clarity. To me they were

[459] Most of this chapter was published previously as: Josh Brahinsky, "Cultivating Discontinuity: Pentecostal Pedagogies of Yielding and Control," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (2013): 399–422.

speaking plain English, the Romanian over here was speaking plain English. I was like, 'whoah that's bizarre.'

The lady turns around and just openly starts weeping. I'm like, 'great what have I done now? Who have I offended?' Well come to find out - she is speaking of a vision that she has had for the past six months. Dreaming of someone with my face, my build. You know, big guy, goatee, bald, the whole thing. She even drew pictures, and the pictures looked like me. I have a sword in one hand and with the other I am pulling young people up into heaven. It was a powerful thing but I still have the hesitancy, the skepticism. 'OK who is the weird Romanian lady speaking this stuff to me.' I go to the pastor who organized the conference. 'Do you know her? Does she speak prophecies a lot?' He says yeah, shuffles some papers around. Has this quizzical look about him. 'She is usually right. What did she say?' That's when it kind of hit me full force.

The shock of the tongues and then the prophecy was like domino effect. It was a big thing. Something is telling me you can do more with your life serving God than serving chemicals. I had the gentle nudge… Came back, resigned from the company, went back to school [for ministry], I am loving it. Took a youth program from 2 to 40 kids. It's like a fire that's contagious. It's not like I need real training. I just have a heart.

* * * *

Reed's story - sublime, sincere, and compelling in its insistence upon spontaneity - exemplifies pentecostal testimony. Without challenging his sense of the tale's veracity, we can see it map onto multiple other narratives aimed at energizing

evangelism. The parallels are striking: the supernatural permeating the mundane and verified by physicality, the shock of the "event," or rupture that reconfigures the self, and the reference to a contagion that can't be taught. These all invite us into Reed's world, where these testimonies emerge from, circulate through, and consolidate into broad sensibilities, training manuals, doctrine, and denomination. They develop portable logics and relatively consistent practices. While such predictability might build from sweeping cultural forces, or perhaps pentecostals simply tell these stories often enough to produce a consensus, I argue that centralized planning, and careful propagation of the pentecostal culture offers an unusually distinct project of worldmaking: the cultivation of discontinuity. I describe a carefully directed pedagogy, "culturally taught, socially expected, and deliberately deployed"[460] – which, of course, has no bearing on its success in realizing a particular *telos*, or on its spiritual legitimacy. In fact, for AG pentecostals, in addition to the consolidation of body logics, the cultivating of sensory aptitudes becomes especially concrete via a textual tradition explicitly aimed at nurturing specific relationships in-between bodies, Bibles, and spiritual experience. This stuff is written down, printed, copied, taught, and distributed in multiple ways. Further, these are such central aspirations in the AG community that nearly every person I interviewed described the normalcy of "fake it till you make it," before they manifested an experience they felt was genuine, and understood as spontaneous. As such, Reed's narrative likely materialized via these pedagogies that teach the means to realize an experience as well as patterns for

[460] Thomas J Csordas, "Ritualization of Life," in *Practicing the Faith: The Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, ed. Martin. Lindhardt (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011), 146.

understanding, containing, and relating it. They invite a ruptural practice cultivated as spontaneous, which bounds and grows pentecostal communities.

By describing the extensive cultivation rendering practitioners capable of speaking in tongues and experiencing spiritual rupture, this paper joins anthropologists who engage a literature where the success of evangelicals, pentecostals, and other social movements and cultures, emerges either from continuity, rupture, or some version of their interplay. More recent works refigure and more deeply enmesh these binaries.[461] This ethnography offers tools to further thicken the relationships these thinkers explore between church and revival as well as their persistence in the face of the other. Observing cultivation necessarily shifts temporal scales from explorations of rupture or continuity to the reciprocal relations by which rupture and continuity coproduce each other.[462] Further, like moving from particle to field and then quantum physics, differing scales offer unique lessons.[463]

Most simply, few have noticed that nurturing a capacity for yielding-towards-rupture can involve forming almost-doctrinal training texts, narratives, and body logics. These texts and practices sit literally between church and revival, and can inspire in either direction. Further, this in-between is the space for differentiating

---

[461] Bialecki, "The Bones Restored to Life: Dialogue and Dissemination in the Vineyard's Dialectic of Text and Presence"; Kirsch, *Spirits and Letters*; Elisha, *Moral Ambition Mobilization And Social Outreach In Evangelical Megachurches*. For the big picture see Robbins, "Continuity Thinking and the Problem of Christian Culture"; Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Robbins provides a genealogy of continuity and moves towards rupture. Bell details ritual theory's approach to questions of continuity and rupture.

[462] Scale here relies on Nathan Sayre's discussion of the spatiotemporal differences in grain and extent that make up particular social science analyses and the folk analyses of our informants. Nathan F Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale: Parallels and Potential for Integration," *Progress in Human Geography* 29, no. 3 (2005): 276–90.

[463] James. Gleick, *Chaos: Making a New Science* (NY: Viking, 1987); J.A. Wiens, "Spatial Scaling in Ecology," *Functional Ecology* 3 (1989): 385–97; Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale."

pentecostals from their constitutive others.[464] As we will see, exploring the boundary making genealogy of dualistic legitimation among pentecostals speaks to the staying power of these polarities. Cultivating discontinuity gives flesh for modeling the simultaneous, yet seemingly dissonant, coexistence of continuity and rupture and exploring its implications for organizing.

These pedagogies arouse fiery debates among pentecostals as they aim to simultaneously invite and bound distinctive, and often ruptural, experience of "gifts of the Spirit" – including speaking in tongues and faith healing. They argue constantly over what makes devotional experience legitimate and spiritually mobilizing, and also how to nourish its prerequisite sensibilities and aptitudes. Training texts offer commentary on practice where Scripture is prime arbiter. They portray a sense of human agency in inducing and achieving spiritual experience and in keeping it within the bounds of acceptability. Yet – here is the rub – these texts are also deeply indebted to the proposition that most, if not all, mobilization lies in the hands of an all-powerful God. This tension between human and divine agency becomes especially important when it finds traction in the strained relationships between pentecostals and the rest of the world – e.g. among pentecostals "yielded" prayer is often opposed to mechanical "ritual". This essay pivots on this entangled dynamic between cultivation, yielding, and control, exploring its ethnographic present and textual legitimation – working somewhere between policing, inspiring and simply

[464] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.

letting it all be. Picture the assiduous cultivation of a yielded sensibility, drained of intent, open to immediate transformation.

Recognizing simultaneous institutional constraint and spiritual expansion challenges narratives that rely on their incompatibility. For instance, in posing a common trajectory from vital sect to sleepy church, theorists of rationalization over movement lifecycles agreed that churches – perhaps other movements too - tend to bureaucratize.[465] The increasingly stultifying weight of tradition slows development and expansion, and saps life from the project. Earlier generations of pentecostals in the US, for instance, likely described more experience of the supernatural than today's adherents.[466] By contrast, instead of seeing rigidity as a problem, others see vitality in the subcultural sense of resistant otherness produced by a church with especially stringent doctrine.[467]

Pentecostals however, do both – continuity and event, structure and experience, pedagogy and spontaneity, solid and breaking - perhaps in sequence, perhaps simultaneously, but clearly in some linked entanglement. Infallible Bible readings provide a seemingly immobile ethical structure, while the search for immediate, personal connection to God justifies constant challenge to their own establishment. Poloma calls it "continuous charisma."[468] This tension inspires religious uprisings as new experience pushes congealed structures, but such that a

[465] Troeltsch and Wyon, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*; Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. (New York: Scribner, 1958); Anthony Wallace, *Revitalization Movements* (Indianapolis IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1956).
[466] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*.
[467] Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing: A Study in Sociology of Religion*.
[468] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*.

solid core of the project recongeals in the aftermath or simply continues on. And they do regularly fragment. However, many groups appear to survive, and flourish, in the very Protestant storms they cultivate.

AG, for instance, emerged to institutionalize and contain one revival sequence while encouraging another. In 1914, AG called tongues and healing the only legitimate manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Later, successive internal revivals challenged, expanded, and renegotiated these initial boundaries. This process inspired a vernacular sensory tradition and a doctrinal counterpoint for discerning and inviting appropriate devotion. If you query pentecostal certainty that God exists, many respond with supernatural narratives, like Reed's. Yet, digging deeper, the sensibilities that stabilize these accounts involve a vernacular of sensory-based certainty, a colloquial understanding that the body serves as core of critical theological affirmations. Simultaneously, questions of spiritual practice are contested through AG training texts as they struggle to both police and motivate devotion. It is an anxious, but vital space – stretched between control and release.

Inhabiting and cultivating these tensions may contribute to both the boundaries and the tremendous success of pentecostal missions. On one hand, as with any musical instrument or dance, structured practice of bodily technique underpins freedom and improvisation. Perhaps the dynamic between cultivate, yield, and constrain is simply the basis for freedom?[469] Others might say that pentecostals inhabiting this paradox lack coherence, or display contradictory consciousness. I

[469] Alasdair C. MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984).

suggest that the cultivated interplay between concerted practice and discontinuous spontaneity, to some degree, gains its energy from struggles to refashion and distinguish the boundaries of the church and its members.[470] Early Christianity posed as spontaneous and genuine against the perceived limits of Jewish law. Today, born-again rupture and speaking in tongues differentiates pentecostals, especially when performed publicly.

As such, I query the relationship between these two seemingly opposite poles. How does cultivation link church and revival, continuity and rupture? That this concerted, intentive, and repetitive nurturing of a pentecostal sensorium is read as spontaneous and as demolishing distinctions between the sacred and the profane stretches previous theorizations of ritual, perhaps to a breaking point. In response, I shift scales, moving away from the micro-details of rites, individual phenomenological alterity, or the debate between claims of continuity and rupture. Instead, I look at the very concrete day to day practices that make for much of the pentecostal distinctive, and in doing so find a third process, neither church, nor revival, but something akin to the cultivation of their dialectical relationship[471] although with more continuous tension and less of the resolution one might expect from dialectics. Engaging other "third term"[472] efforts to obviate Cartesian dualistic

[470] Gretchen Pfeil, "Imperfect Vessels: Emotion and Rituals of Anti-Ritual in American Pentecostal and Charismatic Devotional Life," in *Practicing the Faith: The Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, ed. Martin. Lindhardt (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011).
[471] Bialecki, "The Bones Restored to Life: Dialogue and Dissemination in the Vineyard's Dialectic of Text and Presence," 154.
[472] Brahinsky, "Pentecostal Body Logics."

hierarchies - phenomenological[473] and practice oriented[474] - and building from recent anthropology of learning,[475] I emphasize history, strategy, process, and collectivity. Rupture remains, as does continuity with both gaining potency as "strategic essentialisms"[476] solidified via pentecostal boundary making. In all, Cultivating Discontinuity reimagines pentecostal practice as anxiously entangling continuity-rupture, thought-action, and individual-group polarities – it is a vibrant, tension filled site for mobilizing and bounding a community.

Cultivation

It is oddly commonsensical that authentic experience comes free of constraint and guidance. This is obviously absurd, but somehow a central premise of US culture. And it clearly structures much of the thinking about pentecostal experience. As Edith Blumhofer, a well known pentecostal academic, explains, "they [pentecostals] faced an insurmountable obstacle: they could formalize the message but they could not induce experience."[477] Yet, it seems they could. Given the past chapters, pentecostals aim to induce experience. And yet, it is hard to blame her, for

---

[473] Thomas J Csordas, *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Thomas J Csordas, *The Sacred Self a Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable."
[474] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.
[475] Luhrmann, "Metakinesis"; Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*.
[476] While Spivak has disavowed this term as a permit for ignoring the strategy element and simply accepting essentialism, I think it sheds light on a critical and necessary process within seemingly fluid social movements and ought to be resuscitated. I believe that it clarifies the relationship between phenomenology and analysis – in other words, we solidify in our experience and that matters, sometimes it is part of a strategic struggle over power or control, sometimes less so. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1988).
[477] Edith Waldvogel Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 152.

throughout pentecostalism, and I would suggest, throughout the US, there are basically two positions on this question. Either it is spontaneous and therefore authentic, and potentially spiritual. Or, it is induced trance and therefore mechanical and worldly. This is commonplace among pentecostals but also quite regularized in non-pentecostal circles because there is nothing more common in my everyday life as an academic studying pentecostals than hearing the surprise of a non-believer when I explain that tongues might be learned and practiced – often accompanied by a smug sense of superiority suggesting that any such spirituality entrained must be false.

Early Pentecostal Tarrying

Yet, as I will show, even from the start, pentecostalism involved very explicit technologies for fostering the sensory experience of the Holy Spirit. As Lutheran charismatic Larry Christensen writes, "pentecostal Christianity does not merely assume the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit in the Church. It expects it, plans for it, and depends upon it."[478] In fact, among early pentecostals the extensive effort involved in bringing spiritual experience went by the vernacular "tarrying," even while claims to spontaneity were abundant. In the late 1980s, Margaret Poloma interviewed a group of older pentecostals who remembered early forms of tarrying. As one explained, "coupled with the overwhelming desire for power was a conviction that the only way to receive it was through prolonged, constant and persistent prayer,

[478] Larry Christensen, "Pentecostalism's Forgotten Forerunner," in *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, ed. Vinson Synan (Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1975), 31.

sometimes called 'tarrying' or 'waiting' upon God."[479] Although "waiting" seems a bit vague as instruction, tarrying was a practice with definite shape, repeated in testimony after testimony. As one participant explained, "at that time, people thought they had to tarry. And people tarried for hours–days… We'd go early in the morning and we would be there all day. They would have food on the table in case we got hungry. And we just tarried. I think I must have tarried for about 3 months."[480] At times, pentecostal practices were reminiscent of Catholic rituals with particular body postures crucial to success. Will Norton, missionary to India, explained that, "pentecostal preparation is the only preparation that will meet the need of this particularly dark and trying hour. It is a preparation found while on the knees. It means a personal and complete surrender to the will of God."[481] But over the past century or so, along with changes to pentecostal body logics, there came shifts in the means for receiving the spirit. As one participant explained, "in my day… no one got it [baptism of the spirit] by the formula they use today! You had to work, toil, struggle." It was collective. "People would help you get it." With specific body postures. "They felt the only way you could get the Holy Spirit was on your knees, with your hands lifted and your face up. If you didn't lift your head, they would raise your chin for you… If you grew weary, someone would sit or stand on either side of you and hold your arms. You got a lot of help [laugh]."[482] To Poloma's interviewees recent versions appear distinct. Tarrying is certainly not the correct term. Instead of

[479] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 66.
[480] Ibid., 41.
[481] Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 66.
[482] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 42.

weeks and long days on their knees, "we will encourage people to come forward and have some people stand behind them to help pray." It has definite cognitive element. "We will make an explanation that when the apostles went forth and laid hands on people, they would receive." Perhaps less explicitly embodied. "We teach now that it is a step of faith, much like salvation. Give them some instructions…" Certainly more like a meditation than an active prayer. "Rather than encouraging people to say 'praise the Lord' or 'hallelujah,' we encourage them to simply relax and just try to sense with Spirit is trying to say through them. We tell them that, as we lay hands on them, they will sense the presence of the Spirit and just to speak as they feel the unction of the Spirit. We find that most of the time it is a very easy step into the area of Spirit baptism." Compared to extended tarrying, the model expressed here is quite gentle. As I will show, Poloma's interviewees tell a story that resonates closely with the tales from Bethany.

Bethany Cultivation

At Bethany also, these sensations don't come without effort. Students describe years of yearning and striving to manifest the experience of tongues, practicing nonsense syllables, surrounding other students with a dozen people all speaking in tongues to inspire the one in the center. Many fake it enroute to authentic spirituality. Only later do they come to the experience with the ease of a skilled athlete and the certainty of its spiritual promise.

Daily chapel at Bethany is a required space for community consolidation, a form of guided devotion where students nurture their sensory aptitudes and learn to teach others as well. An ID card reader precisely tracks attendance, with clear consequence for absence. Usually between 100 and 200 students and faculty sway – dancing is not allowed – to contemporary Christian pop performed by a rotating cohort of student bands. Eyes close, arms raise, and faces curl in supplication as the simple, repetitive rock and roll chords wash over them. I am especially attentive to open mouths, since loose-jawed imagery fills pentecostal training texts. Students describe music pulsing through their bodies, the desire for transcendence in their hearts, and the struggle to participate appropriately - with integrity, true spirituality, and within bounds.

Here, most revelations require group effort and careful choreography. Youth pastors become especially skilled in arousing aspiration to sensory experience, summoning students to "give God your tongue." Hoping to transpose body logics across generations, youth pastors engender methodical, carefully legitimized discussions, venues for encouraging visceral spirituality. One pastor asks for "a study" of the gifts of the spirit. He sends home a flyer with Bible passages. It is the central topic at youth group and at home for weeks - some parents are suspicious. Finally, when the group decides to "go for it," the pastor circles the room ritualistically laying his hands on foreheads. Then, "the room explodes." Kids flop about the floor, later describing tongues, all sorts of other powerful physical sensation and deep connection to the Holy Spirit. This goal oriented collective sensory project

emerges from - but is not contained by – an entangled history of doctrine and cultivation. Even so, the dominant pentecostal story tells of spontaneous "gifts," not practice or training. Bodies reveal spontaneous spiritual effectivity as when on stage for all to see a student excitedly whoops, proclaiming immediate healing from scoliosis. The conscious project, if any can be acknowledged, involves a struggle to seek God, not experience,[483] thus yielding authority, not solidifying it.

Thus, on rare occasions, leaders pause and ask that the Spirit fall. It is time to open to, invite, or generally encourage spiritual experience. Some suggest students make nonsense noises, loosen their tongues and yield to God. Students describe friends or neighbors surrounding them speaking in tongues, hoping to stimulate the same. Others explain their own effort as simply "gibberish." One begins by "babbling." Then devotion. "I prayed for myself and had others pray for me. And what do you know, it happened." A physical attuning joins faith to render new capabilities.

Some recognize that faking tongues is quite common, one route to acceptance, or perhaps simply rehearsal. "In school it was what everybody else was doing and a way to show your closeness to God... so we often all faked it." In fact, most of the students I interview pretend tongues before many achieve something they describe as genuine. Perhaps pretending is simply part of the learning process?

Even so, for many, acknowledging cultivation undermines legitimacy. Clear direction certainly frustrates some. As Amy explains, "The preacher says 'raise your

[483] Loralie Crabtree, *Youth Ministry Institute Manual: Bringing It All Into Focus*, 1998, 133.

hands, receive this… repeat after me' [and it] always pisses me off." Her assessment resonates with the modern consensus that valid religion provides a self-evident subtext requiring little human effort beyond simply believing.[484] However, Amy's education continues, "Then in chapel, it just came out." Spontaneously? "A feeling of peace. It wasn't that I couldn't stop speaking, but why would I?" Is she rendered capable in spite of her resistance? Perhaps. Finally, the link to meaning effectively engages. As she says, "[It is] a solidification of my connection to God."

The AG valorization of speaking in tongues generates pressure to succeed. As one Bethany alumnus explained, " I do not believe in speaking in tongues. Although for many years I 'tried' to speak in tongues and thought I was not Christian enough because I didn't do so." Many fail their training. According to Dr. Wilson, "more fail than succeed." After much effort, Daniel comes up short:

> I have had people try to get me to speak in tongues… my pastor wanted me to speak in tongues but I was uncertain… as they pray they put their hand on your forehead. They speak in tongues… They say, 'Try not to fill your mind up with words. Try to accept it. Try to have your mind empty.

As a child, Dr. Espinosa struggled to meet the demands of his AG congregation. "[There was] pressure to speak in tongues. Social pressure: its what all the cool kids do. You want to be on fire for the Lord. That was the controlling message…" Nearly every person who described this pressure also told of their initial processes in which they pretended to speak in tongues. Some called it the "fake it till you make it" ethos of pentecostalism.

---

[484] Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*.

Like other meditations, speaking in tongues requires a particular focus, one Daniel struggles to achieve. "My mind is always thinking of something [else]." For him, AG's high regard for tongues becomes an irritant. "I would go up to the altar specifically to have that: to speak in tongues. The AG, they believe that that's your spiritual baptism…" Daniel comes to disagree. "I'm not sure that everyone needs to speak in tongues. [There are] other gifts – educational, pastoral, leadership."

One student has reservations about the physicality of the worship at Bethany until she spends an afternoon in prayer, feels a powerful physical connection to God and now can't help but raise her hands in sensuous devotion. She is learning – fashioning a body and a mind and a relationship between the two. The cultivation of particular capabilities is certainly part of Bethany's broader pedagogical project. However, much of the effort aims to render people capable of submission, something akin to non-effort.

Texts Teaching Gifts

In my search to explain broad consistency among narratives of gifts of the Spirit, I expect common reference to Scripture, but am surprised when I also find a vernacular textual tradition of explicit pedagogies that articulate tensions between yielding, cultivation and control while pondering the boundaries of appropriate physicality. These are scripts in the most literal sense, detailed plans to galvanize experiences of the Holy Spirit. All the following are published by AG's Gospel Publishing House through their Evangelism Commission's annual Holy Spirit

emphasis: *The Youth Ministry Institute Manual, Helping Others Receive the Gift, When the Spirit Speaks* and *Hungry? A Study in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*.[485] While the texts are not uniform, they share basic themes. Rhetorics of yielding dominate, although the very fact of organizing for revival signals cultivation as well. Looking closely however, a contest becomes apparent – a negotiation between daily practice and interpretation that invokes both the authority of Scripture and anxiety about outsider perceptions of pentecostal practice. Despite a superficial coherence, then, these texts produce a tension-filled channeling of appropriate physicality that often rejects the viability of pedagogy and training.

Yielding, submission, relaxing and "letting God take over" all appear regularly in these pedagogies. One text prescribes, "Relax… worship God… seek the Giver, not just the gift…" It continues with a push towards language. "Leave your native language so you can speak a new language… trust that you are getting what you asked for…" Perhaps the tongue offers an exceptionally effective channel to yielding the total self. "The tongue is the most unruly part of the body… (James 3:3-6)…"[486] And yet like the rudder of a large ship, it can set the direction for our entire behavior." It is a bearing contingent upon release, not control: "Speaking in tongues

[485] I initially wondered if these might be a late 20th century response to declension in Pentecostal worship. However, in searching old AG book catalogs I found a tradition of similar training texts running back to AGs first few decades, and their strategies are quite similar. Crabtree, *Youth Ministry Institute Manual*; Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst, *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008); Warren D. Bullock, *When the Spirit Speaks: Making Sense of Tongues, Interpretation and Prophecy* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Pub. House, 2009); Huffman and Lindell, *Hungry? A Study in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*.

[486] Biblical references in the texts codify appropriate physicality.

is an act of submission, indicating that we have given our entire beings to God."[487] These texts regularly reiterate the primacy of God's agency in spiritual process.

Nonetheless, specific efforts at cultivation dominate. Such texts share a step-by-step pedagogy for attuning believers to the presence and participation of the Holy Spirit: Pray, describe the process and its impetus, and finally the Holy Spirit emerges.[488] Pastors invite participants to "align themselves so they are ready to receive."[489] They develop an atmosphere and describe a specific program aiming towards speaking in tongues. "Develop consensus in the room."[490] Not through dialogue, but via clear messaging: say "'you might hear words in your spirit' or 'you might feel a tension in your tongue.' Encourage them [participants] to… open their mouth and release the language…"[491] Manuals encourage community – they rely heavily on something akin to Durkheim's collective effervescence, especially as stimulated by singing together.[492] Some individuals are called to lay hands on seekers. "Radical worshippers set an atmosphere and environment that is charged with the anointing and people just get baptized."[493] With children especially, seeing

[487] Huffman and Lindell, *Hungry? A Study in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 13,8.
[488] Enloe, "The Nuts and Bolts of Ministering Spirit Baptism," 26–7; Allen Griffin, "Communicating the Baptism of the Spirit to Students," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 116.
[489] Tim. Enloe, "Leading a Receiving Time," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Randy Hurst and Tim. Enloe (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 85.
[490] Enloe, "The Nuts and Bolts of Ministering Spirit Baptism," 27.
[491] Cramer, "Preparing Yourself to Help Others," 47.
[492] Crabtree, *Youth Ministry Institute Manual*, 134.
[493] Cramer, "Preparing Yourself to Help Others," 42.

another child receiving the Spirit can inspire.[494] The group imprints upon individuals, rendering them more capable than before.

Eventually, after the atmosphere is engaged and the plan laid out, newly capable practitioners are called to act: "Now just speak in tongues."[495] "Speak, even if only a few syllables."[496] As one wrote, "It takes a bold, deliberate step."[497] Or, "You will never speak if you keep waiting for the Spirit to put you in some kind of trance and do it all for you. It will be your mouth, your tongue, your voice – but His words."[498] Like Christian rebirth, Spirit baptism involves choice – sure, choice as production and enactment of a collective context and perhaps even collective subjectivity, but some sort of choice in methods of cultivation and choice in the moment of yielding. "The Spirit doesn't just overpower a person's will. We cooperate with him and invite Him into our lives… God does the baptizing, but you're responsible for how you proceed."[499] Thus, actively, "Leave your English… altogether."[500] Such action often involves specific physical direction – especially of the mouth and tongue. "I usually mention that I've never seen a person filled with the Holy Spirit with their mouth closed. People need to relax, open their mouth and give

---

[494] Jim Gerhold, "Communicating the Character of the Holy Spirit to Kids," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 110.
[495] Tim. Enloe, "Ministering the Holy Spirit Baptism in Today's Culture," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Randy Hurst and Gary Grogan (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 53.
[496] Crabtree, *Youth Ministry Institute Manual*, 135.
[497] Huffman and Lindell, *Hungry? A Study in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 8.
[498] Crabtree, *Youth Ministry Institute Manual*, 134.
[499] Huffman and Lindell, *Hungry? A Study in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 12.
[500] Crabtree, *Youth Ministry Institute Manual*, 134.

praise to the Lord, and expect they will speak in a language they don't understand."[501] These texts suggest extremely close attention to microscalar bodily sensations in the nurturing of a "spontaneous" state of active participation. "You will get to the point where your tongue feels like its too big for your mouth, and you want to say something… "[502] The tongue is cultivated as guide, but success in yielding requires specific moments of action and choice.

Detailed instruction and exhortation towards exertion exist in constant tension with affirmations of God's agency. "Only Jesus can baptize someone in the Holy Spirit, so relax."[503] Perhaps worldly actions are impotent, and only belief matters? Thus, after 55 years of seeking through faithful tithing and good works, a person hears: "the Holy Spirit baptism cannot be earned; it is a gift," and only then he does he receive.[504] At the same time, believers clean up their lives, "getting right with God" before expecting baptism.[505] Perhaps the spirit-earth divide is a bit ambiguous?

One has to wonder also: what translates physical experience into powerful belief? Broad consensus among participants that their activities are spiritual certainly compels. Further, students suggest that unique feelings, and improvisation beyond their personal limitations suffice to prove divine origins. But pastors also follow specific directions to consolidate the supernatural interpretation of tongues. They

---

[501] Scott Erickson, "Fostering A Setting for People to Receive," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 68.
[502] Bullock, *When the Spirit Speaks: Making Sense of Tongues, Interpretation and Prophecy*, 59.
[503] Enloe, "The Nuts and Bolts of Ministering Spirit Baptism," 27.
[504] Erickson, "Fostering A Setting for People to Receive," 65.
[505] Gordon Anderson, "Theological, Historical, and Practical Insights on Spirit Baptism.," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 135–7.

assure participants "that God will not play tricks on them, so they are not making up the words…"[506] And, "We need not worry about having a false experience."[507] Yet, of course as good moderns, they do worry and work to contain excess – pastors and students both.

Containing Rupture

"[She] goes off the deep end. A 'pentecostal experience.' [sarcasm] She was speaking in tongues - [but] not doing anything that made sense. Fully on the ground, screaming like a banshee. In her church the wilder you are, the more spiritual you are. I stepped in and said [her name] 'Olibile.' 'Didi Mala!' – [it means] Shut Up! Shut Up!

I'm telling her to shut up? This is heresy.

I said, 'I want you to sit up. What's going on? You've been taught that God comes and takes over and throws you on the ground. That's not God. Maybe evil spirits do that, but that's not God, maybe Demons.' [In her church] being spiritual is not about being spiritual but about yelling loud."[508]

In this story, Dr. James Stewart, a missionary, professor at Bethany, pastor, and white male South African critic of racism, reaches his bounds of acceptance. Olibile, a female black South African convert, needs some guidance, or so he

[506] Enloe, "Ministering the Holy Spirit Baptism in Today's Culture," 52.
[507] Randy Hurst, "Foreward," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 33.
[508] Certainly white male control of black woman's spirituality is deeply problematic. However, Dr. Stewart outspokenly advocates racial equality in a traditionally whites only denomination which has led me to deemphasize these particular power dynamics here.

suggests. Dr. Stewart's response makes sense - a movement needs structure. Pentecostals are mocked for their excess. Secularist, Fundamentalist and mainline critics all agree: pentecostals are chaotic, crazy, too much. Cultivated yielding generates rupture - unpredictable rupture. In response, pentecostals offer continual self-policing, or what they call, "discernment." Dr. Albrecht explains, "the mystic left alone spins into all kinds of heresy." Yet, along with this narrative of containment, pentecostal practices also suggest fluidity and openness to change. "When you think you got God squished into a box," Dr. Stewart says, "cut the sides off. God will only move freely when he's got the freedom to move." Tensions between freedom and constraint animate the pentecostal organizing tradition.

Hype or chaos animates scrutiny, and Bethany faculty are responsible for containment as well as inspiration. Dr. Stewart explains, "Some see pentecostals swinging from the chandeliers and all that good stuff… watching folks running in the aisles, the pastors wife jumping across the pews." Or as Dr. Albrecht says, "Wacky things can happen, you've got to admit… that it's not the Spirit, its some emotion. It's something else… [However] you have to be careful in discernment that you're not saying things are inauthentic …" Mis-distinguishing emotion from spirit, for Dr. Albrecht, at times even incites strong language: "I think I'm gonna' say, 'you know that persons a nut!'" Dr. Espinosa's boundary articulates differently. "If you have your Bible and go out in the woods, enjoy. Just don't stay there." That is, relish the break from the everyday, just return afterwards.

Students also struggle to find boundaries. Brad, a new Bethany pastor, inspires controversy by encouraging tongues. He speaks in tongues and provides translations for others. Some students haven't previously heard translations rooted in the Bible and these provide legitimacy. Others feel uncomfortable. One describes "flack" for her more austere prayer practices, and anxiety since tongues "scared the heck out of me." Some feel unsure. "[These] fruits of the spirit… I am really skeptical about, super skeptical." Students struggle to find bounds for acceptability – what is necessary? Ok? Real?

Challenged by suspicion, Onella describes tongues as genuine even though cultivated. "Its not like I can say that there was just this one night and I fell over, but honestly it began out of the understanding that there was that gift and praying for it…" Much of her description aims at an imagined critic – someone questioning the integrity of her practice. In response, she says, "I really felt that it was true. Not just making it up. I don't really feel like I ever made it up. I don't like just doing it to do it – I think that its definitely real… the best way I can explain [it, is] that its not contrived." That the practice takes its own path mitigates concerns about human agency. "I'll be earnestly praying about something hard core, you know, something so deep on my heart and something so important that English or whatever is coming out of my mouth is not strong enough to express it. I'll be praying but it's like God, 'this isn't enough, it isn't expressing how deep this is on my heart…' it turns into something different – tongues - not that I meant it to." The lack of intention signals sincerity and increased depth.

Andrea sees tongues as contrived until it links closely to Scripture:

> I had never spoken in tongues, I know people who claimed they have. Pastor Brad is the only one who I've felt comfortable with… He came to the front and said the Lord is giving me word as far as what this [tongues] means and he said it was a [Bible] verse. [Previously] it seemed like they were just saying things and then making something up, but this felt more solid. Even if it wasn't exactly that translation, we were going back to the Bible and that is the foundation for our beliefs… Its not like 'you're gonna' find the guy that you're supposed to marry.'

With tongues reliant on text, her confidence increases – a dialectic of the charismatic and the textual.

Linked to the textual authority of the Bible and made available to community discernment, interpreted tongues seem more sure. Thus, interpretation becomes an important element in AG's distinguishing itself. Similarly, Bethany student Chet uses interpretation as criterion for sound spirituality. "With no interpretation it meant someone was speaking out in disorder, more like conflict… [Interpretation] shows some sort of validity to our belief." He distinguishes personal from public experiences, "I practice mostly by myself. I think that tongues in a group needs interpretation." At Bethany he finds tongues does not always reflect spiritual growth. "I've seen people abuse the gift, use it to show off. [To claim to be] superior to others who don't have it." For Chet, interpretation solidifies meaning, but leaves room for abuse. It is, however, one form of containment among many.

Containing Rupture II: Training Texts

Like the discourse of Bethany professors, AG texts encourage tongues but include a cautious undercurrent, warning of excess and "hyper-emotional" devotion, or "fanaticism," expressed physically. This is likely a response to modern critique, but also to previous revivals that unsettled AG. For instance, within AG, both the Latter Rain Movement (1950s) and the Toronto and Brownsville "laughing" revivals (1990s) defied and expanded upon AG's doctrine of tongues and healing. Like the broader Charismatic movement, these revivals valorized multiple physical experiences as spiritual, and their more expansive body logic faced censure from within and without AG. Yet from its start, AG structured itself to both encourage and contain such insurgencies: its balancing of loose fellowship with clear doctrine explicitly aims to regulate struggle. Further, providing multiple and everchanging sites of power within AG makes room for resistance and revival without a full-on split.

At first glance, AG texts emphasize flexibility. Gifts are not "cookie cutter" and might be loud, soft, accompanied by laughing, at home, church etc. It sounds quite open. But boundaries here are actually highly inflammatory. "These manuals aim to describe adequate teaching on how to encourage, guide, correct, and respond to these gifts."[509] Encourage, guide, correct and respond - it runs the gamut from inspiration to discipline.

[509] Bullock, *When the Spirit Speaks: Making Sense of Tongues, Interpretation and Prophecy*, 8.

The AG concern over chaos and unintelligibility manifests in desire for interpretation, but also in devotional processes that encourage some, and discourage other, forms of participation. Bullock affirms churches that position elders throughout the service to guide vocal gifts and ensure comprehensibility by collecting requests to speak tongues. They alert the pastor who then slots particular tongues appropriately into the program.[510] The dynamic between believer and spirit hinges on order. "The Spirit does not 'possess' or 'overpower' the speaker… [in fact] what the Spirit has to say will be said in an orderly and intelligible way… He speaks through the controlled instrumentality of the believer's own mind and tongue."[511] As such, tongues speech is a conjoining of human and spiritual agency.

AG texts describe many sensations as emotional, and thus less authoritative. One author posits tongues as superior to fallible human emotions:

> Emotions must not determine the reality of their experience. The evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, according to the Scripture, is that the believer spoke in other tongues. The evidence is not what he or she felt or the emotions that were or were not displayed. People's feelings vary dramatically...[512]

The text expands its critique of emotions into the physical realm, suggesting that while people cry, feel like they've been hit by lightning, or experience a quiet peaceful feeling, none of these are significant. Instead, "the reality of what people

---

[510] Ibid., 29.
[511] Ibid., 53.
[512] Bill Juoni, "Encouragement in Receiving the Gift," in *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, ed. Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008), 72.

experience is not based on what they do or do not feel. The evidence is in speaking in other tongues."[513] All the texts agree, "the baptism is not the result of emotionalism… keep your head."[514] At the start of the 20th century, non-liberal Christians looked to science for authority. Since then, pentecostals have described tongues as scientific evidence and regarded emotions as far more ephemeral.

Yet, as AG doctrine faces the challenges of modern skepticism and internal revivals, it mutates such that some physicality outside of tongues gains acceptance – especially when posed as almost-tongues or Biblical. Thus, a youth training manual opens the door to a more expansive interpretation, "Some physical things may happen. Stammering lips, tears of joy, and trembling or shaking… (cf Isaiah 28:11; John 7:38,39)." Yet simultaneously, the boundaries around acceptability are further delimited. "Remember: Goose Bumps are not the baptism."[515] Here, a recent expansion of the limits of the Biblical sensorium encounters a broadly applicable body logic and congeals new clarity – stammering, but not goosebumps. Others, however, prescribe differently. Enloe says, for instance, "you may or may not be overcome with goose bumps." His key evidence, in fact, is broader sensory awareness. "You will at least be gently aware of his presence descending upon you in some distinct time."[516] Similarly, falling over or being "slain in the spirit" occurs quite regularly within pentecostal revivals – i.e. Brownsville, Toronto, Latter Rain. Yet in AG publications, "falling over doesn't function as biblical evidence of either

[513] Ibid.
[514] Crabtree, *Youth Ministry Institute Manual*, 133–4.
[515] Ibid., 133.
[516] Enloe, "Ministering the Holy Spirit Baptism in Today's Culture," 25.

Spirit baptism or as a signpost of any stage of the process of receiving."[517] AG does not, in this version, accede to its internal challengers when it comes to devotion. Clearly, physicality is not set in stone – or Scripture - but is an ongoing negotiation.

Rupture

Neither rupture nor tradition disappear amid cultivation. Instead, they both gain solidity from cultivated differentiation, a process of nurturing aptitudes among mind-bodies, in support of both rupture and continuity.[518] A cultivation that holds tension between the extended structure of the church and the immediacy of revival is a particular arrangement of scales. Nathan Sayre describes scale as including both grain and extent.[519] Developing a particular grain can involve building immediate experience as the most consequential element of their narrative and experience, or by contrast, emphasizing extended pilgrimages. Further, scale-makings and scale-readings are historically produced and often contested. Pentecostals, for the most part, recognize either tradition-church or revival-rupture, but not their entanglement. For pentecostals, rupture and church are their strategically formed essentialisms – built on a particular scale - especially powerful for energizing us-them dynamics

[517] Ibid., 24.
[518] As Ortner writes, "the breaks and splits and incoherencies of consciousness, no less than the integrations and coherencies, are equally products of cultural and historical formation. One could question, indeed, whether the splits and so forth should be viewed as incoherencies or simply as alternative forms of coherence; not to do so implies they are some form of damage." Sherry B Ortner, "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal.," *Comparative Studies in Society & History* 37, no. 1 (1995): 186.
[519] Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale."

often considered integral to mobilization.[520] They prefer the immediacy of rupture, recognize the dangers of the bureaucratic church, and rarely mention the systematic work that holds these two in tension. Cultivation, as we will see, becomes the language for organizing at a particular scale, a linguistic tool for both engaging and avoiding this dynamic that is so central to pentecostal mobilization.

This productive anxiety around cultivation is internal to the pentecostal sensorium. Most pentecostals find process-oriented readings of their rupture, like ritual theory, abhorrent and mechanical. Dan Albrecht, unusual among Bethany faculty for his use of the term ritual, explains how for many colleagues "ritual" simply means "unspiritual." Likewise, one Bethany alumnus fervently argues against cultivation as goal oriented. "You got it all wrong! The outside, visible things of the Holy Spirit aren't the real thing. The real thing is the Holy Spirit in my life. The speaking in tongues and the experiences are just the results of the Holy Spirit in my life. They are not the goal.... at all." Albrecht, however, insists – and he taught me – that pentecostals learn, reiterate patterns and, he says, employ "ritual." [521] To me, this sounds akin to cultivation; to many pentecostals it sounds like heresy.

Thus, when my fieldwork recognizes spontaneity, but also places cultivation as central, I risk years of careful trust building between myself and my informants. This highlights the ethnographic gap, the void of intelligibility central to even the

[520] To be clear, strategic essentialism is not the idealist dream: assert, and it is. On the contrary, I am describing severely material, enfleshed, and relational entities whose cultivation realizes semi-solid boundaries congealed from among a myriad of other possible formations at different scales. More like: we nurture, and certain scales congeal while others get less play.
[521] Daniel E. Albrecht, *Rites in the Spirit: A Ritual Approach to Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

most immersive, and thickly described participant observation. It initially seems that either I am right that this is training, or maybe it is truly spontaneous. Perhaps Bell is correct to insist on the inevitability of blindness and misrecognition: does religion require false consciousness? Instead however, I suggest that posing affective spontaneity (intimately scaled) against rationalized cultivation (a bit broader) is a scalar category mistake. In other words, we are both correct, for the consequential scale of an action is something determined by a culture and it not only affects perception, but also sensory experience. For pentecostals, immersed as they are in a deeply ruptural Protestantism, the moment of break leaps out over the tales of nurturance and consolidation and it feels different.

However, at a certain point during fieldwork I do recognize that pentecostal practice demonstrates cultivation in addition to the spontaneity claimed by participants. Since this claim runs right counter to their dominant self-description as unmediated spontaneity, the tension now moves between me and them – they argue actively. I ask informants to read my conclusions, and offer their own.[522] Dr. Wilson, former president of Bethany and scholar of Latin American pentecostalism, questions the term "training." I offer "rendering capable" as more agentive. I think perhaps self-reflexivity can act as the next best thing to impossible objectivity. So, in the interest of full disclosure, I admit that something akin to pentecostal cultivation is my passion. I spend much of my time in the thick of community building and organizing. Yet I didn't write pentecostal training – rendering capable –texts. I didn't ask for

[522] I have had several interesting moments when informants questioned my assessment – most outside the bounds of this essay.

faked tongues in the process of attuning. As such, even given my bias, does this story of cultivation seem compelling? And if so, how do we read pentecostal denials -- as strategic? Confused? Brilliant?

Put differently, while writing this ethnography, rupture nearly disappeared from my tale, but it continued to haunt the project. Why? For pentecostals, rupture becomes deeply poignant through stories of early Christian formation (no longer Jewish, no longer Pagan), individual transformation (baptism, conversion, and gifts of the spirit) and discontinuous eschatological futures. As such, the emphasis on "event" over process in Christianity gains traction from relationships between converts and the unconverted.

While rupture is deeply Protestant, pentecostals expand it farther than most. The 16th century break from Catholicism required a sharp demarcation of emerging Christianities, one especially reliant on contests over visible, ruptural moments like baptism. As such Paul's road-to-Damascus-revelation regularly exemplified Protestant subjectivity. Later, 18th century evangelicals founded their primary distinctive in the "born again" experience. Finally, 20th century pentecostals, perhaps the savants of rupture, expand the evangelical impulse towards total break by joining eschatological urgency to bodies and minds in overt expressions of lost physical control and lost intelligibility, all manifesting the possibility of new subject formation before our eyes. With speaking in tongues and other gifts of the spirit signifying newly cleansed souls, church revival, and coming endtimes, rupture resonates from born again self to community and world renewal, and back again.

Further, pentecostals contest secular hegemony such that believing becomes an act of resistant world consolidation. Solidifying their coming to believe – converting – seems strategic as it resonates with the broader boundary-making or resistant, projects within pentecostalism. Regardless if they explicitly articulate rupture as proper pentecostalism – which many do – or if they simply inhabit the pentecostal agenda of conversion and expansion, resonance builds between the long term project of defining converts and pentecostalism as distinct and the very immediate visceral experiences of conversion, baptism, and speaking in tongues. Here the "external strategy" of ritualization that bounds the outer edges of the pentecostal community, parallels an "internal strategy" that bounds individual subjects, generating homologous oppositions and hierarchies.[523] Rupture solidifies.

So, picture, for a moment, rupture as the glue that aligns the body-minds of believers while also consolidating community margins into solidified walls. Nearly every person I speak with narrates discontinuity. Extensive practice and patience aims at conversion or similarly disruptive spiritual experience. Clothing, lifestyle, friendships, politics and most intimate daily practices change drastically. Transformation is reiterated through testimony and preaching decrying the past, articulating the present. Rupture manifests both avowal and disavowal, a self-fashioning affirmation of the new rejecting the old. The broader community forms via parallel forces.

---

[523] Bell borrows this formulation from Bourdieu. Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*; Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

Yet, how can readers adjudicate between cultivation and rupture? On one hand, they don't need to – the real is likely best understood from inside. Further, to question the ontological status of informant claims seems colonial, culturally insensitive, or simply beside the point. We describe culture, not judge it. Still, I persist: First, because my informants engage the same debate; Second, I suspect the strain between emic (insider) and etic (outsider) readings of pentecostal rupture impacts struggles to define the bounds, and thus the membership, of their movement; And finally, since pentecostal rupture has been appropriated for multiple other movement building philosophies, it seems valuable to complicate its emergence.

Yet, the same event might adamantly appear as either extended cultivation or spontaneous rupture. Just as my scaling emphasizes cultivation, other scales make pentecostal claims to rupture intelligible. In fact, adherence to particular scale provides coherence to their experience that might read well from outside their world. Examined from the proper intimate perspective, the process of speaking in tongues involves volition-less, fully yielded, moments – brief. Scale out and they become unstable tears in the intentive accretion of skills and sensibilities, a place for conversion and tongues to manifest authentic breakthrough. Thus, from a phenomenological or similar perspective, rupture is fundamental. Likewise, for critics who say pentecostals retrospectively name ruptures that never were, scale also serves.[524] Here, stepping back to explore both before and after shows that sensory-mental interpretation is not purely retrospective since cultivation involves rendering

[524] Reinhardt describes retrospective consolidation of sacred experience, although not from a particularly skeptical lens. Reinhardt, "Soaking in Tapes."

participants capable of, and interested in, future ruptures. In other words, scale matters: A liberal shouts "I am myself, free," the Marxist rebuts with a simple "we," and pentecostals practice both but aim for autonomy. Each consolidates scale – politics requires it. The world can appear as one organism, or each individual can enclose millions. Thus, in this ethnography, scale is neither epistemological (what scale do we analyze with?) nor ontological (what scale exists?), but rather onto-epistemological (what scales enflesh and become salient in the struggle over apprehension and existence?).[525]

Epilogue

"Method, think method!" Superficially, Dr. Stewart's exhortation sounds like a supremely mechanical approach to Spirit. However, while his detailed genealogies of mission size and logistics make explicit the pedagogical-planned-cultivated side of his project, the not-so-hidden thesis is always an incitement to "yield" to "the Spirit." Spiritual experience undergirds successful missions, he explains. Further: beware, missionaries stifle. "Where we have missionaries, the works aren't growing. Where we don't, they are exploding... Sometimes God moves people's hearts best when there isn't that orchestration." Reed provides a similar polarity, "Giving my life over to God? It's scary… the human side of me wants control." This tension between human and transcendent agency permeates pentecostal pedagogies. Yielding is considered the clear superior, but methodical cultivation is difficult to deny. Yet,

[525] Karen Michelle Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, 2007.

perhaps the pretense to tongues is merely practicing. However, in class one day, Dr. Chandler pushes me: "One of the things I hope Josh comes to in his research is that this is not human effort alone. From the beginning, this is supernatural... more caught than taught." And he may be right. I have, however, shown a multifaceted story, a coherent set of pedagogies emphasizing Chandler's yielding and submission while also offering incitement, training, collective aspiring, and discipline.

Pentecostals are among the most effective organizers of the 20th century; the means by which they propagate their movement matters. Yet, a study of missionary methodology focused on Bethany and training texts cannot discern the effects of pentecostal pedagogies in the field; my supply-side analysis provides one piece of the picture – music from the perspective of the composer. I portray the tensions channeled within pentecostal pedagogies, the uneasy ways rupture, yielding, and control sit together, and the negotiations between doctrine, practice and everyday vernacular narratives that mold missionary spirituality. Perhaps cultivating tensions between revival and church helps to evade Troeltsch's trajectory towards stifling rationalization. Most clearly though, I am fascinated by the systematic attention to metabolizing and diffusing pentecostal practices. These pedagogies for nourishing gifts share a sense of possibility in making the world anew. While we anthropologists may not always find alternate worlds to galvanize us, if we recognize that all social movements involve ears, eyes, bodies, and minds, we might take the pentecostal cue to think deeply and methodically about the sensory aptitudes - including decisive ruptural capacities – which we can cultivate together.

Chapter VI: Cultivating Sensory Aptitudes, Organizing Modernity

"Make no mistake, the missionary venture of the church, no matter how well planned, how finely administered, and finely supported, would fail like every other vast human enterprise, were it not that where human instrumentality leaves off, a blessed ally takes over… I have long since ceased to be interested in meeting where mission leaders are called together to a room filled with charts, maps graphs and statistics. All one needs to find the plenteous harvest is simply to follow the leading of the Spirit… Stand in awe, my friend, and witness in these days the wonder of the ages, the Spirit of God is being outpoured upon persons and in places for which there is no human design and in which there is not one shred of human planning."[526]

Philip Hogan in the 1970 presidential address to EFMA. At this point Hogan was the leader of both AG's DFM and of the NAE's EFMA, Pentecostalism was exploding across the globe. Note that his argument shows tensions between rationalization and the spirit, while claiming primacy for the spirit, and, of course, applying a metaphor of harvest.

The following is a meditation on "cultivation," a primary language among pentecostals for describing evangelism and a pretty fair commonsensical reference to this project that includes multiple layers of deep systematic training and the nurturing of sensory aptitudes. In previous chapters in this section I described the experience of, and process by which, pentecostals become skilled practitioners and develop particular sensibilities and dispositions. They learn to feel the spirit in their bodies through carefully aimed devotion, and the sensibilities nurtured then course throughout day-to-day lives, with Jesus speaking, bodies signaling, and friends reminding. Thus, through carefully nurtured reiterations that inspire ruptural

[526] Cited in Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 136–7.

experience, sensory aptitudes congeal and become portable body logics. Further, via evangelism, these sensibilities travel across cultures. These practices and training mechanisms consolidated and disseminated within AG's network of teaching institutions draw participants into an active effort to evangelize others while also emphasizing yielding as well as the need to control and contain excess. Here, tensions between human planning and the work of the Holy Spirit become paramount, pentecostal anxiety over excessive human agency pushes forcefully against a deep desire to realize God's work - here and now.

To follow this thread further, this chapter explores cultivation: first as a pentecostal strategy described in early AG publications, a seeming metaphor, but also perhaps as close as possible to a literal portrayal of human agency as pentecostals conceive it; second, as a description of radical evangelical organizing as exemplary of modern organizing; and finally, as "cultivation theory," a relatively volitional theory of affect as tool for analysis of movement culture in dialogue with ritual theory, phenomenology, declension, and post-structural embodiment theories.

First, in this chapter, working from stories published in AG's primary newsletter, *The Pentecostal Evangel*, I argue that cultivation as a pentecostal image ties systematicity to sensory yieldedness. We have seen pentecostals working hard to convert others, to nurture their own sensibilities, and to spread the word far and wide - they are incredibly diligent and methodical in their approach to bodies, dispositions, and the values that they propagate. This calculative approach permeates all scales of pentecostal missions thinking, from the most intimate of spiritual practices,

interpersonal gestures and emotions, to mission pamphlets, and the running of a multi-billion dollar organization. And yet, this modernist technocratic approach to self and community fashioning is in constant tension with an everpresent sense that human agency is only realized in its yielding – any plan, every plan, when fully appropriated by the human, is doomed to failure, for it lacks proper receptivity to God's intention. The pentecostal parallel to Buddhists with meditative training or Catholics skilled at the sacrament is these bodies methodically entrained in yielding to the Holy Spirit. Thus, the triangular relationship between the evangelist, the target, and with God, or the Holy Spirit, makes cultivation both viable and contingent.[527] Any human planning is permeated by uncertainty and even likely failure – a force that calls for humility.

In the *Pentecostal Evangel*, cultivation describes the call to evangelize, the development of a holy self, the process of missions work, and the containing ("pruning") of innate sinfulness. Further, it portrays a process of uncertainty and mystery for humans. The importance of non-human agency as a force for humility is emphasized more clearly by late 20th century pentecostal missiologists as their emerging evangelicalism begins to challenge their earlier fundamentalist selves and compatriots. But throughout, I get the sense that the metaphor of cultivation is itself strategically played, for it allows very concrete discussions of organizing to be present, but kept at arms length so as to avoid the risk of valorizing overt human agency. Further, it seems there is something potent in that tension holding the

[527] René Girard, *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel; Self and Other in Literary Structure*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965).

systematic to the sensory, a means of bringing powerful events into view and mobilizing millions of people.[528]

I then follow this mobilizing strategy as it emerged along with evangelicalism in the US. In a brief history of the forerunners to pentecostalism, I demonstrate that the relationships between systematicity and the sensory became an explicit tool to inspire mobilization. From George Whitefield through John Wesley and Charles Finney, a broad participation in methodical effort - both on the part of organizers and participants - became increasingly central to their theological project. When pentecostals built upon these practices, they manifested the ethos of what Charles Taylor's expansive story of the 19th century describes as the "Age of Mobilization," and what Michel Foucault's more skeptical analysis calls increasing "discipline."[529] Cultivation might be seen as either, energizing or containing, although more commonly, at least when successful, it seems better understood as both. Here, exterior systems are not layered upon an authentic and distinct interior self. The inside and the outside is, instead, coconstituted, and the very boundaries between them are products of systematically nurtured iterative processes. Thus, I suggest that rather than imagine modern religiosity as simply a retreat from the public sphere,[530] perhaps modernity engenders a moment when systematic practices aim carefully at the emotive and the sensual, when bodies and the spirits now interred within them

[528] While Pentecostals call it the Holy Spirit – and this I would not deny – there is also potentially a secularized vision enabled by faith in both discipline and uncertainty and the generative power of the tensions between them

[529] Taylor, *A Secular Age*; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*. For more direct versions of the above stories, one could compare Nathan O Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). to Sehat, *The Myth of American Religious Freedom*.

[530] **Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*. Jacob, *The Enlightenment: A Brief History With Documents*, 18.**

increasingly become the objects of technocratic manipulation, and when that gridding enables a broadly accessible and highly motivating ecstasy.

Finally I explore cultivation as theorizing active participation in the development, and perhaps evolution, of sensory aptitudes, dispositions, and sensoria. In developing a theory of the senses I enter the world of "affect theory" – focused on emotions - albeit via a relatively volitional notion of collective action in the development of a sensorium. In doing so, I give flesh to Talal Asad and Annnemarie Mol's language of cultivation, with both empirical and theoretical expansions.[531] First, a series of recent studies show that iterated practices change sensory aptitudes and bodies more generally.[532] Some scholars even look specifically at religious practice changing the body.[533] Further, culture clearly proceeds across generations, to some degree, in the form of solidified logics, some in the body as body logics. Understanding this reciprocity between bodies and practice, however, challenges commonsense notions of a relatively obvious and solid nature/culture divide. Thus, to understand the relationship between the things previously seen as cultural – i.e. those with meaning – and those seen as natural - i.e. bodies - I borrow from Vicky's Kirby's argument that post-structuralism's recognition that "all is text," suggests also, that bodies change with similarly to texts.[534] In other words, if texts modulate when iterated in new contexts, bodies might as well. I find this insight useful when

[531] Asad, *Formations of the Secular*; Mol, "GOOD TASTE."
[532] Luhrmann, "Toward an Anthropological Theory of Mind."
[533] Andrew B Newberg and Waldman, *How God Changes Your Brain: Breakthrough Findings from a Leading Neuroscientist* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2009).
[534] Kirby, *Telling Flesh.*

combined with Catherine Bell's description of ritualization as a process of iteration that builds the boundaries between previously undifferentiated things.[535] Bell seems to describe elements of the pentecostal process of cultivating and bounding a sensorium and specific sensory aptitudes. Finally, in emphasizing cultivation as scaled between the church and the revival, I borrow also from Anna Tsing's explicit choosing of scales as crucial to analysis – her notion of friction between the global and the local is a close cousin to a cultivation that sits in the tension between them.[536] In the process of developing a "cultivation theory," I significantly stretch previous ritual studies, phenomenology, and body foundationalist explanations of pentecostal process. However, perhaps most significant is a challenge to previous theories of affect that through a selective reading of recent neurological literature and an investment in the overwhelming mechanisms of affective control emergent in the neoliberal state, have come to emphasize the lack of volition in human, or posthuman, affect. Instead of this determinism, cultivation theory here rescales the question of agency to include collective planning and extended modes of nurturance – all seen as quite volitional. In sum, cultivation aims at the utopian impulse in theory, the sense that people, and other creatures, can participate in a co-making of more than meanings, but actual sensory entities. It is, perhaps, one way to understand some of the excitement evinced in the entanglement of pentecostal spirituality and visceral experience. It is, however, not a particular politics; not a process of choosing and advocating between differentially empowered formations. Even so, its ability to engender vibrant

[535] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.
[536] Tsing, *Friction*.

mobilization matters, and I find this premonition of a broader somatic agency inspiring.

* * *

Cultivation The Texts: Self-Development[537]

Cultivation is one, if not the, language most used to describe AG missions. It can signal self-development or missions more generally, and does a lovely job of holding the tensions between continuity and change, certainty and chaos, that seem central to the success of pentecostal missions. As AG moved from fundamentalist to evangelical, this balance within cultivation changed as well – the chaotic got increasingly short shrift.

Cultivation symbolizes processes of pentecostal missionary development, the development of the "call" to missions. "Any call should be tested by time, by the word, by God's providences and by cultivation in this country of one's gifts."[538] As such, cultivation of the self, the soul, and its connection to spirit becomes the self-fashioning for pentecostals engaged in evangelism. They focus tremendous energy on developing a self adequate to the mission.

For instance, the pentecostal author of "Fallow Ground" in 1929 posed crop cultivation as the systematic managing of everyday suffering. "Our hearts grow

[537] The following sections are built on close reading of the *Pentecostal Evangel,* which from its inception in 1914 was the monthly newsletter of AG. *Pentecostal Evangel* is abbreviated as PE in footnotes followed by the year, volume, issue and page number.
[538] PE, 1918_10_26 p 9

harder under each added pressure until there comes a rude awakening to the fact that we are at a standstill in our Christian experience." Cultivation then, engenders a process of change. "Before the ground which has become fallow can be used for cultivation it must broken up, plowed deep, harrowed down." Deep transformation, in fact. "There are some who… never dig below the external and superficial in their hearts… either because they do not want to know it, or perhaps because they are afraid or do not know how…" The difficulties of life become the foil for self-observation and refiguration. "But there are instruments necessary to accomplish the plowing up of the ground. Bitter trials, deep sorrows, galling afflictions which God permits to come are plow and harrow…" He explains how trials make us tender, as well as enable us to yield and to be open to a new form of subjectivity, or "…willing at any cost to be conformed to the image of his son…" And the final exhortation: "Break up your fallow ground."[539] Cultivation here aims at the individual psyche.

But, more often, vegetative growth is tied to missions more generally. Multiple authors cite the Bible story of Amos for evangelism, "They shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them" (Amos 9:14). In "Tend Your Garden, " for instance, Joyce Wells Booze talks of her neighbor's garden project, small, humble, but carefully nurtured. "Everybody likes to bring in the harvest. Of course, it must be done at the right time--when it is ripe; and in the right way -- with care. But it is a joy to go to the garden and pick red, ripe tomatoes and long, crisp green beans. So it is in

[539] "Fallow Ground," *PE* 1929_07_06, p 4

God's world. If we are faithful to use our plot to plant, to water, to cultivate, 'we shall come rejoicing bringing in the sheaves.'"[540] "Sheaves" here translates as converts.

Cultivation is progress against natural degeneration. "A plant left to itself without any cultivation will degenerate and revert to a wild form. So it is with strawberries… gradually they will revert to type and become like the wild strawberries from which they were developed." [541] People also regress, it seems.

Cultivation The Texts: Systematic and Yielded

For pentecostals, the language of cultivation might also suggest a disciplinary society, a controlling force that permeates our psyche, rationalizes our quotidian life and brings us subservient not to spirit, but to the mammon of planning, evangelism, and church building. The cartoon shown, "They who would bear fruit, must bear pruning," offers a tree with God clipping off the branches of temper indifference, laziness, selfishness, pride, and self glory. It is tempting to see this pruning as a violent mechanism of control, something that might mechanize nature, perhaps akin to industrial agriculture. "Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it." It doesn't sound especially gentle or fluid.[542]

[540] PE 1967_4_9, p26-7.
[541] Take Heed, Ernest S Williams, PE 1954_4_4, p.6
[542] In a similar vein – "Remember what Jesus said: 'My Father is the gardener. He cuts off every branch in me that bears no fruit, while every branch that does bear fruit He trims clean so that it will be even more fruitful' (John 15:1, 2, NIV)." "The Parable of the Peach Trees," Jo Ann Craver, PE 1984_5_20, p.14-15

I am reminded that the gentle tones of AG's "Decade of Harvest" theme for the missions of the 1990s had followed immediately from the more aggressive vision - "Global Conquest" - in the previous decades. I wonder if perhaps they were not so far removed from each other? Perhaps the violence of control is somehow enmeshed in the nurturing of freedom? This is useful. Cultivation, as pentecostals work it, is not a rigid mechanism of control, nor is it an event that escapes process. Instead, cultivation grabs firmly to God's plan (unknowable), the whim of the Holy Spirit (unpredictable), and to human intervention (fallen). Human action alone is certainly not desirable. W.E. Moody's question from a 1940 *Pentecostal Evangel* "Have You Become Entangled?"[543] is ripe for translation - simply put, autonomy sounds undesirable.

Figure from PE 1931_05_31, p. 11

Cultivation The Texts: Uncertainty

Certainty then is key, for if the technical fix is made certain, then the systematic has overcome the visceral and cultivation might appear unbalanced - the vital tension lost. And although the valence has changed over time, there is a case to be made for pentecostal certainty. The image of a bugle call as "no uncertain sound"

[543] W.E. Moody "Have You Become Entangled?" PE 1940_5_4p.2

is everpresent in the annals of AG. Wacker describes the incredible vitriol that flowed between early pentecostals while debating even the slightest deviation in theology or practice. Yet, I will argue, it is a certain kind of certainty, one open to contest, unintentionally perhaps, but revivals as central to the identity of AG as it constantly teeters between a separatist fundamentalist certitude and expansively reaching evangelical fluidity.

For instance, in "How Does Our Garden Grow? Maxine Williams searches for the "laws" of the harvest. "DID YOU PLANT A GARDEN and watch over it week after week, only to end up eating canned corn instead of the roasting ears you had dreamed of?" She writes, "If you will analyze your gardening methods, perhaps you will find you failed to keep the laws of the harvest. There are fixed laws for growing things. One cannot break those laws and still reap a good harvest." Her leap to evangelism is simple and explicit. "Similarly, there are laws in the spiritual realm and we must follow them if we wish to reap a good spiritual harvest. The Bible says, 'He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him' (Psalm 126:6). Let us consider some of the laws attached to bringing in the sheaves."[544] This sounds very much like a modernist polemic, the kind of technocratic approach to missions that pentecostals decry. However, looking more closely at the list of "laws," they are far from confining – seeds must be sown, by a sower, it takes time, they need cultivation, God can't do it alone, one must take risks, and plant intelligently. Even so, Williams ends

[544] PE 1969_7_20, p. 8-9

by revisiting her claim to a juridical framework of laws and *telos* by concluding with clarity: there is a "certainty of a harvest." A certainty, but perhaps with room for maneuver?

Certainty can be had – in faith. But then, how solid is that? A 1940 PE essay seems to suggest that faith, law, and *telos* all join in the AG worldview. "FAITH IS A ROCK – is certitude, is supremely the sure thing in life. Faith is law, not mist, not mere talk, not dream. Faith is the only sure thing in the world. This is God's guarantee, as it were… There is nothing uncertain in the law of faith." It is difficult to express more certainty than this. In other words, sureness can be found in a relationship with God. Yet, at the same time, the uncertainty of the Holy Spirit is just as present.

For the Lord's relationship to believers in pentecostalism keeps changing. When, "Our place of peace is in a meek and humble walk, dependent wholly upon the Lord,"[545] the kind of Lord, and his/her ask of believers becomes key. In the 1940s, when *Faith is a Rock* first appeared, the Lord, for AG pentecostals, had crystalized around a literal reading of the Bible. Their increasingly fundamentalist impulses left little question that interpretation or culture might intervene to destabilize the rock upon which they lay – "rock" meant certainty through literalism. Yet, even in these fundamentalist 1940s, in the last lines of *Faith is A Rock*, the project falters, if only a touch. It reads, "The future is merely uncertain in our ignorance of it…"[546] That is to say, certainty can be had, but not by humans. This initial opening was purely

[545] Ernest S Williams, "Have Faith in God," PE 1925_1_25, p2.
[546] Dan Crawford, "Good News, Faith IS A ROCK" PE 1940_3_2, p12

epistemological, and very much secondary to the dominant sense of sureness. But, as missions grew and post-colonial cultures pushed against Western theologies, the pentecostal emphasis on both spiritual gifts and cross-cultural translation became more prominent than their fundamentalist focus on the book. This gap between the rock and human knowledge of it - the caveat at the very end of the tale – thus cracked open a space which initially came quite small, but enlarged as missions reached post-War post-colonial nations. Western missionary ignorance became far more palpable, and the gap thus offered a portal through which a vast array of cultural forces flowed. In other words, the pentecostal claim to "no uncertain sound" might be read retrospectively as less sure than it seems - it is a sound, an impulse, a signal, but must reach from the spirit world to the human, and when human uncertainty expands via cross cultural translation it has less of the quality of concreteness provided previously.

Further, by the 1970s AG missiologists began very explicitly critiquing fundamentalist systematicity by deploying the uncertainty of the Holy Spirit. Contemporary AG missiology argues that spiritual immediacy trumps text. For instance, Paul Pomerville calls for the "the immediacy of God," described as a, "confrontation with the reality of God the Holy Spirit and the living word."[547] Pomerville saw immediacy as opposed to fundamentalist innerancy and rigidity. Likewise, Everett Wilson emphasizes the lack of human access to a determinist modern *telos* when he writes, "since these missionaries recognized their own

[547] Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*, 9.

inadequacy, they left room for – and persistently sought – divine help…"[548] Mel Hodges agrees: "None of us is wise enough to chart the future course of missions. We don't have to be! The Holy Spirit will lead us on a better course than we could possibly plan. He is already doing so."[549] Certainty here has mutated, from belief in specifics to faith in an overarching direction.

Likewise, Wilson suggests that the systematizing of "Church growth " missiology aims for clarity in ways unlike the more fluid approaches of AG. "Adopting an engineering model, a great many students of missionary work took up the tools of sociology, emphasizing demographic analysis, the growth rates of particular churches, and the rationalization of missionary methods... " And while the AG Department of Foreign Missions (DFM) engaged closely with these projects, there was always a balancing act. As Wilson described, "While the church growth movement was concerned largely with the meticulous assessment of need, the systematic proclamation of the message, and the rational deployment of resources, J. Philip Hogan, [AG leader of DFM], without neglecting these concerns, urged his colleagues to keep the end of the missionary task in view. The sowing of spiritual seed, although a logical priority, was a wasted effort if the church did not eventually emerge. He believed that wherever the good seed of the gospel was sown in fertile soil, the normal process of germination would result in at least some tender

[548] Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 66.
[549] McGee, *This Gospel Shall Be Preached,* 106.

plants…Reaping a harvest thus entailed the entire process: sowing, cultivating, watering, and whatever else was needed to produce a crop."[550]

The power of "Cultivation" as a language for the methodical nurturing of selves, conversions, and communities became a central lesson for this dissertation emerging after several years of participant observation among pentecostal communities. At first, I imagined it was my own invention, with its nice pairing of systematic action aiming teleologically and the deep uncertainty that comes when agency is not confined to the actor. But, I later realized that this sense of the tensions within the process of coming to be was cultivated within me through my encounters with pentecostals, and I easily found the very specific articulation amongst my interlocutors.

Cultivation The Practice: Modernity

Yet cultivation is more than language – it refers to pentecostal practices that might also be generalized to reference a set of processes developed by 19th century evangelicals that bring technocratic systematicity to bear on the modern religiosity. Thus, today's pentecostals follow a tradition of cultivation that emerged in loose correspondence with what scholars often call modernity – especially with regards to its emphasis on rationalization and objectification. Since the late-1700s, religious leaders in the US and Europe experimented with bringing the stringent methodical cultivation of the self from the monastery out in to the world. In doing so, they

[550] Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 64.

popularized and made easily accessible ecstasy and spiritual authority. As Taylor explains, from 1800 to 1960, the "Age of Mobilization,"[551] meant increased popular participation in the methodical creation of religion. Efforts at mobilization intensified[552] as Protestant and Catholic[553] competition for adherents motivated new programs aimed at potential converts such as the Wesleyan Methodists, other free churches, and voluntary associations like temperance organizations, credit unions, revivals, and retreats. Charles Finney and Dwight Moody also rationalized approaches to emotion and faith that exemplified broader efforts at evangelism in the 20th century.[554] Yet, at the same time, the increasing systematization of social life began to move religion from a holistic organic ever-presence, to something explicitly embattled, increasingly separated, only finding solace in a newly articulated private sphere, far less and to hegemonic discussions of social life, especially politics. Thus, with the public sphere increasingly present and closed, "experience," and "faith" became the fallback position for Evangelical Protestant survivals of the Enlightenment attacks. They called it "religion of the heart" and both the critics of its "enthusiasm," and its progenitors imagined the new religious sublime as outside of the mechanical habits of everyday life. Yet, as I will argue, this privatization of

[551] Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Boston: Harvard 2007).
[552] As Taylor says, "It becomes clearer and clearer that whatever political, social, ecclesial structures we aspire to have to be mobilized into existence." Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 445.
[553] Catholics also began massive efforts at consolidation and organization emphasizing popular modes of piety and lay authority. Taylor 2007
[554] Jon P DePriest, *Send the Light: Team and the Evangelical Mission, 1890-1975* (Bloomington, IN: Author House 2007), 6-7. Frank Lambert, *Inventing the "Great Awakening"* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999).

religion did not – as many have argued - necessitate its escape from the systematizing touch of the modern.[555]

Evangelicals themselves were quite sensitive to the dangers, as they put it, of either formalist religion – structure without the feeling – or of enthusiasm – feeling without God. Yet, those groups that proliferated could not simply reject the rational and systematic for ecstasy, if some did, their movement likely didn't last. Thus, the increasingly emotional sensibilities of emerging evangelicalism came joined, albeit uncomfortably, to mechanical systems of thought and practice. George Whitfield was famous for his stadium presentations, unusual body movements, vocal gymnastics, and their emotional effect on huge crowds. While he prescribed an immediate experience of spontaneous rupture, or the new birth, his work was far from spontaneous. In the two years preceding his tour, newspapers were flooded with stories and discussions inspired by Whitfield's promoter. This rationalized religious practice reach thousands – 22,000 attended his peak revival - and in doing so systematically nurtured a freedom from the rational.[556]

Likewise, Ann Taves' work on revivalism shows that despite differences over the desirability of sensate experiences, other "Great Awakening" preachers agreed that experience was cultivated in ways that included both encouragement and constraint. Jonathan Edwards nurtured a revival that was controlled, or so he hoped,

---

[555] Philip S. Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: Church, State, and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Ca. 1300 to 1700," *American Sociological Review* 65, no. 1 (February 2000): 138.
[556] Frank Lambert, *Inventing the "Great Awakening"* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999).

by carefully educated preachers. Newly significant scientific terminology meant experience must be tried in practice and experimentally tested.[557] Charles Chauncey's critique of Edwards decried the nurtured sensibilities amongst those "accustomed to the Way of screaming out."[558] Likewise, John Davenport encouraged this cultivation with highly repetitious congregational songs repeated 30 or 40 times, and praying till three in the morning. He modeled visceral experience "with the most violent agitation of body even to the distorting of his features and marring his visage," and "an unrestrained liberty to noise and outcry."[559] Some cultivated in a different direction: another preacher, McCulloch, collected testimonies in the 1740s but carefully controlled the educational process by excised references to ecstatic religious experience visions, voices, trances.[560] In other words, religious communities in the 1700s began actively cultivating – controlling and encouraging – a particular set of sensory aptitudes that they deemed helpful for a broad group of people in search of genuine spiritual connection.

In a similar vein, John Wesley developed an extraordinarily systematic method of nurturing the sensory aptitudes that he came to see as necessary for the new birth required of Methodists and other Evangelicals. Wesley's Methodists formed into twelve person bands of closely monitored practitioners. They encouraged and tracked regular home visits, daily regimes of prayer, and carefully constrained quotidian practices – eating, teatime, reflection, and conversation all became spaces

[557] Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, 49.
[558] Ibid., 31.
[559] Ibid., 70.
[560] Ibid., 63.

for the cultivation of spirituality. The details were intimate, for "studious persons" likely required "about eight Ounces of Animal Food, and twelve of Vegetable in twenty-four Hours," good amounts of water, and 2-3 hours of physical activity a day.[561] Within these bands, elders kept a careful watch on spiritual development, visiting members in their homes weekly. Regional authorities hoped to visit and confer with every single member every few months. At the quarterly "convergence" (conference), those whose development seemed acceptable were given tickets of spiritual certification, and the unspiritual – both enthusiasts and formalists - were expelled. These networks were cultivated by itinerant circuit riders who systematically encouraged conversion.[562]

At the same time, Methodists, named quite rationally for their emphasis on systematic method, were known for extremes of emotive and visceral behavior. Methodists were the people falling on the floor, moaning at camp meetings, and singing and shouting the Lord's praise until the morning. Methodist communal call and response worked to inspire sensation. Sensory aptitude rooted their theology, for as Wesley explained, "no man can be a true Christian without such an inspiration of the Holy Ghost as fills his heart with peace and joy and love."[563] And, while he denied human agency in the process, Wesley's preaching made the sensory cultivation explicit via calls for manifestations of the spirit. As Taves writes,

---

[561] Joseph W Williams, *Spirit Cure: A History of Pentecostal Healing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 6.
[562] Christine Leigh Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
[563] Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, 51.

"Although Wesley indicated he was surprised when Hannah Corniche cried aloud, Wesley had actually just called for such a 'sign'" that God would, "bear witness to his word."[564] Further, Wesley collected stories in an effort to build the community acceptance of visceral legitimation. As Stephen Gunter puts it, "[Wesley] searched incessantly for testimonies of conversion experiences which would substantiate the validity of his claim that human experience was a form of proof for divine activity."[565] Methodists became people skilled in a certain set of sensory aptitudes, a practical mastery of the body-mind-spirit such that incredibly rational and rationalized system of organization and daily practice provided space for explosive spontaneous religiosity. They had refined the tension between the systematic and the affective – perhaps they were masters of cultivation. And their growth was impressive, from 2% in 1775 to 34% of US church membership in 1850.[566] Methodists later birthed the Holiness movement that joined with 19th century faith healing to become the pentecostals.

The early 19th century theological shift from Calvinist predestination to Arminian agency reflected this growing sense – and reality - that spirituality could be systematically nurtured. As the Arminian revivalist Charles Finney described, the Spirit descended on him, "like a wave of electricity, going through and through me. Indeed it seemed to come in waves and waves of liquid love… I literally bellowed out

---

[564] Ibid., 73.
[565] W. Stephen Gunter, *The Limits of "Love Divine": John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm* (Nashville, TN: Kingswood Books, 1989), 151.
[566] John H Wigger, *Taking Heaven by Storm Methodism and the Rise of Popular Christianity in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 3.

the unutterable gushings of my heart."[567] Yet, at the same time, his most famous speech was quite clear about the instrumental process engaged, as he wrote: "revival is an act of man."[568] In other words, his use of the anxious bench, crowd enthusiasm, and singing was aimed at nurturing an emotional and physical skill set that he could bequeath to a team of preachers across the country. Wesley, by contrast to Finney, was born a Calvinist and fervently believed in predestination. He struggled throughout his life with emerging Arminianism in which choice was becoming more prominent in one's relationship to God and to heaven. By the time Wesley died, the Methodist blend of the systematic and the emotive included a very clear call to action for the sake of spiritual advancement.

Pentecostals later took Methodist practices and turned them into a clear theology of sensory experience. Instead of Wesley's vague call for gifts, by 1914, AG pentecostals legitimated tongues and healing in their core documents, making physical experience a prerequisite of spiritual growth. Through intensive striving and practice, the heart could manifest, with explicit intention, in very specific bodily sensations. What emerges is a distinctively modern, highly rationalized, version of religiosity.[569] Yet explicitly embodied, for whereas some pentecostal forbears (i.e. the Keswick movement) understood full consecration as a mental act, many pentecostals saw it as an act of bodily possession.

---

[567] Anderson, *Spreading Fires*, 23.
[568] Charles G. Finney, *Revivals of Religion* (Virginia Beach, Va.: CBN University Press, 1978).
[569] In her study of Brazilian Pentecostalism Celia Loreto Mariz argues that Pentecostalism refigures hierarchies in a patently modern manner. "Many authors believe that Pentecostalism merely imitates a traditional relationship to authority and the supernatural and does not represent Pentecostalism, among other things, as a process of rationalization." Cecília Loreto Mariz, *Coping with Poverty: Pentecostals and Christian Base Communities in Brazil* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 161.

This increasing rationalization was not uncontested. In fact, it is through the Protestant concern that too much human agency would destroy spiritual possibility that one can see the increasing rationalization especially clearly. Taves shows that the concern with systematicity, human made, could energize a critique of enthusiasm. For George Roberts, a Methodist preacher, the problem with the new worship was not "the involuntary loud hosannas of… pious souls, [but]… forming jumping, dancing, shouting, &c. into a *system*, and pushing our social exercises into these extremes." In other words, his concern was not with enthusiasm but with the cultivation and rationalizing of enthusiasm as, what he calls, "habit." For those who "learn a *habit* of vehemence [are]… mostly persons of credulous, *uninformed* minds; who, before the change to grace had been of rude education…"[570] Habits here seem especially exciting to the poor and uneducated; their cultivation, for Roberts, suggests manipulation.

In all, cultivation among evangelicals and emerging pentecostals manifested in what Taves calls the "sacralization of the body,"[571] a religious process brought into pentecostalism and critiqued by Wacker because, "believers effectively sacramentalized the divine power by locating it within their own bodies…"[572] This resonates closely with what I describe as the process of solidifying portable body-logics. Taves applies Bourdieu's notion of "practical mastery" to the "structural exercises" that move participants from "apprenticeship through simple

[570] Ann Taves, "The Camp Meeting and the Paradoxes of Evangelical Protestant Ritual," in *Teaching Ritual*, ed. Catherine Bell, 2007, 124.
[571] Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, 107.
[572] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 108.

familiarization."[573] She explains that people acquire or develop the necessary skills under a variety of conditions involving trauma, drugs, bodily deprivation, sleep and relaxation, heightened attention, and stimulation of the senses.[574] I would add that these conditions are both carefully nurtured, systematically implemented, and grounds for the apparent release from all systematicity.

Finally, while this rationalizing of affect seems especially enabling to religious practice, Evangelical histories resonate with some broader shifts within modern sensibilities especially its joining of the systematic to the visceral seems to resonate. Zygmunt Bauman finds a similar organic metaphor to describe the increased systematicity of modernity: "modern society differs from its predecessors by its gardener–like, rather than gamekeeper–like, attitude to itself…."[575] Thus, in my most expansive moments, I imagine that religion did not retreat into the internal private self, the inversion of the public sphere.[576] Instead, perhaps modernity traces the time when the rationalized is applied systematically to the emotive and the sensual, when bodies and the spirits now interred within them increasingly become the objects of technocratic manipulation. Mine is not exactly Michael Young's argument that evangelicalism is the root of US social movements but perhaps its slightly more modest kin.[577] I am suggesting that if the parade of historians arguing that evangelicalism is the absolutely crucial central core of American culture have

[573] Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*, 10.
[574] Ibid., 358.
[575] Bauman, *Freedom*, 10.
[576] Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*.
[577] Young, *Bearing Witness against Sin*.

purchase on something,[578] then the methods of cultivation in the evangelical world would very likely make their case a bit more tractable. Perhaps, cultivation is a dynamic of the modern. It could be that along with, or maybe even instead of, interiorization of religion, the modern includes its exteriorization, the rationalizing and making public the intimacies of monastic cultivation. This relationship between the systematic and the affective has been described as discipline and biopolitics[579], rational disaggregation,[580] secularization,[581] and the underpinning for anomie,[582] rationalization,[583] alienation,[584] or objectification[585] as well as the more positive spin in Taylor's Age of Mobilization among other liberal thinkers.[586] For some, this suggests the destruction of holism and increasing alienation. Others see a growing capacity to engage agentively across broader horizons. For pentecostals, and their predecessors, it means both. They regularly see the rational as mechanical and yet also enabling. They call the work done within this tension "cultivation" and I argue that its

[578] McLoughlin, *The American Evangelicals, 1800-1900; an Anthology*.; Young, *Bearing Witness against Sin*; Brint, *Evangelicals and Democracy in America Religion and Politics*. Butler, "Born Again America? A Critique of the New 'Evangelical Thesis' in Recent American Historiography." Cited in Stout and Taylor Jr., "Studies of Religion in American Society: The State of the Art," 19.
[579] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*.
[580] Philip S Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: Church, State, and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Ca. 1300 to 1700," *American Sociological Review*. 65, no. 1 (2000): 138.
[581] For a summary of the secularization arguments see: Taylor, *A Secular Age*; Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: Church, State, and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Ca. 1300 to 1700."
[582] Émile Durkheim, *Suicide, a Study in Sociology* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951).
[583] Max Weber, *Economy and society; an outline of interpretive sociology*. (New York: Bedminster Press, 1968).
[584] Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. (New York: International Publishers, 1964).
[585] Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977).
[586] Taylor, *A Secular Age*.

exploration offers insight into the productivity of contemporary religious movements, perhaps other movements as well.

Modern Cultivation: Therapeutic Culture

The evolution, and importance, of therapeutic culture within the US offers another suggestion that cultivation is especially modern. While Methodists took the monastery and brought it to the churches, Freud brought it home, into schools and the clinic. And work on the therapeutic self, a meticulously constructed project if there ever was one, is deeply indebted to evangelicalism - think of AA's evangelical roots – but also its entwinement with contemporary Christian projects as well. For instance, in *Born Again Bodies*, Marie Griffith describes today's devotional fitness culture: "Even as many modern social institutions have progressively divested themselves of explicit Christian content, metaphysical and evangelical beliefs have thrived in the therapeutic culture they helped create. Within this milieu [we find people] relentlessly exhorting mind over matter, gospels of wealth and health, and unshakeable optimism in the self."[587] These are all modes of expressing the systematic cultivation of the sensory in a particular Christian, but very modern, vein.

Along the lines of Griffith's story of devotional culture, and resonating closely with the proliferation of evangelical self-help literature, this effort at systematic cultivation of the self and the body extends into much of everyday pentecostal life.

[587] R. Marie Griffith, *Born Again Bodies: Flesh and Spirit in American Christianity* (University of California Press, 2004), 14.

George Holmes' essay, "God's Exercise Program for a More Perfect You," from *The Pentecostal Evangel* 1988 shows the project clearly. As he writes, "Our speech is one indicator of our spiritual health. It requires constant exercise to control the tongue muscle. In a crowd we are often tempted to blurt out the first witty thing that comes to mind. It may provoke laughter, but sarcastic missiles can score a direct hit on someone's heart and blow apart a friendship. Exercise in tongue control is as essential as speaking wholesome words...." Tongue control here contrasts starkly with training for speaking in tongues in which the goal becomes release. "Love, faith, and purity need daily cultivation," writes Holmes. "Contact with the abrasive world system can erode these qualities unless we nurture them… He [God] will show us our inconsistencies as we exercise ourselves in prayer and examination." As he cites, "train yourself to be godly" 1 Timothy 4:7[588] However, remember here that training, in any active sense of the word, is bound to failure. Instead, the dualism of the mechanistic and the sensory is put in abeyance, elided by the third party involved. For pentecostals the third party is God or the Holy Spirit, for less Christian oriented thinkers it might be nature, or simply a metaphysical contingency, but in either case, the result is an entanglement of the rational and the irrational, only mediated by a third force with multiple qualities. Translation across cultures is always a dicey project, especially in light of the oft cited anthropological and post-colonial assertion of cultural incommensurability, and yet it is central to my project and to that of my interlocutors. Evangelism, like ethnography, is all about translation, appropriation,

[588] "Gods exercise program for a more perfect you," George Holmes, PE 1988_4_17, p4-5.

power, and encounter and perhaps makes apparent that there is no relationship without these dynamics. So, I engage cultivation as a potentially translatable tool of analysis and of mobilization.

This is very much in line with Rick Warren's *A Purpose Driven Life,* its exericise manual, and the broad world of evangelical self-help projects.[589] Taken even further, Anthony Giddens, Scott Lash, and Ulrich Beck argue that the characteristic feature of high modernity is this kind of reflexive self, now conceptualized as a project.[590] Such thinking adds density to my sense that cultivation is useful as a description of modernity.

Cultivation Theory

The final section of this chapter works at bringing together insights from psychiatric anthropology, post-structural embodiment theories, practice theory, neurology, and anthropologies of scale to resonate with pentecostal practice and help me think more abstractly about cultivation as a theory. Most importantly, taken together, these scholars provide a framework for thinking with pentecostal sensory solidification, both in its physical consolidation, and in its winnowing processes, as well as in the relationship between rupture and nurturance, and the tensions between gridding and somaticism. Further, it explains why ritual theory, phenomenology,

[589] Griffith, *Born Again Bodies*.
[590] Ulrich Beck, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash, *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994).

body foundationalism, and declension narratives don't quite support what I am learning here.

While discontinuity might seem the pentecostal distinctive[591], I hope it is clear that the cultivation of enduring capabilities – including the capacity for rupture - is also significant. Further, if we take into account recent studies on changing bodies, it becomes apparent that this kind of systematic effort creates lasting change, in material bodies as well as culture; body logics, sensibilities and sensory aptitudes crystalize in multiple ways - into seemingly raw physiology as well as consolidated relational dynamics and, of course, the more commonly recognized religious formations of doctrine and ritual practices. This section then builds from theories of cultivation, which, like the pentecostal version, explicitly entangle bodies and norms. Also, importantly, it sees cultivation as broadly applicable. I start with Talal Asad and Annemarie Mol's use of cultivation as a language for socio-somatic processes. This brings me to a second set of thinkers who show nature and culture in a reciprocal relationship, and mutually transformed. They focus on the processes of crystalizing sensory aptitudes, dispositions and the cognitive and physiological substance materialized through practice. In particular, they explore how communities of people evolve particular mind-body ratios, Theories of Mind, and sense ratios.[592] Thus, when we see pentecostals develop specific body logics, this is more than merely a cognitive project, but rather one that sits deep in the tissues, likely transmitted through

[591] Robbins, "Introduction"; Robbins, "Continuity Thinking and the Problem of Christian Culture"; Robbins, "On the Paradoxes of Global Pentecostalism and the Perils of Continuity Thinking."
[592] Luhrmann, "Toward an Anthropological Theory of Mind."

generational modeling, but perhaps extending into transgenerational epigenetics. This plasticity of body, mind, and their relationships is explored and debated by neurologists and psychologists, but also modeled by Vicky Kirby and Catherine Bell whose work is useful for demonstrating the process of cutting that does not quite match traditional notions of ritual, but seems to sit very well with pentecostal practice. Bell's practice theory, scaled in the tensions between church and revival, might catch some of the most consequential elements of pentecostal practice. Finally, Anna Tsing offers a model for understanding relationships between these scales and their value in social theory and perhaps philosophy. In all, I aim to show that when pentecostals talk about sensations in their body, there is good reason to think they describe something powerful, meaningful and likely a very real physicality, rather than collective fantasy. For mobilizing requires cultivating a sensorium; collective effervescence and rupture materialize through practice; and, finally, to some degree, we choose what we cultivate.

For Talal Asad and Annemarie Mol the word cultivation has potential for broad application. Asad, for instance, describes the processes of secularization as cultivation. He tells how our sensory aptitudes mold in the repeated experiences of everyday life.[593] That is, the cognitivist emphasis of contemporary secularism might be as cultivated and sensual as the viscerality of contemporary sports culture, or pentecostalism, for that matter. In this tradition, as with the work of Marcel Mauss

[593] Asad, *Formations of the Secular*.

and Pierre Bourdieu, our gait, our stance, and likely even our passions form slowly and sediment in culturally and historically specific ways. Bourdieu, for instance, explains how ritualized practice can disperse out into the everyday. He speaks of, "the hidden persuasion of an implicit pedagogy which can instill a whole cosmology, through injunctions as insignificant as 'sit up straight' or 'don't hold your knife in your left hand.'" As such, we " inscribe the most fundamental principles of the arbitrary content of a culture in seemingly innocuous details of bearing or physical and verbal manners."[594] Culture here involves bodies, not merely as adjunct to a set of meanings. Rather, bodies and meanings reciprocally constitute and deeply entangle, with neither primary. This results, as Mol says, in a "body on which norms do not need to be imposed because they are already incorporated in it."[595] Through Mol's lens, the rationalization, the ritualization, and the systematization of the sensory, describe an internal pattern of feeling, not some outside force or object in collision. I will suggest, however, that while all is gridded, the intensity of the patterning, might differ when the web of feeling is either loosely thrown, or pulled taught and resonates with and vibrates in every breeze. In either case, gridding is not external.

This entanglement is quite literal, not simply a post structural passion for text within soma for recent studies in the relationship between practice and the visceral show sensoria, and the bodies that inhabit them, changing, and rather rapidly. Tanya Luhrmann shows Evangelical practice enhancing the experience of "moments of total attention that somehow completely engage all of one's attentional resources –

[594] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 69.
[595] Mol, "GOOD TASTE," 270.

perceptual, imaginative, conceptual and even the way one holds and moves one's body," what Luhrmann calls "absorption."[596] In dialogue with practice theory stressing the social, historical, and strategic lodged in the act, the body, and its ritualization, Luhrmann might be seen to detail specific tools used by evangelicals to develop "practical mastery," or skilled bodies.[597]

These skills help form a sensorium, or sensory culture, where they are then nurtured and transmitted. Sensoria vary across time and place. According to Classen, for instance, European cultures increasingly ignore and perhaps debase the sense of smell,[598] while sight has become more dominant.[599] Other scholars show variation across cultures. When presented with the same stimuli for their five senses, for instance, different cultural groups describe them with significant variability.[600] Likewise, we know from Kathryn Geurts that Ghanaian Anlo-Ewe people understand mind as partly somatic because their sensory hierarchy doesn't allow for the disembodied mind common to the West. Ghanaians score significantly lower than North Americans on "attention to emotion subscales" and higher on "somatic-focused awareness."[601] More broadly, it seems that Protestants emphasize hearing, Catholics

[596] Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*, 199.
[597] Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*; Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.
[598] Classen, *Worlds of Sense*.
[599] Ong, *Orality and Literacy*.
[600] Majid and Levinson, "Th
e Senses in Language and Culture."
[601] Geurts, "Consciousness as 'Feeling in the Body': A West African Theory of Embodiment, Emotion and the Making of Mind."

and Hindus seeing.[602] Likewise, Homeric Greeks saw the mind as divided between generators of motion and locus of ideas. The Japanese envision a relative unity of mind and body, thus, for them, to understand via the head would be an insult.[603]

Perhaps, even more surprisingly, sensory aptitudes change rather rapidly. We know that in broad schemas practices work with natural selection to change physiology. Dairy farming culture selects for high populations of lactose absorbers. Brain encephalization likely evolved through the increase of group size and the emergence of language.[604] These are long slow processes. But, cultivation is also relevant over a much tighter temporal scale. The contemporary Vietnamese have only recently – post-Communism - adopted a theory of mind that valorizes emotions and seems to intensify them as well, yet it seems established.[605] Likewise, Sonya Pritzker describes how Americans learning Chinese medicine quickly come to feel emotions in their bodies.[606] Luhrmann describes a 6-9 month learning period by which Evangelicals learn to hear God's voice in their prayer practices.[607] Put simply, cultivation changes things, some rather quickly – bodies, minds, and their relationships.

---

[602] Schmidt, *Hearing Things*; William A. Dyrness, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards* (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[603] Lillard A, "Ethnopsychologies: Cultural Variations in Theories of Mind.," *Psychological Bulletin* 123, no. 1 (1998): 12.
[604] Li SC, "Biocultural Orchestration of Developmental Plasticity across Levels: The Interplay of Biology and Culture in Shaping the Mind and Behavior across the Life Span.," *Psychological Bulletin* 129, no. 2 (2003): 176.
[605] Allen Tran cited in Luhrmann, "Toward an Anthropological Theory of Mind," 10.
[606] Pritzker, "Thinking Hearts, Feeling Brains."
[607] Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*.

Recent studies of religion have emphasized the role of religious practice in channeling neuroplasticity. Newberg and Waldman suggest that religious practice can, "permanently change the structure of those parts of the brain that control our moods, give rise to our conscious notions of self, and shape our sensory perceptions of the world."[608] In other words, quite a bit can be modified if only subtly.[609] How deeply, and solidly, this change manifests is uncertain. Recent work on epigenetics suggests that even across one lifetime, very specific experiences, can crystalize and be passed on the next generation.[610] Finally, regardless of genetic plasticity, cultural practices certainly outlive their practitioners – body logics can be taught through evangelism, parenting, or education and across time and space.

In all, we know that communities develop sensory aptitudes peculiar to their life world. They cultivate mind-body divisions, sensory hierarchies, or holisms and then we call the meaning making that attaches to these sedimented sensory aptitudes "culture." Aside from the – in my mind misplaced - emphasis on cognition, studies of culture explain their coherence by virtue of the sedimented (less motile) discourse, practices, faith, or needs. Culture is thus a snapshot – and a very useful one that could include the sensorium. A more processual view, however, would explore the ways bodies, minds, and practices nurture sensibilities that change as they are recognized. Culture has become. Cultivation is both a becoming and a being. And,

---

[608] Newberg, *How God Changes Your Brain*, 2009, 7.
[609] See also Richard. Noll, "Mental Imagery Cultivation as a Cultural Phenomenon: The Role of Visions in Shamanism," *Current Anthropology : A World Journal of the Sciences of Man* 26 (1985): 443–61; Michael. Winkelman, *Shamanism a Biopsychosocial Paradigm of Consciousness and Healing* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010).
[610] Nessa Carey, *The Epigenetics Revolution: How Modern Biology Is Rewriting Our Understanding of Genetics, Disease, and Inheritance* (Columbia University Press, 2013).

given these studies in changing theories of mind and body, we now have good reason to think that things previously seen as rather sticky – like mind-body dualisms - are in fact somewhat fluid.

Vicky Kirby helps translate between the empirical transformations of the body and the seemingly linguistically bound work of culture. She inverts the commonsense reading of post-structuralism as discursive foundationalism because of its emphasis on language. Instead, Kirby suggests that since text is all, semiotics can be a useful model for the structure of the sensory. As she writes, "if there is no outside to textuality, then the differential of language is articulate in/as blood, cells, breathing, and so on." If so, perhaps, "the body of the world is articulate and uncannily thoughtful."[611] Kirby builds her argument from Derrida's claim that the "most elementary processes within the living cell," are also, "writing."[612] In doing so, she challenges post-structural thinkers who limit the entanglement of soma and language. As Kirby points out, Judith Butler describes change and agency in the slippage between re-presentation: as things are resaid, their context, and they themselves, change. Yet, read by Kirby, Butler suggests that underneath this respeaking we find a solid body. And yes, I must agree that bodies change more slowly than words and their solidity is grounds for politics, although not a clear one: i.e. either the essentializing of women as the weaker sex, or perhaps gays as inherently queer and thus worthy of more open marriage laws. However, bodies are

[611] Kirby, *Telling Flesh*, 4–5.
[612] Jacques. Derrida, *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 9. Cited in Kirby, *Telling Flesh*, 61.

also deeply relational, such that changed context and encounter constantly refigure the soma. In other words, instead of bodies being the alterity at the limit of language as suggested by both Thomas Csordas[613] and Butler, like language, bodies also are gridded, also change via relational iteration, and also can be experienced in powerful unintelligible immediacy.

This suggests a challenge to nature /culture divides. Kirby thus describes "corporeo*graphy,*" in which, "representation is 'sensible' in that biology is not a supplementary ingredient to be included or excluded."[614] Yet, I argue instead, that at any given moment there is likely grounds for distinction between bodies and minds. As neurologists argue, bodies are minds, yet the shifting sands of our senses suggest that their relationships crystallize in a given temporal context. However, at a different scale of analysis, over extended time for instance, the division can lose its cogency as relationality and change either prevail, or iterations of separation can sharpen previously fuzzy distinctions. However, while there is an extended argument to be had over the relative stability and viability of nature/culture divides in a given context, practically speaking, what matters for this study, now that we have bodies with serious levels of sediment, is how body-mind relationships might change.

There have been plenty of attempts to think through relationships between culture and the soma some of which stretch in the face of pentecostal practices. In particular, cultivation theory, as I am developing it, responds to, but significantly

[613] Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable."
[614] Kirby, *Telling Flesh*, 154.

refigures ritual, rationalization/declension, phenomenology, and body foundationalist explanations of sensory evolution and/or pentecostalism.

Ritual Theory

Pentecostal practice challenges ritual theory. Most broadly, ritual theorists struggle with dualisms of thought and action and affiliated concepts. When seen as generating symbolic meaning and/or modeling social dynamics through mindless collective enthusiasm or the repetition of traditional forms, mechanical ritual is often opposed to ostensively deeper impulses of individual self-reflexivity, spontaneity, and creativity: control against freedom. In response, some analyses, like Jon Bialecki's dialectic between charisma and the Bible and Thomas Kirsch's description of spirit and letters as "synchronically" engaged and "complementary" provide compelling visions that might explain joined polarities.[615] These are very helpful efforts to account for tensions between systematicity and somatic experience central to pentecostal practices. Yet, the tradition I examine among pentecostals adds a very material third element to the institution-charisma binaries these scholars seek to overcome. Instead of two scales in tension, I describe an in-between that has materialized - cultivation that is congealed in text and in skillful sensibilities that bind church and rupture. It is the tension within Bialecki's dialectic made increasingly concrete and less open to the resolution implied by the notion of dialectic.

[615] Bialecki, "The Bones Restored to Life: Dialogue and Dissemination in the Vineyard's Dialectic of Text and Presence"; Kirsch, *Spirits and Letters*, 17. See also Elisha, *Moral Ambition Mobilization And Social Outreach In Evangelical Megachurches*.

Pentecostalism challenges ritual theory further by expanding ritual deep into the everyday, perhaps voiding the power of the ritual-quotidian divide. Thomas Csordas describes "subsum[ing] quotidian practices within the sphere of ritual activities"[616] or the ritualization of life, interpersonal space, the domestic space, civic space, geographic and natural space, and time.[617] Likewise, Gretchen Pfeil sees testimony "achieved in and through talk of the lowest register, in the most common way, about the most banal, bodily, and ugly of things."[618] Off-the-cuff and "high affect" (very emotional) thus become the outward sign of profound interiority – the everyday as sacred. Pfeil argues that pentecostal-charismatic practice "demands the mundane as a necessary medium of devotion, perhaps even to the point of exaggerating or staging the mundane… arranged so as to appear disordered and messy. It is a form of ritual action that depends… on its status as not 'ritualized' and not separate." If the process "eventually leaves no room for distinction between sacred and secular action even in everyday life,"[619] why hold onto the term ritual? Yet from outside the pentecostal world, their iterative practices appear obvious; they have not disappeared. In other words, whatever we call these repetitions, the cosmological significance of these quotidian acts works to differentiate the sacred community from the profane - the internal and external – but they do not allow for clear rite-mundane distinctions.

---

[616] Csordas, "Ritualization of Life," 129.
[617] Thomas Csordas, *Language, Charisma, and Creativity : The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement*, 1997, 102.
[618] Pfeil, "Imperfect Vessels: Emotion and Rituals of Anti-Ritual in American Pentecostal and Charismatic Devotional Life," 289.
[619] Csordas, *Language, Charisma, and Creativity : The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement*, 108.

Csordas engages pentecostalism's challenge to ritual theory with an exploration of the microscale of phenomenology – very much in sync with his informants view of subjectivity.[620] As he argues, if spiritual experience is a precultural, preobjective human capacity rooted in fundamental alterity, it might be constituted before, or beneath, mind-body dualisms.[621] This suggests a part of the human that is not cultivated – which seems to me a confusion between ontology and scale. There are certainly sedimented bodies with certain skills. That does not mean these are not cultivated over time. As such, because of his sense that cultivation is incomplete and barred from the deepest interiority, Csordas asserts the human capacity to rupture but does little to explain how one group got so good at it. Further, perhaps through a personal commitment to the immediate experience of otherness as "the sacred," or from his deep inhabitation of pentecostal-charismatic subjectivity, Csordas emphasizes elements of a self quite congruent with modern Protestant-secular subjectivity - individual, discontinuous, inherent. By contrast, I challenge pentecostal self-reflexive narratives of autonomy and spontaneity by placing cultivation and collectivity at the center, a foregrounding I suspect will help resolve some challenges of ritual theory and speak to the success of pentecostalism. In other words, while we may have a capacity for alterity, or limit experience, it is likely cultivated and solidified like the rest of us.

---

[620] His studies are of Catholic charismatics.

[621] Thomas Csordas, *The Sacred Self : A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Csordas, *Language, Charisma, and Creativity : The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement*; Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable."

Cultivation provides a very similar challenge to theorists who argue that if only we could dematerialize culture, or degrid the natural body, we might find a pure soma underneath, one without the myriad of problems the modern body brings with it. I call these thinkers "body foundationalists" as they portray bodies as the pure clay that is later molded to produce culture and social life. My simple response: if bodies emerge through gridding, then there is no plausible natural pre-gridded body to return to. In other words, backwards motion here is not possible. Life requires both structure and flow.

Among those valorizing bodies as fundamental, and healthy, elements of social life, I briefly discuss Nietzsche and Foucault because of their powerful influence engendering deep concern with the gridding ostensively imposed upon bodies from the modern outside. However, there are plenty of others with similar projects.[622] For Nietzsche, the mind rests on the body. "Philosophy is a product of

[622] Body foundationalism – a bit more than essentialism in that it suggests that underneath the social grid there lies an essential, but also healthy, body of some sort. It manifests in multiple ways. Feminists reclaiming the healthy in woman's sexuality, or physiology, what Joan Peters calls Red Bloomers. Joan K. Peters, "Mittelschmerz: A Lady's Complaint upon Reaching the Age of Forty-Four," *Michigan Quarterly Review*. XXIX, no. 4 (Fall 1990): 685–93. Some include Adrienne Rich and Luce Irigaray in this category. Luce. Irigaray, *This Sex Which Is Not One* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985); Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* (NY: Norton, 1976). It would also include queer thinkers claiming the homosexual is essentially bound to DNA, and then might be related to less kind theories of black male (often female, queer, or poor) bodies as needing the social grid to contain their instinct towards violent and/or irrational passions. For an overview of feminist discussions see Susan Bordo, *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993). In this vein, there are those who simply see the body as more expansive or fluid than the controlling discursive grid. i.e. "Communicating through the body precedes and to a great extent always remains beyond speech" Jackson, "Knowledge of the Body," 328. 13 Or "Human bodies have a wonderful ability, while striving for integration and cohesion, organic and psychic wholeness, to also provide for and indeed produce fragmentations, fracturing, dislocations that orient bodies and body parts toward other bodies and body parts." E. A Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 13. "Following Deleuze's Spinozist formula we simply must assume we do not know what a body can do, what our embodied selves are capable of. Life as the exploration of this

the bodies' impulses that have mistaken themselves for psyche or mind… those grand metaphysical categories–truth, subject, morality, logic… can all be read as bodily strategies, or rather resources, which contribute to the will to power."[623] Foucault, by contrast, is usually described as a social constructionist or discursive foundationalist. His famous critique of Sigmund Freud and Wilhelm Reich's "repressive hypothesis" clearly challenges any sense of an originary healthy body. Yet, as others have noted, Foucault's extensive narratives of grid as malaise might suggest otherwise – the despair always has me looking for something better underneath.[624] Here I show that, in fact, he sometimes explicitly advocates the body foundationalism perhaps implicit – but explicitly rejected - in much of his work. For Foucault expands Nietzsche's emphasis on soma by exploring the systematic construction of the soldier as, "something that can be made… posture gradually corrected; a calculating constraint runs slowly though each part of the body, mastering it, making it pliable, ready at all times, turning silently into the automatism of habit…"[625] As such, they both portray the sensory as a space of development subtending other realms of existence.

Their next move, however, is key to my concern. Both thinkers then build a philosophical nemesis in the gridding of subjectifying of bodies. Nietzsche - read through Deleuze - sees culture deploying "training procedures" that turn people into a

---

affirmative capacity or *potential* is the core of Spinozist politics" Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 12. This is the inversion of Kean's notion of text as an organizing principle. Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*; Keane, *Christian Moderns*.

[623] Cited in Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*, 126.

[624] David Couzens Hoy, *Critical Resistance from Poststructuralism to Post-Critique* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004); Jay, *Songs of Experience*.

[625] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 135.

species of "gregarious, docile and domesticated animal." This suggests something better, perhaps a bit resistant, previous to the training or its "perversion."[626] Similarly, Foucault, also can imagine a healthy body anterior to the imposition of violent cultural gridding. To be fair, he begins by criticizing foundationalist arguments about bodies: "We believe, in any event, that the body obeys the exclusive laws of physiology and that it escapes the influence of history, but this too is false. The body is molded by a great many distinct regimes." Yet, perhaps he doth protest too much. The Foucauldian obsession with the micro-politics of control that he calls discipline and later biopolitics engenders an active resentment and frustration with the systems that perpetrate these chains. It suggests, although very much indirectly, a hope for something else. And, very much in this vein, immediately following his historicist claim, Foucault, perhaps inadvertently, reinstates a healthy, and a bit less historical, body. Bodies face destruction. He says, "[the body] is broken down by the rhythms of work, rest, and holidays; it is poisoned by food or values, through eating habits or moral laws;" and thus, "it constructs resistances."[627] This romanticization of bodies resonates closely with the general logic many draw from the Foucauldian rage against modern discipline, an inspiration to resistance against all hierarchy, and at

---

[626] Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), 138–139.
[627] Foucault, Bouchard, and Sherry, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, 153. Dreyfus and Rabinow see the ambiguity in Foucault's position as him waffling between a malleable body and one more sedimented. They wish for some sediment to build resistance from: "if the body is *more* than the result of the disciplinary technologies that have brought to bear upon it, it would perhaps provide a position from which to criticize these practices, and maybe even a way to account for the tendency towards rationalization and the tendency of this tendency to hide itself." Cited in Hoy, *Critical Resistance from Poststructuralism to Post-Critique*, 62. Hoy argues that if the body has been lived differently historically or across cultures that it certainly has an element of "more" in that it is not fully rationalized to the current moment. Ibid., 63. My project does not rely upon if as essential. It must, however, be feral and plastic to matter.

times perhaps, all structure. Further, it parallels the Deleuzian and early romanticist portrayal of flow as health and structure as life deflating.[628] Cultivation challenges each of these imaginaries by declining the dualism of grid against nature.

Now, Foucault's insight that power is both constraining and productive is a useful corrective here, for grids might enable as much as they contain, but it is not often deployed to describe bodies. Claire Blencowe does argue that contemporary biopolitical rationality is far more enabling than constricting. As she writes: "Biopolitical rationality addresses a world comprised of expansive, affective, embodied processes. It is not an economizing rationalisation of bodies, rendering them docile, objectified, disciplined. Rather it is the rationality of trans–organic, vital processes and force that must be, to an extent, respected (*laisser faire*), and that can be harnessed and managed but not artificially created. It is subjectifying, not objectifying."[629] Blencowe might be correct that rationality comes in multiple flavors. And her description of biopolitics certainly matches pentecostal practices as I

---

[628] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987); Isaiah Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*, ed. Henry Hardy (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999).

[629] The full quote very directly addresses the questions of evangelical rationality. "We *could* associate… biopolitical modernity with the history of Protestantism.... To do so we would not look to the rationalism and individualism of Calvin, but the great awakenings and evangelical revivalism of the 18th century–the emotive, expansive, welfareist turn that gave rise to the Methodists, the Baptists and the Quakers, movements that created a direct emotional relationship with God, the church and the world, which were radically expansive, carrying the gospel and the new Protestant message to the furthest reaches of the European empires, and which were decentralized with the power to carry the creed extended to laymen, who acted as both lay preachers and missionaries. Biopolitical rationality addresses a world comprised of expansive, affective, embodied processes. It is not an economizing rationalisation of bodies, rendering them docile, objectified, disciplined. Rather it is the rationality of trans–organic, vital processes and force that must be, to an extent, respected (*laisser faire*), and that can be harnessed and managed but not artificially created. It is subjectifying, not objectifying." Cultivation, as a productive relationship in the making seems quite within this realm. Claire Blencowe, *Biopolitical Experience: Foucault, Power and Positive Critique* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 17.

describe them. Yet, I want to ask a more fundamental question - why does any grid seem deathly, or unobjectified mush especially lively? These logics seem products of the agency-anxiety of modern, and especially postmodern, thinkers. For object making is what we do, seeing is gridding, being is gridding. Instead of a terror of the grid, one qualitative difference then between the premodern, modern, and postmodern might be found in a significant shift in the intensities with which we hold those lines together, the tensions that they play, and the energy they generate. In other words, cultivation allows for a range between the generative and lively force of tensions between systematizing and sublime impulses and, on the other extreme, the tendency towards icy – that is, relatively frozen - rationalization or discipline.

Body foundationalism, by contrast, can valorize the freedom of the body as opposing the containment engendered by discourse or society, such that it misses the vital necessity of shape – especially when it comes to bodies. First, as Judith Butler and others have shown, discourse is not nearly as fixed and clear a counter-model as it might seem, iteration produces gaps and excesses.[630] But thinking more somatically, mitochondria without a membrane have a really hard time. Life requires structure and shape. It seems persuasive then that the cognitive grid is paralleled and interpenetrated by a somatic one, they are both excessive and both limited, both historical, and both potential sites for phenomenological immediacy. Neither offers an

[630] Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993). Think also of Michel de Certeau for whom mystical experience is not outside of language but about a split within it. Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 386 note 109. Or can think of Walter Benjamin and Johan George Hamann as well - language as the site of divinity, not the rationalized site of control. Ibid., 320; Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*.

especially inviting site for resistance, or for cultivation, for that matter, or just as likely - they both do.

Catherine Bell's theory of ritualization responds to the pentecostal challenges to ritual theory in ways that resonate with Kirby's initial insights around the textual patterns of somatic development. First, Bell's processual model eliminates dualist hierarchies. And second, she provides a means of understanding how body logics congeal – how reiteration solidifies and bounds. In general, Bell offers a theoretical framework imbued with power for understanding how the dialectic between self and other results in object formation.

Like Csordas, Bell aims to disrupt Cartesian dualisms, but instead of a phenomenology that valorizes the discontinuous, she evokes history, collectivity, and process. Bell's practice theory responds to dualist hierarchies with "ritualization," a shift away from specific rites or immediate experience towards exploring collective processes of strategic differentiation and validation of particular practices in relation to others. As Bell sees it, previous ritual theory mistakenly denigrates ritual as a "particularly *thoughtless* action – routinized, habitual, or mimetic – and therefore the purely formal, secondary, and mere physical expression of logically prior ideas."[631] Even those aiming to reintegrate thought and action, either by mediating between *communitas* and the social order,[632] the social and the individual,[633] or worldview and

[631] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, 19.
[632] Victor W Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure* (Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1969).
[633] Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. (New York: Free Press, 1965).

ethos,[634] reify the thought-action hierarchy within their ethnographies and between the thinking ethnographer and the acting informant. Performance theorists, she says, similarly fail to undo these dichotomies since reading ritual as a text reiterates the interpretive endeavor of searching for coded meaning as opposed to action.[635]

However, while Bell sees dualisms within processes of perception as inevitable, their saliency in hierarchies – the problem as she sees it - relies on differentiation enacted through routinization, regularization, and repetition in social life. Ritualization thus involves "setting some activities off from others… creating and privileging a qualitative distinction between the 'sacred' and the 'profane,' and… ascribing such distinctions to realities thought to transcend the powers of human actors."[636] For Bell, "even the exact repetition of an age-old ritual is a *strategic* act with which to define the present"[637] Here, formality, fixity, and repetition are present, not as the only defining features of ritual, but rather as collective and historically constructed practices that effectively produce the distinctions that ritual claims. In other words, pentecostal practices might be tools for solidifying their own bodies and the world around them, in both resonance and contestation with past practice. By

---

[634] Clifford Geertz, *Myth, Symbol, and Culture*. (New York: Norton, 1974).
[635] c.f. Stanley Tambiah, *A Performative Approach to Ritual* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1979). Mary Keller works with Bell's notion but is concerned that she has not eliminated the actor or agent in possession. As she asks, "But is there a residual "actor" and a residual agent in Bells argument?" Mary Keller, *The Hammer and the Flute Women, Power, and Spirit Possession* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 71. Here, actors and agents are as real as authors, they are simply one scale of analysis – instead of asking "is there and actor"? I would ask, rather, is it the consequential formation? Or does some other scale a more significant "actor" or agent in this situation? In other words, why not discuss the autonomous agent in certain circumstances? Is it the hegemonic? The resistant?
[636] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, 74.
[637] Ibid., 101.

borrowing from Bell's "ritualization," cultivation theory can describe the processes of learning sensory aptitudes and dispositions involved in pentecostal mobilization.

Further, with rupture such a crucial element in pentecostal inspiration, Bell's ritualization might account for the cultivation of discontinuity. Her emphasis on the boundaries and cutting enacted through iteration perhaps captures the making of the vital sense of immediacy recognized by Csordas' alterity narrative, and central to my informant's narratives. The emphasis on immediacy could be called an ideology – i.e. pentecostals think their experiences are immediate, but are simply wrong, they are cultivated instead. As such, the ideology of spontaneity could be explored, maybe challenged as false consciousness. Perhaps. However, aside from my discomfort with the paternalism of false consciousness arguments that do not explicitly recognize a debate between scholar and informants, I disagree on two other levels. First, an experience both prefigured and subsequently articulated as immediate will likely have a different somatic effect than one imagined as a pilgrimage – ideology is more than an idea, it manifests reality. Secondly, the temporal scale at which we examine experience is not fixed – there is no strong argument for choosing the richly contextual over the immediate unless one, or the other, is seen as especially consequential. As such, I am challenging "in the final instance" arguments, like Kirby's discussion of Saussure where, "what is heard as the self-present immediacy of voice is, in the final instance, the articulation of history, informed by the living

burden of infinite mediation."[638] Sure, context matters, but what is consequential in this case? What scale has been nurtured and bounded until it stands out, both somatically and linguistically, as the active agent? Perhaps lessons emerge at each scale? For these practices entrain and then digest as immediate. In other words, like the spontaneity of the highly skilled jazz musician, things happen, within multiple preexisting shapes, and yet also, outside of them. That is, cultivated spontaneity as truly spontaneous provides one highly consequential way to look at these things. I see this, but in the case of pentecostals, emphasize instead the scale of practice in-between, of cultivation and its nurturance of a crucial discontinuity.

As such, Bell's practice theory provides a useful tool, but as I see it, a humble one – no claim that practice is the consequential process in all movements. Similar to cultivation, other practice theories aim to bring together the unconscious and the systematic,[639] or coherence and incoherence,[640] and thus overcome the, "problematic dichotomy between structure and agency without ignoring the shaping power of the former on the latter altogether."[641] Bourdieu's tennis player's swing seems spontaneous, yet is highly practiced. Or as he says, "the constraints of rhythm or metre are internalized at the same time as melody and meaning, without ever being perceived in their own right."[642] William Connolly describes a "minority tradition" of philosophy in which practice offers the most consequential, and most ethical, scale of

[638] Kirby, *Telling Flesh*, 38. Bourdieu and many others make similar in the final instance kinds of claims – mine is a slightly more contextual exploration.
[639] Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 10.
[640] Ibid., 12.
[641] Ibid., 13.
[642] Ibid., 74.

analysis. As he says, "the practical activities of embodied human beings give priority to 'know-how' over propositional knowledge."[643] Here, thought is indistinguishable from action. "To think is to move something. And to modify a pattern of body/brain connections helps to draw a habit, a disposition to judgment, or a capacity of action into being."[644] And Connolly ties this project to ritual in a manner quite resonant with Bell's ritualization theory. In his tale, ritual not only makes boundaries, but also sensory aptitudes and dispositions. He describes ritual as, "a medium through which embodied habits, dispositions, sensibilities and capacities of performance are consolidated."[645] Connolly thus finds what he calls a Spinozist-Deleuzian tradition and ethic of "cultivation" that binds body-mind and social life, one that focuses on becoming. Problem is, as I see it, some studies activate bigger structures, and others micro-processes instead – it depends on the consequential scale, and that needs to be determined on a case by case basis.[646] Thus, in response, I try to borrow the practice theory without generalizing it as the only, or best, scale for analysis.

This idea that making scale explicit might provide an opening for social theory resonates closely with Anna Tsing's exploration of the "friction" between

---

[643] William E Connolly, *Neuropolitics: Thinking, Culture, Speed* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 91.
[644] Ibid., 103.
[645] Ibid., 77.
[646] This follows Elizabeth Grosz's call for an "understanding of embodied subjectivity, of psychical corporeality… which refuses reductionism, resists dualism, and remain suspicious of the holism and unity implied by monism–a notion of corporeality, that is, which avoids not only dualism but also the very problematic of dualism that makes alternatives to it and criticisms of it possible." If reductionism is merely one path, dualism another, as with holism or monism, then the teeth is taken out of the hierarchy. In other words, the problems are not the analytics but their exceptionalism, or claims to righteousness. Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*, 22.

scales.[647] For Tsing, the consequential action in her ethnography occurs when the global and the local grate against each other. Here, the action between scales does not resolve nicely into a synthesis, even for a moment. Further, her theory shows how useful it is to make scale explicit. Thus, like Tsing's friction, cultivation shifts scales to voice the space of enmeshment between them. In doing so, shifting scale provides two analytical moves, both ways to recognize and choose the context. The first is temporal – out from event, rupture, or ritual, towards the before and after. The second involves a similar, but distinct move from the solidified thing itself – person's rupture, community's church - to the relationships between them, something that might be called groupness. Nathan Sayre distinguishes these forms of scale as well as two characteristics of all scales: the grain (fine or coarse), and the extent, the scope of a particular mapping (large or small).[648] Cultivation theory borrows his sense of scales as the product of relational construction, and central to all analysis. Further, while scale refers to my tools for understanding pentecostal experience, it also is evidenced in the ones pentecostals deploy and debate in defining themselves and their experience and as such reinstates the binary between scholar and informants.[649]

By claiming the grid as within processes of embodiment rather than an externally imposed order, cultivation also challenges the influential view of Ernst Troeltch and others who see the increasing bureaucratic gridding of a movement as its downfall. Such declension narratives rely on the binary between free autonomous

[647] Tsing, *Friction*.
[648] Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale."
[649] For more on scale see the Epilogue to Section III, Scaling Anthropology

agent and the contained disciplined creature who no longer makes free choices but is now doomed to follow the rules. However, pentecostals clearly defy this divide – their structuring is within their freedom. As one can best improvise in the wake of systematic practice, pentecostals practice and train for spontaneity. Instead of the binary between immediacy and structure, in portraying pentecostals, I describe the weave of feeling and the warp of the rational as one fabric. Their carefully sytematized practices are part and parcel of, and fully entangled with, the drive towards spontaneous relief. Much like a fishing net through deep waters, the wires of reason are pulled tight within the very flesh of the affective emotional self. Yet, the tension varies. Troeltch speaks of declination, but pentecostals continue to thrive, in large part due to repeated revival. Revival suggests an inversion, moments of relaxation, a lessened tension. I argue that these revivals are part of the tradition, sometimes suppressed, but often nurtured as well. The renewal is something of an internalized energy, the fibers of structure within the affective tissues of the church, something that can be pulled taught, or left lax and drooping, but both are gridded, and both are affective.

Given the entanglement of gridding and the sensory, perhaps there is less claim to essential truth around things like the nature/culture divide, that is, the sensory solidify and destabilize? This is not especially a big deal, merely emphasizing Heraclites over Parmenides, change over stasis. But apply it here and it matters. For instance, if, as is often asserted in post-structuralism the nature-culture divide is a historically sedimented political process that could – if it were purely

logical – very well have been drawn along several lines other than human-made/not human–made (i.e. living/dead, underground/above, sparkly/not so sparkly?). We then might ask – what does it mean that we change our nature through culture? Or that nature and culture are so thoroughly entangled in this situation that we need to redraw the lines between them. This seems interesting in its own right. But also, I think it provides an impetus to change things – if we can seriously modify our brains and our bodies, and if the process of change is within the lifetime of one human, and it is something that we can build our communities and practices around, then the scale of our sense of agency might change. We can see agency in environmental destruction, but bodies are pretty close to home, pretty accessible.

There is also clearly danger here. For the fact of change – the deep lesson of post-structuralism – means that things, once changed, continue to change, and become actually different. This, of course, brings us right back to the well-founded fears that spurred much of post-structural thought in the first place. If race, gender and religious practice inhabit and engender physiology, then perhaps one could argue that racism, sexism, and religious prejudice have material foundations, they are more justified. For instance, while perceived racial sameness, as it has been understood, has some, but less rather than more internal commonality than racial difference, other physiological groupings are plausible. In other words, the physicality of cultivation risks restarting the eugenics debates or solidifying the innateness of gender roles. But is solidity the political problem? I am unconvinced. However much fluidity might appeal to our senses cultivated through the neoliberally inflected sensorium, solidity

is a necessary moment of politics, the claim to one or another perspective, a moment of decision. And just as pentecostals can be fluid and right wing, solidity also can fly in multiple political directions. In fact, I sometimes suspect this is true of all philosophy, at least those that privilege abstract notions of relative flux or scale.[650] Here, I am certainly on shaky ground – but as I see it, kindness does not especially inhere within solid rather than fluid systems. This suggests that either that we recognize that philosophy is often a tool of oppressive structures, which will use fluidity or solidity as they see fit – i.e. philosophy "as such" is not a politics - or perhaps more humbly, we ask which philosophy is necessary in a given conjuncture to push for a kinder world. Then we ask what forms of somatic sensibilities we might hope to nurture there.

Cultivation Theory: Volitional Affect

It is exactly that question of nurtured sensory aptitudes that likely most differentiates this study from other recent explorations of what has been called "affect," although I prefer language of the sensory for its specificity. Affect theory has become a growing industry in academia,[651] and it is quite diverse. However, when it comes to questions of volition, or intention, much of affect theory is burdened by a series of what I think of as scalar fallacies as well as a relatively selective

[650] For more See Chapter 8

[651] Patricia Ticineto Clough and Jean O'Malley Halley, *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007); Melissa Gregg and Gregory J Seigworth, *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010); Clare Hemmings, "Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the Ontological Turn," *Cultural Studies* 19, no. 5 (September 2005): 548–67; Lauren Berlant, "Affect Is the New Trauma," *The Minnesota Review* 2009, no. 71–72 (2009): 131–36; Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*.

reading of neurology. As such, affect is generally scaled either quite immediately, such that, like phenomenology, there is no planning, rather, affect emerges spontaneously. Or, it is scaled at the level of the neoliberal state, quite deterministic. Most importantly, in both versions, it emerges without volition, either individual or collective.

First of all, this lack of volition derives in part from a reading of neurology that emphasizes a series of experiments suggesting that our conscious actions are so far predated by specific and predicting chemical activity that all that appears as individual choice is really simply a false belief of volition layered upon a determinative physiological process. Simply put, our thoughts have already happened in our bodies by the time we think them, so much so that consciousness as choice is simply pretense.[652] Secondly, because the neoliberal state appears as a highly effective affect inducer, and the lack of viable protest has been understood as a failing of affect on the part of resistors, affect has been posed as an especially crucial terrain for contemporary political struggle.[653]

Each of these moves involves an attachment to a particular scale of analysis that limits the sense of volition. For however much the neurology does, or does not, suggest that consciousness is predated by chemical reactions – and it is highly contested – this weakens volition only when it is scaled autonomous and immediate. In other words, if volition is this individualistic thing that happens in a given moment,

---

[652] Ruth Leys, "The Turn to Affect: A Critique," *Critical Inquiry* 37, no. 3 (2011): 434–72; Michael S Gazzaniga, *Who's in Charge?: Free Will and the Science of the Brain* (NY: HarperCollins, 2011).
[653] See Colebrook in Alliez et al., "Deleuzian Politics?" Also look at Elizabeth Povinelli.

sure, neurological determinism is powerful.[654] But, if, on the other hand, volition is a collective process that emerges over time, as with pentecostal sensory cultivation, then the critique is less viable because the determinism founded on the neurology of a few seconds ago, is itself ensconced in a broader process, which is quite volitional. On the other hand, whether affect is controlled by the neoliberal state such that there is no room for resistance is simply an empirical, but undeterminable, question – we can only wait and see. It could be an argument for battle on the terrain of affectivity, but it seems a weak basis for a lack of volition. Most crucially, both of these arguments for non-volition in affect rely on a particular scale of analysis, either way immediate, or massive, and miss the scales in between, where cultivation and collective volition might be more visible. I lean instead towards the recent studies of learned affect and emotions where aggregate action manifests.[655]

Conclusion

For pentecostals, cultivation describes evangelism. I think that means they carefully develop methodical approaches to developing sensory aptitudes. It also seems to describe important elements in the project of radical evangelicalism and

[654] This is how I would read Massumi's notion that affect is asocial but not presocial. Brian Massumi, "The Autonomy of Affect," *Cultural Critique*, 1995, 91.
[655] Arnaud Halloy, "Gods in the Flesh: Learning Emotions in the Xangô Possession Cult (Brazil)," *Ethnos* 77, no. 2 (June 2012): 177–202; Amanda Blake, "Developing Somatic Intelligence: Leadership and the Neurobiology of Embodied Learning," *Stonewater & Strozzi Institute*, 2009; Vlad Naumescu, "Learning the 'Science of Feelings': Religious Training in Eastern Christian Monasticism," *Ethnos* 77, no. 2 (June 2012): 227–51; Kalpana Ram, "How Is Afflictive Possession 'Learned'? Gender and Motility in South India," *Ethnos* 77, no. 2 (June 2012): 203–26; Luhrmann, "Toward an Anthropological Theory of Mind."

modernity more generally. And finally, cultivation might be language for the processes of nurturing, and winnowing, the senses.

As such, cultivation shows minds, bodies and their interrelationships congealing physical-mental sensory apparatus over time. To find sensation or thought outside a history of collective attunement or previous resonance seems unlikely. Even seemingly pure physicality, in its genetic and epigenetic genealogies, can be read through this view of cultivation. Sensory aptitudes, as I imagine them, are not simply the emotive, the feeling, or the visceral, but include cognition, the skill in deciphering one object from another (objectification), and the enmeshed emotive-cognitive processes including memory, analysis, and planning. I assume that mental cognition emerges through an emotional and visceral context, and vice versa, emotions and sensations form within the mental, inseparable and maybe barely distinguishable even for purely analytical purposes. Together, these provide a view of the human (or perhaps posthuman) that leans away from naturalizing the Cartesian mind-body divide. Of course, folks could nurture dualisms - they certainly have - but my point is to start analysis at the sensory so as to allow multiplicities of the human.

Further, perhaps ruptural experiences, neither purely emotional, visceral, nor cognitive, provide crucial tools for inspiring new thoughts, feelings, and sensations – a means of practical cognition. Rupture might provide a form of grasping and resituating. Thinking only along linear rational lines makes it difficult to find new modes of being, we often stay within our language games, our mode of immanence, or our habitus. I am arguing then, that although bodies are not without their gridding,

cultivation, and structure – they are not the avatars of a fluid freedom – they are, however, very much a part of reason, reflection, and learning.[656]

There are hard science versions of this tale. Brain plasticity studies show practices, certainly religious ones, transforming contemporary brain development. At the far end of the "cultivation might have lasting effects" spectrum, epigenetic changes manifest after only one generation or practices, like the use of the metal axe, transform DNA over time. This involves a serious suggestion that the day to day work we do on ourselves has lasting effects. For all their propensity towards fluidity, religious sensory aptitudes and dispositions also solidify, and they travel via evangelism, parenting, and education, likely also though epigenetic and genetic evolution, but either way, quite definitively. As Marcel Mauss writes, "I think that there are necessarily biological means of entering into communion with God."[657] Or more simply, culture is physiological.

Cultivation is in the making and becoming – it is coconstitutive motion, not culture. Yet, it is only one lens, one scale of exploring something. But one that is increasingly consequential as communities learn to bureaucratize techniques of person-fashioning, in evangelicalism, the therapeutic subject, and what Taylor calls

---

[656] While affect theory claims that emotions prefigure and subtend reason are empirically debatable, they do not effectively disentangle the two. Even if, as they claim, visceral activity came half a second before cognition (which is not at all settled) they would both enmesh over time, mutually cultivate, and emerge dependently. Leys, "The Turn to Affect."

[657] Mauss, "Techniques of the Body (1935)." It seems perhaps a scholarly trend as, "somatic drives and genetic dispositions are increasingly regarded as part of, not an opposition to, the processes of social construction." Claire Peta Blencowe, "Biology, Contingency and the Problem of Racism in Feminist Discourse," *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 4. Along these lines, Thomas Csordas' "somatic modes of attention," William Connolly's "visceral modes of discernment." are varieties. Thomas J Csordas, "Somatic Modes of Attention," *Cultural Anthropology : Journal of the Society for Cultural Anthropology*, 1993; Connolly, *Why I Am Not a Secularist*.

the search for authenticity. These modern subjects are not new creatures, but now emerging from governmentality, discipline, or any one of the multiple names for the objectification and systematizing of modernity, they are increasingly significant. Perhaps cultivation describes a modern project of subject making.

Cultivation involves active, and reflective, participation in the development, perhaps even evolution, of the senses: not scaled large as the structures of church and rite that permeate the subject, seemingly denying agency in their mechanical redundancy; nor as small as the spontaneous liberal or Pauline rupture, the freely chosen self. Perhaps something more akin to the rhythmic interplay of rite and liminality, no clear moment of one and the other, always the liminal interred in the mechanical, the remainders of *communitas* swim within the flesh, invariably a hovering potentiality embedded among cellular fibers, entrained into bodies as deeply entangled sensory logics and visceral modes of discernment, held together by the membranes, the structures evolved for nursing tensions. In concert, at times they lay slack, and at times pull the conglomeration taut, perhaps, as Reich suggested, tension engenders rupture and release.[658]

[658] Wilhelm Reich, *The Function of the Orgasm; Sex-Economic Problems of Biological Energy*. (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1973).

Epilogue to Cultivation: Scaling Anthropology

My research with pentecostals suggests that the humanities and social sciences, and especially critical theory, would benefit from a more explicit recognition of the ways our analyses inhabit and crystalize certain scales and certain assumptions about scale. Pentecostals battle over the scale at which to experience the Holy Spirit, and the scale at which to understand their politics. Yet, I find limited tools for recognizing and thinking along with these processes. Many in the hard sciences, however, have come to describe differently scaled questions as evocative of different kinds of answers and further, that these are often irreducible to their components at a smaller scale. They talk of "scale effects," particularly translation misses between model and reality,[659] but which can be extended to include "top-down causality" and deeply divergent logics emerging at different scales. Scale effects challenge deterministic "bottom-up" analyses, and as I will show, also weaken false consciousness arguments that reify a "global" scale of analysis. It seems that anthropology can contribute complexity and historicity to thinking about scale effects by showing that scale is built via visceral-cognitive contests among both informants and scholars.[660] As such, in this exploration, I will define scale, attempt to translate its function from neuroscience and

[659] Ecologists and engineers recognize the problems of scaling effects on translation from model to reality. I am extending the concept here. G. Darrel Jenerette and Jianguo Wu, "On the Definitions of Scale," *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 2000, 104.
[660] Neil Smith, "Contours of a Spatialized Politics: Homeless Vehicles and the Production of Geographical Scale," *Social Text*, no. 33 (1992): 54; Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*.

other fields into contemporary critical theory and anthropology and then demonstrate its value in discussing pentecostalism.

Scale and Scale Effects

Temporal and social scale, as I use it, enables thinking through different approaches to understanding and thus also viscerally grasping and consolidating the relationships between variously understood groups of people and of moments of time.[661] Scales thus provide "a practical and conceptual device that allows us to climb up and down various… dimensions in order to see things from different viewpoints" while simultaneously consolidating these particular scales via socio-cultural struggle.[662] Especially useful is Nathan Sayre's distinction between the "grain" of a given scale and its "extent."[663] Grain is the unit of measure (i.e. from fine to coarse: individuals, groups, communities, cities, states; or moments, weeks, lifetimes), while extent shows the limits on the overall analysis, its scope. For instance, I might explore a scale in which the grain is the individual and the extent is the market, or the grain is a social class and the extent is contemporary capitalism, or perhaps the grain is the moment of experience of the Holy Spirit and the extent is a weekend revival.

While scales are certainly related, scientists increasingly argue for a kind of discontinuity between scales. The neuroscientist Michael Gazzinaga provides one model. He points out that at the level of the neuron scientists can describe

[661] Geographers often focus on spatial scale, it is not central to this particular analysis.
[662] Joanna Zylinska, *Minimal Ethics for the Anthropocene*, 2014, 26.
[663] Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale."

mathematical functionality and set of causal rules that apply across all species. In other words, when the grain is the neuron and the extent is all living creatures, in certain ways the system is mathematically predictable. However, if we change the grain so as to think about the organism, a whole new set of rules apply that are not predicted by exploring the neuronal level.[664] Gazzinaga describes, "different types of organization with different types of interactions governed by different laws, and one emerges from the other but does not emerge predictably."[665] He then offers a further list of examples: water turns to ice in ways not predicted in the structures of the former; Newtonian physics emerges similarly from quantum mechanics; ants only build huge towers when their collective reaches a certain size; the structure of a cam shaft cannot predict freeway traffic. In other words, scale effects include discontinuity between scales.

Further, Gazzinaga argues that emergent scales can have "top-down" effects on the functioning of lower scales in ways that are "non-redundant." They do not repeat lower level processes. An organism, for instance, can change all sorts of behavior to effect neuronal activity. For Gazzinaga, the emergent and top-down qualities of these scale relationships challenge neuroscientists who see consciousness as reducible to the effect of a set of causal chains of neuronal firing. If each scale functions via a logic emergently related to the others, and thus not determined by the others, the gaps between them provide space for agency.

---

[664] Gazzaniga, *Who's in Charge?*, 124–142.
[665] Ibid., 125.

That scale effects involve related yet irreducible logics emerging at different scales is increasingly recognized across disciplines. Think of recent genetic theories that recognize the effects of RNA (a higher level of complexity) back on DNA, or environmental effects on gene expressivity, and other top-down causality. Likewise, Timothy Clark explains that progressive social policies scaled at the level of the state at a broader scale, may resemble instead, "an insane plan to destroy the biosphere."[666] While scale has become explicit in some recent anthropologies of the anthropocene and of "frictions," between the global and the local,[667] however, scale effects are not yet a central element in the conversation.[668] One of the few anthropologists to recognize scale effects, Talal Asad argues that the anthropological distinctive valorized by Sherry Ortner – the ground level view – is limited by its uniscalar view.[669] Finally, this thinking resonates closely with the modal "gap theories" of Bourdieu and others in which different fields of society are logically different and irreducible to one another and thus offer a locus for collective agency.[670]

---

[666] Timothy Clark, "Scale," in *Theory in the Era of Climate Change. Volume 1*, ed. Tom Cohen (Ann Arbor: Open Humanities Press, 2012), 150.
[667] Tsing, *Friction*.
[668] Tsing, Strathern and DeLanda all talk extensively about scale, but without recognizing the importance of different scale logics and scale battles. Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, "On Nonscalability: The Living World Is Not Amenable to Precision-Nested Scales," *Common Knowledge* 18, no. 3 (September 21, 2012): 505–24. Marilyn Strathern, *Partial Connections* (Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1991). Manuel De Landa, *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity* (London; New York: Continuum, 2009).
[669] Sherry Ortner, "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26, no. 1 (1984): 126.
[670] As Lois McNay describes Bourdieu's theory of fields: "each field is autonomous in that it has a specific internal logic which establishes non-synchronous, uneven relations with other fields and which renders it irreducible to any overarching dynamic." The interactions of fields allows us to see both discipline and agency in that field. They have their own logics – much like Mahmood's traditions – but are in a mobile and productive relationship, not simply incommensurable. For while they limit possible actions, they also open new ones, "in the 'potential for subversive misappropriation' arising from movement and conflict between the fields." Lois McNay, *Gender and Agency: Reconfiguring the*

My favorite stories of scale effects that differentiate logics between scales come from ecology. One study describes how the effects of diversity on plant community resilience varies massively across different scales. At a small scale, plant diversity functions to protect an area from invasive species. But on a larger scale that same kind of diversity signals an openness to invasive species survival.[671] Another study describes how single blocks of ecological field data analysis do not simply add up when analyzed in larger formations. The species richness after grazing increased at one scale, yet stayed constant at another.[672]" For Sayre, this means that scales are significantly differentiated. "[If] you move far enough across scale, the dominant processes change. It is not just that things get bigger or smaller, but the phenomena themselves change'."[673]

Further, a sense of agency is very much about scale. People often see themselves as agentive within a smaller scaled analysis and as determined by the broader forces in life. However, smaller is not always more agentive. My father is constantly fending off Anselm's story of lost agency by suggesting that folks in prison have less freedom than those outside, regardless of whether or not the "free" ones are caught in an endless causal chain. He calls it relative freedom. I think he is looking at different scales of analysis and recognizing something useful there,

---

Subject in Feminist and Social Theory (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2000), 52. She cites Pierre Bourdieu, *La Noblesse d'Etat: Grandes écoles et Esprit de Corps* (Paris: Les Editions de minuit, 1989).

[671] Karen M. Alofs and Norma L. Fowler, "Loss of Native Herbaceous Species due to Woody Plant Encroachment Facilitates the Establishment of an Invasive Grass," *Ecology* 94, no. 3 (2013): 751–60.

[672] Stohlgren *et al.,* 1999 cited in Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale," 279.

[673] Gleick, *Chaos*; Wiens, "Spatial Scaling in Ecology"; Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale," 279.

something crucial about localness that offers an increased sense of control in this case. However sometimes the agent is a group in which the individual is less consequential. Thus, Garrett Hardin emphasizes that scale effects can include both increasing or diminishing returns – the direction of scaling is not determinative of the effect.[674] Thus, analyzing scale opens a window into the specificity of relationships in a given story to try and determine at what register things move, and in what direction.

Thus, if critical theorists were more explicit about their scalar thinking, perhaps they could better explain the differences between various analyses. For instance, the posthuman and the anthropocene might simply be the human scaled up to include the broader world. The death of the author is very much the same – instead of an autonomous author, we write within broader traditions or disciplinary modes. Similarly, the event of conversion or evental rupture scaled outwards to include years of preparation and training seems far less spontaneous. But further, scale is part of the process of solidifying experience. That is, the choice of scales effects how we think of ourselves and others but also how we experience the world. For, as I will argue, when a scale is hegemonic, it often sediments a way of being, a set of sensory aptitudes and institutions and even the consequential shape of objects.

Pentecostal Scale Battles

Scales are contested. When pentecostals claim speaking in tongues is autonomous, abrupt, and individual and yet tell stories of extended training, or when

[674] Garrett Hardin, *Living within Limits: Ecology, Economics, and Population Taboos* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 100, 125.

they talk of the family as the constituent unit of social and political life and ignore completely the state except as disciplinarian, each of these are scaled analyses shows that scale can be a crucially contested part of a worldview and shape experience via a cutting of possible things to grasp onto. This consequential cutting, strategic essentialism,[675] or re-naturalization,[676] is the process by which politics and culture emerge out of interconnected being. Most pentecostals hate when I say their practices are cultivated. They do argue among themselves, as shown in Albrecht's discussion of ritual,[677] but for most, cultivation seems ungodly. And this argument wins every time because Christian scaling from Paul to the present has emphasized conversion, baptism, and tongues, as autonomous and immediate. It is a cutting, a making of consequential scale as analytic, experience and existence. Even more concrete than any other effective social fact[678] or historical individual,[679] something is solidified, enfleshed, named, made object, given power, and because it resonates with 500 years of Protestant boundary making it provides an essentialism with solid grounding. Tongues is thus actually autonomous, even as it is the product of a community of trained mediators.

Pentecostals also argue about more mundane objects, some of which are exceedingly important in their world view. In particular, they battle over the consequential scale of social intervention. I was sitting in a small Indian restaurant in

---

[675] Gayatri Spivak, *In Other Worlds : Essays in Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1988).
[676] Hasana Sharp, *Spinoza and the Politics of Renaturalization* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011).
[677] Albrecht, *Rites in the Spirit*.
[678] Émile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method, and Selected Texts on Sociology and its Method* (London: Macmillan, 1982).
[679] Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

Springfield Missouri the site of AG's global offices. We had driven south from the post-industrial city to the newly expanding suburbs, passing the relatively new mega church by the highway. I was having dinner with Darrin Rogers the researcher who runs AG's archives and since we had been talking for three or four days straight it seemed time to cut to the chase, perhaps push a bit, and bring some of our differences to the fore. I asked about neoliberalism and its effect upon the poor in Springfield. He was quite sympathetic. He told stories of racial reconciliation that he had facilitated within the city – he appeared white. Apparently, on the very day in 1906 that the first multiracial pentecostal revival burst from the church in Azusa street in LA, white mobs in Springfield lynched a black man after which black families fled the city. Ten years later, when the white pentecostals in AG decided to leave their black brethren for a separate church, they chose the newly white city of Springfield for their headquarters. Now, nearly 100 years later, the pentecostal whites in Springfield were atoning for their ancestor's violence with prayer and explicit efforts at reconciliation. I asked Darrin if this would include economic support. He explained that the proper scale for intervention is the family, not the state. Further, black families in Springfield had been having a hard time, they needed help with developing a culture of safety and hard work. The problem was not scaled at the level of neoliberalism, deindustrialization, or any of the many broader shapes that might be considered decisive in the formation of black Springfield. Instead, the question, he asserted, could only be usefully approached at the level of the individual

family. Here was a battle of scales in which pentecostals had nurtured a particular lens.

Scale and False Consciousness

Scale is important in challenging false consciousness narratives. For instead of foolish and mistaken, pentecostals might be seen as engaged in a scale battle. Pentecostal experiences are deemed spontaneous because that is the consequential scale chosen among many. When Dan Albrecht leads a groups of scholars to conclude that pentecostal practice is ritualized, he is emphasizing a broader temporal scale than the dominant notion of spontaneous event. He engages a contest over consequential scale.

Similarly, the family is their chosen locus for political agency. In other words, voting Republican is, to some extent, a choosing of which scale matters most in a given moment. Here we see the notion of "consequential scale," a concept that allows anthropologists to recognize different scales as important in a given situation.[680] The family becomes the grain that matters in Republican analyses of black community poverty.

Thus, in the end, scale allows the return of immediacy and autonomy. For after recognizing scale, one can return to phenomenological immediacy and notice that its lack of historicity no longer seems much of a problem. It is now one lens among many. And, because pentecostals battle for a particular notion of scale, the

[680] It is equivalent to what ecologists call "operational scale."

immediacy they romanticize matters. While it is merely one scale of analysis, it is a cut with consequence. And quite an effective one when it comes to mobilizing. Likewise, when some pentecostals start to critique the state for its effects on the family, they demonstrate "scale contests." For not only are scales differently consequential to a community, there are constant battles over which ought to predominate.

In spite of their careful training, there is something in pentecostal practice – in the sensibility of immediacy - that makes for an especially fluid, changeable movement. Again, the scaling is more than analysis, but practice and bodies as well. And, it is more than scale, because for pentecostals immediacy signals connection to spirit, thus their passionate opposition to any other scale of analysis. Here the triangular relationship between God, believers and the rest of the world becomes key: for it is God's "dynamism" that enables this fluidity. Thus, when God is fundamentalist and deeply innerant, the rationalizing strings pull taut throughout community sensibilities and there is less room for motion. But, when the God is evangelical and more focused on intercultural encounter, the intensity of rationalization within cultivation shifts, and while learning continues, it is with less predictability – although perhaps more liveliness. And liveliness is a key to effective mobilization. In other words, these questions of scale are likely key to the overall project of understanding pentecostal expansion and vitality.

Finally, and here is the stretch, the dominant conception of scale in a given community can solidify into viseral-cognitive crystals, or logics, that become actors

in the future development of the community. In other words, because the family is the dominant site for agency in Republican and pentecostal narratives, the family is then reified again and again, not only in testimony, but also in the institutional systems of pentecostal churches that support the family, and in the church foundations that fund family activities and advocate for state support aimed at families. In this process, families are naturalized and solidified in a particular shape i.e. generally without extended families. The family is thus constructed as increasingly consequential and substantive.

In other words, specific interactions consolidate different consequential scales, which are sedimented through cocreative contests and cooperations. Smith explains that, "the material and metaphorical are by definition mutually implicated and no clear boundary separates the one discretely from the other."[681] Thus scale emerges as the, "resolution of contradictory social processes of competition and cooperation," an "active progenitor of specific social processes."[682] As with Karen Barad's notion of intra-action, scale is one tool that emerges from a coconstitutive process involving the scholar, and the object of study. The tool is involved in constructing the object and vice-versa.[683] Further, it happens on several levels at once. For while informants are struggling to pick their consequential scale, analysts need to pick scales at which to analyze, and the two processes coinform each other.

[681] Smith, "Contours of a Spatialized Politics," 63.
[682] Ibid., 64.
[683] Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*.

Conclusion

Scale matters. Simply because the ways we sense changes what we sense. But more, because the ways we sense also changes how we form the world around us. Pentecostal scale battles are thus central to their experience of spiritual practice and to their politics.

Pentecostal battles over the consequential scales energizing speaking in tongues and of their political senses offer concrete examples of the ways that shapes emerge in dialogue and contest. The intra-actions between the tools for analyzing and the objects being analyzed are crucial to understanding what it is that emerges. Further scale is differently constructed for and by scholars and their informants, sometimes in synchrony, sometimes in productive misalignment. In other words, scale is cocreated via practice. That is, it is enacted through interactive processes between scholars, participants and the things they scale.

By recognizing analyses as filtered through particular notions of scale, scholars gain clarity while losing the universalizing effects of their claims. Thus, the posthuman becomes a useful tool for understanding certain things in certain moments, but the human is still available as an analytic in other situations. Or the anthropocene's need to "work on a universal scale" must be contingent – we don't always "swap the telescope for the microscope"[684] depending upon the goals of the project.

[684] Zylinska, *Minimal Ethics for the Anthropocene*, 29.

Finally, recognizing the differences between scaled analyses might refigure previous approaches to scholarship in ways that challenge hierarchy. For Zylinska, explicit scaling might enable us to think outside our usual containers.[685] Further, recognizing scale effects contributes to a "post-masculinist rationality" that "eschews any attempt to collapse these scales in order to tell a totalizing story about it."[686] In a similar vein, for Smith, scale opens possibilities for freedom: "guideposts in the recovery of space from annihilation and a language via which the redifferentiation of space can be pioneered on freely argued and agreed-upon social grounds rather than the economic logic of capital and the political interests of its class."[687] In this paper scale provides a means to think more empathetically along with my pentecostal interlocutors.

[685] Ibid.
[686] Ibid., 30–31.
[687] Smith, "Contours of a Spatialized Politics," 78.

Section III: Cultivation and Discontinuity

The Mobilization Philosophy and Politics of Pentecostalism Alongside Post-Structural Debates on Resistance, Event, and Agency.

This next two chapters takes pentecostalism as an example of highly effective organizing and thus in conversation with contemporary critical theory aim to learn what can be learned about mobilizing. The first is an exploration of agency that is refigured from autonomous individualism via pentecostal emphases on passivity, receptivity, and collectivity. The second looks at the event and resistance as strategic responses shared between pentecostal and post-structuralist thinkers in the face of modernity.

Chapter VII: Modern Agency-Anxiety and Pentecostalism

A True Story

We all know the fluid feeling generated by good music. Something permeates the body, loosening, juicing fibers. Perhaps the volume shakes our bones, instigates a nervous system shift, a mode of sensual pleasure. Or maybe the crowd inspires collective effervescence, togetherness, a single trajectory among many bodies. On this day we've been in chapel for several hours – it is "Spiritual Emphasis Week" at Bethany University, with classes cancelled to make room for collective devotion. The band plays for a good 40 minutes, a few hundred students stand and sing, swaying in

place, many arms outstretched in signature Charismatic worship. Preaching soon adds a second layer to the music: words insistent and passionate, staccato and pointed, contrast sharply with the continued roll of a highly flanged electric guitar. At first the message surprises me with its relevance. The previous evening a friend asked about my spending all this time among pentecostals without feeling the tug of faith, thinking I was bound to convert – she was a bit concerned. And when the preacher begins, "What you behold, you will become," I am struck, and a mite anxious. The message: where your attention goes, so does your self, seems perfectly primed for an outside observer like myself. This is odd. I am in a crowd of converts, a few hundred people so devoted to Jesus they spend their days in an all-Christian college and participate in daily iterations of ritualized devotion and commitment. I soon realize however, that the message is aimed at the insecurity of every person around me – it is a story of confidence and stability. All these folks are already safely beholding and thus becoming Christian. The preacher is actually pointing outside, telling his flock to be less attentive to pop culture and its temptations: sex, drugs, partying, especially sex. Sounds like a typical Fundamentalist jeremiad – yet in the 2 years that I intermittently attended services, there had been little mention of discipline, hell or sex. I hear that Reverend Shelton is on a campaign to quell partying. I guess this is the first step. Instead of release, yearning and passion – all so well manifested in the lyrics posted on the screen - this service joins intimate ecstatic devotion to its counterpart in ascetic discipline and Biblical single mindedness. I am not buying the message. So what happens next is certainly not intellectual acceptance.

The pastor calls for community participation. All eyes close. He asks us to seek ourselves in his story of desperation. Heads bow, many touch and comfort neighbors. One student puts his hand on my shoulder. I do not reciprocate. He retreats. In the next moment, when the lights dim further and singing resumes, I feel a burning in my thighs down by my knees. As if a flamethrower aims at my legs, a fiery heat rises through to my hips, belly, chest and I am drenched in an all-out sweat.

This is not familiar. Years of epileptic parasthesia has prepped me for strange sensations, and in fact makes them suspect, but this heat is new, not erotic or esoteric in the sense I am accustomed to. It feels both separate and within. I can understand how it would seem an outside force. The MRIs of pentecostals show that they can learn these neurological patterns, I wonder if I am learning.[688]

The truth is I hadn't done so much to earn my way into the pentecostal sensorium. Yes, I had been sitting in on services, but I didn't raise my hands, ask for tongues, or pursue any of the other routes to physical conviction. I just stood there, maybe rocked back and forth in time to the music – but I didn't even sing. On one hand I was psyched to feel the burn – what incredible research data. But more intensely, I simply wanted to have it go away – a wish made more poignant by the ever present fear that I might be on the verge of an epileptic seizure. Yet, even my cynical body had somehow responded to the call.

Introduction

My world is not a pentecostal friendly one. This is perhaps logical – in much of the academy, religion is seen as both atavistic and dying, and pentecostals are not only religious, but famous for their love of snakes, belly flopping religious practice and a deep disdain for modernity, science, and the state. In fact, even the non-pentecostal theologians I meet often describe pentecostals as off their rockers. Taken together, this means I am regularly defending the intelligence, thoughtfulness of my informants and their ability to pursue decisive change. This essay is just that. But also, in the process of defending the agency of pentecostals I find the concept of agency undone and then, perhaps, salvaged.

---

[688] Andrew B Newberg et al., "Measurement of Regional Cerebral Blood Flow Associated with the M Technique-Light Massage Therapy: A Case Series and Longitudinal Study Using SPECT.," *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine* 14, no. 8 (2008): 903–10.

Agency, the access to shape our own lives, or the lack thereof, is the central trope used to both valorize or denigrate pentecostals. As most visions of agency include a sense of autonomous reason driven action and pentecostal practices that seem viscerally motivated, collective, or more about yielding than acting, don't seem to fit.[689] Thus, they are figured either as irrational holders of false consciousness, or similarly irrational exemplars of political resistance against the technocratic grid. Thus, a close look at pentecostal practices pushes against previous notions of agency. For instance, pentecostals develop their receptivity, what they call "yielding" such that, the agency here doesn't fit at all within the active-passive model of contemporary agency-anxieties. They are, as they say, "Free to submit."[690] Further, they actively engage in collective processes described by others as irrational frenzy, clearly without autonomy. Yet, I wonder how strange this is perhaps collectivity is fundamental to the thing called human (or posthuman just as well) that has emerged over the past millenia. Maybe, as Hegel, Spinoza and a host of contemporary psychologists and neuroscientists agree,[691] humans develop through relationship. In other words, the mimesis of collectivity might easily be healthy, normal, and

[689] See Mack for an extended list of definitions of agency: Phyllis Mack, "Religion, Feminism, and the Problem of Agency: Reflections on Eighteenth-Century Quakerism," *Signs Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29, no. 1 (2003): 149–77.
[690] Griffith, *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*, 150.
[691] See Sharp for a discussion of the relational ontologies in Hegel and Spinoza. Sharp, *Spinoza and the Politics of Renaturalization*. For social psychology and neuroscience see: Simon. Baron-Cohen, Helen. Tager-Flusberg, and Donald J. Cohen, *Understanding Other Minds: Perspectives from Autism* (NY: Oxford University Press, 1993); Susan T. Fiske and Shelley E. Taylor, *Social Cognition: From Brains to Culture* (Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2008); Christian von Scheve and Mikko Salmella, *Collective Emotions: Perspectives from Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology*, 2014.

crucial.[692] If so, why limit the activity of relational development to encounters with other people when pentecostals practice receptivity to a spirit as well.[693] As such, I use the pentecostal experience of mutual entanglement, and my own alongside them, as a foil to expand notions of agency to include collective processes of mutual constitution, including receptivity and yielding.

I wonder, however, what inspires the interest in agency, that is, beyond scholarly debate. The key, I suspect, lies within its family of terms – autonomy, rationality, freedom – where agency serves most clearly to define the humanity of others. As Talal Asad argues, because "this intoxication with 'agency' is the product of liberal individualism,"[694] it matters, for "the doctrine of action has become essential to our recognition of other peoples humanity."[695] I will argue that this concern manifests throughout Western thought in recurrent efforts to assuage what I call "agency-anxiety." Pentecostals invert the secular version of the term. That people might assert agency rightfully due to God or the Holy Spirit is perhaps the most serious concern pentecostals pose against modern humanity.

---

[692] See Mazarella for the psychological theories that support this. William Mazzarella, "The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who's Afraid of the Crowd?," *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 4 (2010): 697–727.
[693] Keller, *The Hammer and the Flute Women, Power, and Spirit Possession*.
[694] Asad writes, "We accept too easily that a theory is to be accepted only if it gives scope to agency. But the sense in which a theory gives scope to agency is quite different from the sense in which actual conditions give scope to agency. If it is the case that particular situations in the world do not give a person scope for shaping his or her life, such as in the case of imprisonment, there is no use blaming theories for that." http://web.stanford.edu/group/SHR/5-1/text/asad.html "Agency has become a catch word. In a way, this intoxication with 'agency' is the product of liberal individualism. The ability of individuals to fashion themselves, to change their live, is given ideological priority over the relation within which they themselves are actually formed, situated, and sustained." Talal Asad, "Modern Power and the Reconfiguration of Religious Traditions" Interviewed by Saba Mahmood
[695] Talal Asad, "Comments on Conversion," in *Conversion to Modernities: The Globalization of Christianity*, ed. Peter van der. Veer (New York: Routledge, 1996), 272.

Western agency-anxiety manifests by denigrating those imagined as less agentive. For instance, discussions of pentecostal agency often devolve into portrayals of "false consciousness" suggesting they fail to analyze their lives adequately and thus tend to choose against their own interests. Contemporary thinkers tried to reject this term, but it continues to arise. It is a difficult notion to quell, for in these versions, false consciousness simply signals a disagreement between the author and their subjects over what constitutes the vital needs of a community and here the author insists they know best. These debates will likely not disappear. However, there is clearly something colonial about a view from the outside that says "your real needs are elsewhere." Not that, people never make mistakes about themselves. However, the question of needs is quite subjective, and to turn it into a positivistic claim about another group likely reifies existing power relations and, more simply, can just miss the boat regarding cross cultural understanding. In response, Saba Mahmood argues that agency must be understood within the grammar of the community from which it evolves. She aims to solve the problem of false consciousness by reliance upon a radical incomensurability between communities.[696] In essence, Mahmood accepts that different groups have radically different analyses, but simply inverts the strateg of false consciousness claims by siting truth locally, rather than from the ostensively unsituated observer. I also find false consciousness a problem. Yet I question her claim to such stark difference across communities, and further wonder at the capacity of scholars to find the line

[696] Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*.

dividing them in any useful sense. (Mahmood, for instance, has been criticized for exagerrating the difference between Islam and the West regarding their traditions of critique and scholarship).[697] Thus, instead of incomensurabity between communities, I suggest that recognizing different scales of analysis that are related but irreducible toone another might better show both the value of local intelligence, as well as its difference from other scales.

In all, because their action tends to be collective, passive, cultivated, and compelled through visceral interpellation, pentecostal agency deeply confounds images of agent dependent upon the autonomous rational individual. As such, pentecostals might inspire either a refiguration, or complete rejection of the concept of agency. For one, if agency is in both action and yielding, perhaps it is everpresent, and thus meaningless – we all have it, when acting, when resisting, and also when receiving? But perhaps, as I suggest instead, agency is a relational term, valuable primarily for the ways it inspires or constrains the potential to act when entangled with others? Comparative agency, what Mel Chen calls, "animacy hierarchies," provides one way to think together about the ways race, gender and class are all used similarly to (de)humanize.[698] Perhaps also, as I will suggest, agency's traction might depend upon the scale at which we analyze, practice, or experience?

This chapter begins by exploring the history of agency-anxiety within Western thought, ranging from the chain of causation arguments in classical philosophy to the

---

[697] Sindre Bangstad, "Saba Mahmood and Anthropological Feminism After Virtue," *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 28–54.
[698] Mel Y Chen, *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect* (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2012).

concerns over objectification and rationalization that permeate modern thinking. I trace efforts to find agentive space beginning with modern notions of consciousness through visceral freedom from the grid, scale-shrinking phenomenologies, and finally to postmodern efforts at finding gaps in modern discipline. I then trace pentecostal versions of agency-anxiety where human action risks supplanting God as agent. I explore the ways pentecostals are described as irrational and therefore either unusually confused about their place in the world or equally irrational but especially able to intervene in the hegemonic grid of modernity. The pont being that agency is a concept of evaluation – a means to think about the other, in this case, pentecostals. And in fact, there is something unusual to evaluate, as I show in the visceral, collective and yielded elements of pentecostal practice. Finally, I look at R Marie Griffith and Saba Mahmood's arguments for agency via inhabiting norms and suggest that their argument are useful for thinking with pentecostals and strengthened when seen as an analysis of a particular scale and when combined with Mel Chen's notion of agency hierachies.

In all, pentecostals challenge the autonomous agent of liberal discourse in their collectivity and nurturing of exceptional availability. It may be, in fact, that pentecostal practice stretches agency to its limit – perhaps it becomes a synonym for both action and inaction and no longer differentiates? Yet, I hate to let it go. For political reasons and also because analytically there is a huge anxiety to be filled.

Modern Agency-Anxiety

The pentecostal intervention into contemporary discussions of agency challenges a deeply established tradition in Western thought in which freedom from constraint serves as a crucial pivot for measuring humanity. Freedom here was imagined either as the degree to which rational autonomous individuals can choose in ways that eliminate the mediation either of the passions, discipline, or modern technocracy.

Nearly every modern philosopher (and many anthropologists), expressed concern over the lack of freedom and agency in modernity. Kant, for instance, was obsessed by the potential for obstruction of humans by things. As Isaiah Berlin explains, "This problem, although it was particularly acute for Kant, has dominated European thought, and indeed to some extent European action, ever since. It is a problem which obsesses both philosophers and historians in the 19th century and, indeed, in our own century too."[699] Denise Da Silva agrees, arguing that protection of self-determination from exterior influences is the primary concern motivating modern Western philosophy.[700] Secular critiques of non-liberal religiosity rely on this anxiety. And pentecostal anxieties, while appearing quite different, also depend upon the same worry about the overwhelming force of modernity, only the modern for them is human construction threatening the authority of the Holy Spirit.

---

[699] Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*, 74.

[700] Webb Keane agrees. He says that, in modernity, the search for agency becomes, "an ethical imperative for much contemporary writing about feminism, politics of recognition, democracy, rights, and post-colonialism, among other things."Keane, *Christian Moderns*, 3. Zygmunt Bauman explained that it was not only sociology that developed first and foremost as a "science of unfreedom." Bauman, *Freedom*, 5.

In other words, while perhaps "*We Have Never Been Modern*," that is, genuinely free from nature's determination, many are deeply stricken by its frustration.[701] An intense "agency-anxiety" motivates the project of purification. In fact, the nature-culture divide is not simply a philosophical proposition but references a growing terror at the sense that although modernity asserted increased human creativity and control, that same ability to shape our environment swallowed itself in the mechanics of modern social life. The distance between the two – creative potential and cultural constraint – has been measured as rationalization or discipline, the experience as alienation, a lack of genuine experience, and/or objectification. As Claire Blencowe explained, "romanticism, vitalism, phenomenology, pragmatism and humanist Marxism," all aim to, "recover, liberate or create authentic experience which modern Western rationality, intellectualism, industrialization, or commodification have destroyed."[702] As such, modern agency-anxiety manifests in two distinct questions: first, are we simply determined by an endless regression of causes? And second, how much does society control us? The latter is the question peculiar to moderns. As the growing "immanent frame," made it increasingly difficult to avoid wondering if we were simply a collection of effects, modern philosophers replied by positing consciousness, emotions, or fleeting moments, all beyond causal chains or social control matrices.[703]

---

[701] Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).
[702] Blencowe, *Biopolitical Experience*, 19.
[703] Taylor, *A Secular Age*. These concerns are not utterly new. The Fates had impinged on Greek freedom and the Stoics posed self-determination as the exclusive moral attribute of the rational thing. For Augustine, self-determination involved release from bodily passions when human will realizes

The initial response involved self consciousness. As Michael Gillespie explains, "Western thought from Rousseau to Kant to Hegel" posed "consciousness" as liberation from the tyranny of nature, tradition, and passions.[704] Think, step outside the grid, and view the world reasonably. Freud's resistance to cultural repression through deeper self-reflexivity might be the ultimate in autonomous self-consciousness. Likewise, Kant finds safety in transcendent unaffectable reason.[705] Thus liberal self-conscious authenticity provides a kind of knowledge, "altogether independent of experience, and even of sensuous impressions."[706] Exteriority is disavowed.

A second version of the, "space outside of modern objectification," argument comes through resistant "primitive" or sensual subjectivity. Rousseau's critique of the dehumanizing effects of property is an early exemplar.[707] Rousseau replies with an atavistic bumping of the pre-modern noble savage. In a similar vein, Nietzsche's Apollonian vision, the romantics, the neovitalists, and of course the evangelicals, all choose an affective space of freedom via the human heart and emotions.

---

itself via supernatural will. Later, Anselm and Aquinas struggled to prove agency in the face of God's omnipotence.

[704] Michael Allen Gillespie, *Hegel, Heidegger, and the Ground of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 27.

[705] Kant recognizes in the Third Antinomy that freedom and natural law are, in some sense, incompatible and responds by providing a space outside the phenomena, the unknowable noumena, which can house the sublime interior of consciousnessImmanuel Kant et al., *The Critique of Pure Reason*. (Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1955).

[706] Gillespie, *Hegel, Heidegger, and the Ground of History*, 59. Ibid.

[707] As he writes, "The first who, having enclosed a piece of earth, thought to say, 'this is mine,' and found a man simple enough to believe him was the true founder of civil society." Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Donald A Cress, *On the Social Contract ; Discourse on the Origin of Inequality ; Discourse on Political Economy* (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1983).

Others rescale the consequential questions so as to curtail determinism. Kierkegaard's "that individual" or Husserl's phenomenological aspirations at pre-objective sensual reality both shrink the analytic lens to find an immediate underlying experience and bypass the process of objectification.[708]

A final set of modern responses aims for deeper entanglement rather than the liberatory distance of either Kantian or affective spaces of freedom. Best known through Hegel, Marx, and Heidegger, this tradition describes the modern abstraction of the concrete, the decontextualization of social relations, and the alienation of people from their creativity as engendering a lack of agency and increased violence. However, instead of exploring an outside to contemporary culture, their freedom is within, a truly immanent philosophy that rejects Kant's divide between knowledge and being. For the Hegelian tradition, the highest irrationality encloses within it the highest rationality. Key to this move, however, it works to validate both the French revolution and for Napoleon, thus it is politically empty.

Post-structural Freedom

Post-structural thought expressed intensified anxiety about a lack of human access to knowledge and agency in the world and this engendered new efforts at compensation. By the late 20th century behaviorism and neurological reductionism suggested the human as wholly determined. Postmodern analyses of the structures of

[708] Søren Kierkegaard et al., *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, for American Scandinavian Foundation, 1944); Edmund Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, trans. William Ralph Boyce Gibson (New York: Collier Books, 1962).

language in culture expanded this notion until even the most interior author was dead at birth.[709] These extremes of agency-anxiety seemed to yield even the glimmer of agency. However, this congealing of constraint inspired a deeper digging for agency beyond the reach of modern discipline. Postmodern theory offered three primary solutions to the problem of freedom: gap theories with modern grids necessarily riven by cracks that might allow freedom;[710] the sensuous which like Rousseau, provided a space of feeling that seemed less available to modern rationalization;[711] and the truly immanent by which agency entangles with control.[712]

One constant was a denial of individual consciousness. By rejecting Freud's repressive hypothesis and arguing that sexuality emerges as an effect of power, Foucault eliminated the conscious self as a potential outside to modern culture. Consciousness was now an internal part of the process, immanent to structures of power. Yet, no matter how much he argued for the elimination of the control-resistance dichotomy, a study of prisons and torture that told of our interpellation by the panopticon of the state and was called *Discipline and Punish* couldn't help but suggest an agentless and painful ontology. (*Permissive and Rewarding* might have

---

[709] Seán Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998).
[710] i.e. Butler, *Bodies That Matter*; Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jaques Lacan*., trans. Jacques Alain. Miller, 1999; Badiou, *Being and Event*. and in its modal versions: Bourdieu, *La Noblesse d'Etat*; Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. G. E. M Anscombe (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001); Bruno Latour, *An Inquiry Into Modes of Existence: An Anthropology of the Moderns*, 2013; Gilles Deleuze et al., *What Is Philosophy?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).
[711] i.e Spivak's poetics, affect theories, body foundationalism, neovitalism. Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*.
[712] i.e. Foucault in his non body foundationalist moments, Mazzarella's dialectic would fit here, but is more modern in flavor

made the same argument about immanence, but likely to a much smaller audience.)[713] His most well known claims reject any sense of originary vitality, arguing instead for a pure immanence, which because it lacked Hegel's dialectic, or any comparable vision of motion or space, seemed, to many readers, as lacking space for agency.

The dominance of Foucault's thinking inspired a scramble to find a gap, or space, in the disciplinary grid, some opening for agency.[714] Reams of critique described the dearth of agency in early post-structural thought. Foucault himself eventually added self fashioning to remedy this problem.[715] The broader response to this increased agency-anxiety was, in some sense, brilliant. In exploring structures of mathematics, language, and (ostensively) society, scholars paralleled Godel's uncertainty theorem, which argued for the incompatibility of both coherence and completeness in an analysis.[716] Any coherently gridded analysis would, of necessity, be left incomplete and anything complete could not help but be a bit incoherent. In other words, perhaps the deterministic totalizing that Foucault seemed to suggest was literally impossible. Judith Butler, for instance, describes the uncertainty of linguistic iteration, in which each re-speaking of an object cannot help but subtly misspeak, its new history makes sameness impossible. Here, "agency is the hiatus in iterability, the compulsion to install an identity through repetition, which requires the very

[713] Some suggest that this is an effect of weak translation. In any case, the effect was a lack of agential hope. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*.
[714] Morris and Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, 11–12.
[715] Michel Foucault et al., *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988).
[716] Paul M Livingston, *The Politics of Logic: Badiou, Wittgenstein, and the Consequences of Formalism* (New York: Routledge, 2012).

contingency, the undetermined interval, that identity instantly seeks to foreclose."[717] From her perspective, a chain of causality would lack the coherence necessary to turn us all into robot-effects of the panopticon. The linear reductionism necessary for determinism is thus lost in the uncertainty of semiotic repetition. Likewise, Badiou's void at the edge of formalism, Derrida's trace, Lacan's Real, even Schmitt's exception all offer a version of Godel's theorem: there is no coherence if complete, and no completion if coherent.[718] Another group of theorists (i.e. Bourdieu, Wittgenstein, Latour, Deleuze) allowed for the gaps to emerge in between broader modes of existence instead of individual actions.[719] And that gap between coherent and incoherent, complete and incomplete might provide the space for affect, for the event, and hope for resistance.

Other post-structuralists followed Rousseau's impulse towards an originary vitality and argued either that bodies, vital energies or the aesthetics of art could escape the mechanical gridding of modernity. This strategy has been played hundreds of times throughout the 20th century in art, poetry, free jazz, philosophy and politics – modernists escape the rational with irrational, Picasso with Africa, others with white canvases. The most recent manifests in theorists of queering and its inverse in the quotidian – both posed as outside of, or mobile within, the rationalized iron cage.[720]

---

[717] Butler, *Bodies That Matter*.
[718] Badiou, *Being and Event*; Derrida, *Of Grammatology*; Lacan, *The Seminar of Jaques Lacan*.; Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985); Livingston, *The Politics of Logic*.
[719] Bourdieu, *La Noblesse d'Etat*; Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*; Latour, *An Inquiry Into Modes of Existence: An Anthropology of the Moderns*; Deleuze et al., *What Is Philosophy?*
[720] To be clear – there is an important logic to gap and vitalist theories. They do actually offer possibility against totalizing hegemonies. The gaps make mathematical sense and while the vitalists

Yet pentecostals present a challenge to agency that is not accounted for by either the modern or post-structural thinkers. It seems that the collective, receptivity based agency of pentecostals, and other non-liberal religious movements, is less easily found in the gaps, than in the inhabitation of norms. Agency here might emerge within a tradition.[721]

Pentecostal Agency-Anxiety

Pentecostals invert the liberal concern with heteronomy in their worry that people might feel too autonomous. Like liberal thinkers, they decry modern rationalization and its ill effects on culture. Anomie, alienation, and objectification play here as well. And like their secular philosophical counterparts who imagined consciousness might derail determinism, evangelicals also respond by searching inside. Perhaps their heart connection to Spirit protects from the rational and mechanical? Pentecostals especially, are savants of affective, emotional, and embodied practices that provide purchase in this escape. Yet, their efforts to break free and experience transcendence also attach to an agency policing, an effort to ensure that converts remain aware of God's limits on human power.[722]

---

miss the cultivation of the sensuous, they do bring previously ignored realms of existence into play in ways that certainly shakes things up. Yet, when thought in conjunction with pentecostalism, it becomes clear that they might claim more than they manifest. Most simply, affect, event, and gap are all lovely and crucial strategies. And pentecostals use them to great effect, certainly far more broadly than any progressive movement has. But, none are spontaneous, and all are cultivated. (See Chapter 8) also Shannon Winnubst, *Queering Freedom* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2006).

[721] i.e. Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*.

[722] Agency, for pentecostals might translate as "power," perhaps their primary concern. Everett Wilson explains that "adherents understood power as referring to the divine grace which is evidenced, usually, by a climactic emotional experience and is followed by an ongoing sense of God's presence and at

AG's 1949 refutation of the Latter Rain revival clearly demonstrates pentecostal agency-anxiety. Here the General Council denounced revivalists for an excessive sense of human influence on spirituality. They describe, "the extreme teaching as advocated by the 'New Order' regarding the confession of sin to man and deliverance as practiced, *which claims prerogatives to human agency which belong only to Christ*."[723] The concept of human agency as a risk associated with overt efforts by people to actively fashion their world permeated deep into AG culture, supporting its inversion in the virtues of a yielded ethos.

Critiques from their spiritual kin in the holiness movement clarify the concern. A.B Simpson, holiness preacher, for instance, spun his critique of tongues towards its excessive human agency, not its enthusiasm: "When 'Tongueism' is sifted down, it will be found that the cunning craftiness of depraved human figures in it to a greater degree than anyone has yet dreamed." Evil spirits were likely involved as, "I have no doubt that there is much demon manifestation in the 'Tongues' meetings for I've seen it with my own eyes." But the key challenge involved human intervention for "many learn the art of copying others."[724] The horror at mechanically generated spirituality was in the air.

Pentecostal concern with agency often arises from fear that moderns imagine themselves ruling in place of God. Instead, in pentecostal practice, agency involves

---

least some occasional objective confirmation…" And he continues, "power is ultimately defined by pentecostals as it is for everyone else: 'Power is the unimpeded ability to do work.'" This sounds a lot like agency. Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 156.

[723] [emphasis added] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,* 325.

[724] Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 178.

yielding and sharing the project. A 1929 *Pentecostal Evangel* essay explains that, "Development by Cooperation," begins with "*We, then, as workers together with him*," and describes cultivation as a joint effort, with human complementing the divine. Thus, on one hand, "In the process of cultivation God has planned and instituted the laws of nature and placed the many elements essential to growth in air and earth…" Yet, also, "The farmer possesses independent intelligence and volition. He may or may not co-operate with God… It is man's part to break up the fallow ground and prepare the soil and plant the grain..." We choose then to cooperate by yielding, or not. For, "…by our own volition we present ourselves to God, bringing ourselves under the influences and power of His truth and in line with the operations of the Holy Ghost. It is ours to deliberately mortify the deeds of our own flesh, put off our old conversation, shed the garments of the old man "self" and don the garments of the new man by sanctifying ourselves unto God that we may be sanctified of God." We decide. Very much a agential moment, yet one that is not at all autonomous. Instead, it is inhabited. For, "…in working out our own salvation, we must do so knowing that it is *God working in us*."[725] The triangular dynamic makes for indirect agency, "instrumental" in Mary Keller's sense of the term, but perhaps not coerced or controlled.[726]

The 1936 "Words of Counsel from Daddy Welch" runs similarly. Cultivate and work, but subordinate. "Never neglect the cultivation of every talent you have, but keep them under the Blood, on the altar, and consecrated to God." There is but

[725] PE 1929_07_20, p 4
[726] Keller, *The Hammer and the Flute Women, Power, and Spirit Possession*.

one anxiety – individual agency. "The only danger is when natural talents cause one to be self-reliant." Instead, "rely on the power of the Spirit always and let Him use you."[727] As Mahmood points out, inhabiting this kind of tradition is a form of agency not easily accounted for in Western thought.[728]

In fact, the Western approach to human agency in which individuals actively try and then succeed, or fail, is not only dangerous in pentecostal lore, but bound to be mistaken. In "Conquering a Bad Temper" F. M. Bellsmith tells of the preacher with a temper who tries to sweep clean his soul, apparently a bit too actively. For, his is a dirt floor. Sweeping manifests only a growing cloud of dust. "You see the mistake the preacher had made: He was trying to sweep his own heart clean." Instead, he must let God do the work for him – "I will cleanse thee."[729] And the theme is reiterated throughout the *Pentecostal Evangel*: "…while self-control has its limitations, there is no doubt that Christ-control can meet any emergency."[730] That is, we make our destiny only via a willingness to train diligently (and teach others to train diligently) to let go and receive.

Further, when pentecostals yield to a higher power, God's broader agency makes all their methodical and rigorous development of sensory capacities uncertain. As Wilson writes in his biography of AG Division of Foreign Missions director Philip Hogan: "Hogan saw missionary effort as being extremely contingent – as the unpredictable, timely and ongoing work of the Holy Spirit," but also attached to

[727] PE 1936_10_10, p 5
[728] Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*.
[729] PE 1944_07_15, p 3
[730] "How You May Inherit the Earth," Albert L Hoy, PE 1963_3_17, p. 2 and PE 1981_10_25

human effort, as it was "based on the individual, sacrificial effort of sensitive, amenable, and dedicated men and women."[731] Thus, pentecostal conceptions of the agent as yielding through triangulation[732] both undoes the liberal active-passive dichotomy of liberal notions of agency and, in the process, provides a model to think with – a humble agent, active in its systematic efforts to co-operate with, or yield to, a force within which it can abide.

One Agent: The Pentecostal Scholar

In 2008 Dell Tarr – an accomplished pentecostal academic – could finally write in retrospect: "I remember the day when pentecostal scholar was my favorite oxymoron."[733] Massive energy had gone into building pentecostal scholarship since Mark Noll's 1994 publication of *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*, which critiques evangelicals for their lack of interest in critical thinking. As such, a growing group of people enjoy academic standing in both the secular world and the pentecostal.

Pentecostal scholars, however, are a particular and peculiar bunch. It is awkward to say what follows, but I think without this sense, readers will miss something important. Dan Albrecht was the first pentecostal academic I met and he pretty much set the tone for the others. Albrecht is friendly, funny, brilliant, scruffy,

[731] And this uncertainty, the uncertainty of the Holy Spirit, was encouraged through a careful process of support. "Monitoring the development of a church; nurturing, encouraging, and supporting its spiritual health; and discerning its needs at various stages of its development – in other words, providing pastoral care – were his primary concerns."Wilson, *Strategy of the Spirit*, 65.
[732] Girard, *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel; Self and Other in Literary Structure*.
[733] William W Menzies, Wonsuk Ma, and Robert P Menzies, *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 198.

and deeply polite, but most exceptional is his excitement. We sat at Starbucks, he got coffee, hot chocolate for me, and from the minute we began I simply scribbled furiously in my yellow pad, page after page of connections, linkages, and seeming side stories. I had asked one question. Something simple – define pentecostalism? Then I sat silently, writing notes for three hours as Dan took me on a tour of church history, and several minor traditions in Western intellectual history which at times seemed completely unrelated to our starting point. Stunningly, by the end, he circled through thousands of years, multiple authors, sociology, theology, history, neurology, and anthropology and brought us right back home. It all connected beautifully – if one could hold the threads. This happened once. It left me exhausted and intrigued. I joked with his colleagues about it. They all knew what I was talking about. We laughed at, and with, Albrecht. The funny thing is that it happened again and again. He was incapable of the simple answer, perhaps incapable of a simple thought. And his passion was contagious. Yes, students did manage one hand texting under the back seats of his church history classes (I sat behind them and found their skill impressive). But they seemed inspired by the material. Albrecht's degree is in the History and Phenomenology of Religions from the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. And he is simply one of a multitude of highly educated, vital, and curious pentecostal scholars. These are not the uneducated Holy Rollers of H.L. Mencken's tales.

However, perhaps the hardest thing to explain is the energy or buzz emanating from these deeply passionate scholars. Often something is quite visible in their eyes,

honestly some regularly look quite stoned. Everett Wilson, an incredibly warm generous man with a BA from Berkeley and PhD from Stanford also has amazing eyes, round, open, googly even. How does one describe a person not quite here, or perhaps looking elsewhere in the midst of conversation, and yet sharp as a whip? Simply stand near him and feel an excitation, an itch, wash across one's own body. To talk together for hours is a whole other ballgame. In some sense this feels absurd, to describe a group of people as somehow inciting physical sensation. And yet, aside from their brilliance, and passionate inspiration, my central experience involved being shaken, not intellectually, spiritually, or emotionally, but in my flesh.

Irrational is Agentive

Some see this affective valence of the pentecostal as a tool to fend off the appropriation and objectification of life under neoliberal capitalism. Michel De Certeau's ideal of glossolalia (speaking in tongues) as a "vocal utopia" uncaught by rationality, untrained, and spontaneously applied with no particular trajectory[734] resonates perfectly with the increasing valorization of the spontaneous event as a militant ideal (i.e. Alain Badiou).[735] Likewise, Donna Haraway's call for "a feminist speaking in tongues to strike fear into the circuits" of the new right did more than simply appropriate tongues for the left.[736] She also joined a genealogy of progressives for whom tongues signified freedom from constraint, and a transgressive cultural

[734] Michel De Certeau, "Vocal Utopias: Glossolalias," *Representations*., no. 56 (1996): 29.
[735] Badiou, *Philosophy for Militants*.
[736] Donna Jeanne Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 181.

politics. Gloria Anzaldua's, Chicana women "speak in tongues like the outcaste and the insane," as a revolt.[737] In *Gyn/Ecology* Mary Daly proposes "speaking with tongues of fire" as resistance to phallocentric speech and ways of knowing. And even earlier, Norman O'Brown advocates for a homologous, if less feminist, channel for transgression. For Brown, the chaos of tongues might model liberation. He asks his readers to imagine with him: "Pentecostal freedom, Pentecostal fusion. Speaking with tongues; many tongues, many meanings… The Babylonian confusion of tongues redeemed in the pentecostal fusion."[738] Brown aims to unleash the erotic, the irrational, and the chaos of spirit against the constraint of the disciplinary society.[739] More recently, evangelicalism's exceptional organizing success inspired movement philosophers who see resistance to hegemonic norms via affect, the event, and other ruptural political practice. In this vein, Alain Badiou, Slavoj Zizek, and Giorgio Agamben all pose the rupture of Paul's conversion as a model for a new radicalism.[740] Thus, from Brown to Haraway to Agamben, the ruptures of conversion and speaking in tongues serves as an ideal, a moment of freedom.[741] They share a vision of

---

[737] Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* (New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press, 1983). Anzaldua, Speaking in Tongues, 165

[738] Norman Oliver Brown, *Love's Body,* (New York: Random House, 1966), 38.

[739] Brown's call for poetry to replace politics prefigured Spivak's "poetics" by 30 years. His recognition of the polyphony and fertility of meanings set the stage for Deleuze's "excess." But then, what of the poeticity of symmetry (Jakobson) of a timetable (Pasternak) wine list (Vjazemski), a clothes inventory (Gogol). From Jakobson cited in Kirby*, Telling Flesh,* 36.

[740] Badiou, *Being and Event*; Giorgio Agamben, *The Time That Remains: A Commentary on the Letter to the Romans* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005); Slavoj Žižek, *The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003).

[741] I am indebted to John Sanbonmatsu for tracing this left-expressivist trajectory of tongues metaphors in The Postmodern Prince, "Speaking in Tongues"John Sanbonmatsu, *The Postmodern Prince: Critical Theory, Left Strategy, and the Making of a New Political Subject* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004).

religious practitioners as irrational and therefore subversive, who, like Rousseau's noble savage, proffer freedom that escapes modern discipline.

Irrational is Without Agency

On the other hand, some argue that because of their dependence upon God, a preacher, or enthusiastic bodies, pentecostals cannot think rationally, and are instead the product of manipulation, either by their passions, or their preacher's passions. Perhaps pentecostals generate a narrow analysis that misses the overarching patterns in society and thus when they say tongues are spontaneous, or income disparity derives from bad parenting, or when they vote republican, they simply manifest that irrationality so apparent in their ecstatic practices of devotion.

Critics of right-wing movements regularly pose rationality against the irrational and see pentecostals as exemplars of poverty-stricken atavism. From HL Mencken to Richard Hofstader and Thomas Frank[742] the right is imagined as irrational, thus not in accord with their working class economic interests, and therefore unwelcome in the liberal polity that requires religion and feeling to hide in either the internal sublime or overarching transcendent, but not in everyday practice of human encounter, or the conscious working of a reasonable politics. Perhaps the best-known example of this critique is in Frank's question: "What's the matter with

[742] Thomas Frank, *What's the Matter with Kansas?: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004); Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics, and Other Essays*. (New York: Knopf, 1965).

Kansas"[743] which comes down to asking "Why do poor whites vote for Republicans who shift resources to the wealthy and destroy the welfare state that the poor rely upon?" Similarly, pentecostals are often narrated without agency – as emotional, unreasonably faithful to a God, and/or caught in a collective frenzy, or an outside force – not the kind of person who ought to lead a meeting, build an organization, investigate a complex academic question, or even vote. Think of Steinbeck's poor illiterate and licentious pentecostals in *Grapes of Wrath*, or Deniro's pentecostal turned psychopath in *Cape Fear*.

There are several rebuttals. First, perhaps the data here is incorrect, and empirically speaking, poor whites are not choosing trickle down economics?[744] Regarding rationality, we could simply say, look they're very rational, read these texts they wrote. We could challenge the divide between rational and irrational and claim that everyone is just as motivated by feeling, and just as inspired by collectivity?[745] Also perhaps their choice of church community over state, and people over technocracy, proclaims aversion to the violence of modern anomie. As Bethany Morton suggests, the "soul of neoliberalism" is a choice of value over wealth – we are not simply *homo economicus*.[746] This helps. Yet, I find these answers not quite fully satisfying. For the excitement and visceral intelligence demonstrated by pentecostal academics does not simply appear from nowhere. It is carefully envisioned,

---

[743] Thomas Frank, *What's the Matter with Kansas?: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004).
[744] Larry M Bartels, "What's the Matter with What's the Matter with Kansas?," *QJPS Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 1, no. 2 (2006): 201–26.
[745] Kim Fortun, *Advocacy after Bhopal Environmentalism, Disaster, New Global Orders* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
[746] Moreton, "The Soul of Neoliberalism."

cultivated, maintained and, in fact, deeply rationalized. From the Methodists onward, the experience of faith became a subject of intense study and meticulous nurturing.[747] Charles Finney called revival "a work of man," and he spent a lifetime building rational mechanisms for realizing this.[748] In this tradition, pentecostals carefully train to develop the sensory aptitudes and sensibilities necessary for a successful pentecostal community. Thus - and this is key to this paper - these distinctions between a rationalized process and an irrational event might be usefully understood as differences in analytical perspective, in scale. That is, what analytic is most useful? Moments or journeys? Groups, or individuals? Scale, for Nathan Sayre, comprises "grain" (the size of elements) and "extent" (the reach of the analytic).[749] Here we see irrational events grained small, without the prep and post-mortem while the rationality lies in the extended lens of planning and theorizing.

Collective Effervescence

While one might simply try to recuperate the pentecostal scholar – "they are smart, have agency, etc."– in fact, the collective, receptive, and compelled elements of their practice do seem out of place in a traditional tale of agency. For more than rational conductors of concept, pentecostals rely also on somatic interplay between selves as they inculcate feeling in the people around them.

[747] Taves, *Fits, Trances, & Visions*.
[748] McLoughlin, *Modern Revivalism*.
[749] Sayre, "Ecological and Geographical Scale."

At the start of this paper, I described my own visceral experience in which pentecostal practices somehow permeated my outer layer and I experienced some of the burning sensations described by my interlocutors. I did choose the room – all seemingly autonomous and self interested - but how the collective effervescence translated across space to my body is something to mull on. I was standing in church, not praying, not singing or moving, and a burning sensation wafted from my gut to chest as others prayed out loud. I did not aim to experience this, which makes it a bit of a challenge to agency. How does one describe the agency of a person inhabited by collective effervescence? Does walking into the room constitute agency? What of the next moments? The experience is clearly relational – it depends upon others. Perhaps a collective agency? But, when scaled at the individual level and at a brief moment, it looks very much like coercion. In other words, seemingly autonomous individuals choose to come to church, but then experience an immediate collective force that moves them. Here, socio-temporal scale seems decisive in determining agency.

Thus, modern anxieties regarding the allure of somatic collectivity are borne out, to some degree, by my own nonvolitional recruitment, albeit partial, into the pentecostal sensorium. Even though my engagement was limited, I could not help but experience "fire from heaven." Seemingly autonomous agency brought me into the chapel, but from there the sensorium enacted a corporeal interpellation or sensate seduction – some means to induce my body into kinesthetic resonance with the pentecostal sensorium. True, sensation was not effectively sutured to meaning – I did not believe – but I did garner a flavor for the appeal of pentecostal reasoning.

Although not fully determined, nor an irresistible tidal wave of collective frenzy, the cultivated sensorium does enlist, or at least entice. The agency involved blends individual and corporate, cognitive and corporeal, mechanical and spontaneous, and perhaps more simply, freedom and control.

Yielding[750]

Agency, as conceived in Western liberal theory, involves an actor shaping the world around *him*(sic), yet recent critical interventions suggest a space for less immediately volitional forms of agency. R Marie Griffith and Saba Mahmood's claim that agency engages while "inhabiting norms,"[751] Talal Asad's emphasis on the agency of structures,[752] and Mary Keller's description of a non-volitional "instrumental agency"[753] all stretch the concept so as to invite an agentive reading of group and temporal scales unlike the immediate experience of the autonomous male subject. In spite of their penchant for individualistic rhetoric, pentecostals practice a form of yielding that can be read as agentive through these recent redefinitions of agency.

Pentecostals in AG prefer "yielding" as the God-centered depiction of spiritual experience. As one put it, "[There is a] connection between tongues and a

[750] The Pentecostals I worked with don't seem to clearly deploy yielding outside of theology.For an exploration of the political suggestions that emerge from theologies of yielding, or surrender see: L. Kintz, "Finding the Strength to Surrender: Marriage, Market Theocracy and the Spirit of America," *Theory, Culture & Society* 24, no. 4 (2007): 111–30.
[751] Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*; Griffith, *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*.
[752] Asad, *Genealogies of Religion*.
[753] Keller, *The Hammer and the Flute Women, Power, and Spirit Possession*.

sense of being yielded to God's will… when I am not in complete obedience I notice it is a lot harder to speak in tongues and now when I feel totally submitted it comes much easier." Another described, "learning to allow myself to do those things. I prayed to allow my defenses to open (which is a big deal for me, since I am painfully shy)." In fact, some of the clearest stories of training and cultivation can be inverted to argue for yielding. As one alumnus wrote, "When I was a child, certain adults (AG) tried to force me to speak in tongues, mainly by putting oil on my head, grabbing my shoulders and shaking me till I cried. WTF?" He pushed back. "Ever since then, I rejected such things as tongues, carefully avoiding them out of fear." Yet, such resentment did not bar the door to an experience generated without training, but seemingly effortlessly. "Then one day I simply started speaking in tongues in private prayer. It's not something I ever learned or tried to learn, neither can I do it on demand." Effort is thus deployed as evidence of its own ineffectivity vis a vis spontaneity.

Letting go though, in this model, means accepting another's direction. As Dr. Wilson describes, "I don't know, but God does. I'm gonna' make myself available… in order to speak in tongues you have to let yourself flop… the idea of being possessed by the Spirit means relinquishing yourself." That is, he trains to give up ambition and accept direction from elsewhere. Bethany student Stan also describes a practice of active yielding. "The backstory: I said I don't want it. It's not for me. I just thought it was weird. But at youth camp I was told, 'You've given God your life, why not give him your tongue too?'" He decides to try. "[I said] God if you want

this, then give it to me now." It came, says Stan. This kind of request might be intentional yet still assumes God decides. As Stan explains, "I don't control it. Its something God gives you – peaceful – I am speaking to God in a language only he understands." Yet, however much it appears beyond personal control, Stan still approaches tongues like other training. "[I am] trying to get a deeper grasp on it. [I've] done studies on it – praying for it, reading more about it." Thus, he recognizes that study brings learning. "It gets easier – before I'd pray 'God let your Spirit fill me' but, sweet, I don't have to pray anymore. Now it just happens." Stan systematically hones his sensory aptitudes for the sake of relinquishing control – he cultivates his ability to yield to God.

Most stories involve complex interactions between intent, practice, and release. Anne's sister inspired: "My older sister spoke in tongues at teen camp and told me about it. I began praying for it." Anne persisted. "Over a 6 month period I was praying and drenching my self in Jesus - not thinking of anything but Jesus." She succeeds. "Next thing I knew I was speaking in tongues." Her self-reflexive analysis emphasizes yielding. "I read about the gifts and asked God to fill me and use me. I opened my self up and he did [it]." Here God is agent. Jim expands the story, "Speaking in tongues just kinda' happened one day." Spontaneous – but sometimes action is required. "Gifts often require you just have to step out and do more than anything else," he continues.

Youth camps provide fertile soil for tongues training. Blanche responds to altar calls, where pastors ask volunteers to the stage to receive the baptism of the

Spirit. "It's a thing with us [pentecostals]. We go to camps. [I] went to every altar… I would always go and ask God, 'I want to be filled with the Spirit. I want to speak in tongues.' And I never did." Until later. First, she needed to rechannel her aspiration. "I learned that when we're seeking a gift but not God it is not how he designed it. We should pray for [tongues] but it shouldn't be our primary focus. It should be knowing God." Aiming for connection, she accomplishes speaking. She emphasizes the sense that direct human aspirations may be ineffective and perhaps even profane.

This sense of action as sitting, waiting, or inhabiting explicitly informs the pentecostal tradition. A 1941 *Pentecostal Evangel* article carefully defines "Abide" in this passive, yet active mode. Here, to inhabit their role as "branches" in Jesus' parable of the grapes links activity to passivity. "The main exhortation to us as branches is to abide in Christ."[754] He then clarifies "abide" as passive activity: "So all the way through this wonderful lesson we find the exhortation to ABIDE. It is a word which does not suggest activity so much as rest." Rest, for to do otherwise is mistaken since our capacity for action is severely limited. "Why does a tiny baby abide in his crib? Because he has neither strength nor wisdom to get out of it…" The response – yield. "We are to give up all dependence on our own strength and wisdom, so that the Holy Spirit may keep us in that constant place of communion, love, and joy."[755] Here, "abide" is not simply passive, for it is within a a vital locus with a *telos* and tradition – it is even capitalized. For to sit within God's tradition may be

[754] PE 1941_5_31, p11
[755] "The Sunday School Lesson: Jesus The Vine," Alice E Luce, PE 1941_05_41, p11.

different than simply sitting. As such, structure both exerts control and emanates possibility.

In analyzing these acts, some might draw a line here between agentive cultivation and passive realization. Yet, this seems to twist the notion of agency beyond its bounds. When we train to hit a baseball, to play a sonata, or to eat a fish, agency manifests throughout – there is something particular to the moment of realization, but, as I will argue, to choose merely the moment of seeming action or passivity invokes a particularly limited scale at which agency is analyzed and experienced. In addition, maybe receptivity itself is agentive. As Spinoza suggests, when, "a body is more capable than others of … being acted on in many ways at once, so its mind is more capable than others of perceiving many things at once."[756] In all, these narratives of pentecostal yielding and of collective mimesis are likely stories of agency, agency in the development of yielding, in a cultivated passivity and receptivity, and in the capacity to entangle our sensory experiences and develop a collective sensorium. Yet, when agency stretches to include the passive it might include all and everything and become inoperable.

Refiguring Agency vis a vis the Pentecostal Challenge: Collective Mimesis

In all, in spite of efforts to reconcile the irrational, and potentially highly educated, pentecostal with autonomous *homo economicus*, pentecostalism's yielding and receptivity to collective enthusiasm or control challenge contemporary notions of

[756] Baruch Spinoza, *Ethics* Part II Proposition 13 cited in Sharp, *Spinoza and the Politics of Renaturalization*, 94.

agency. Scholars have offered two arguments that might help here: First, all agency might be collective and involve visceral interpellation; and second, perhaps receptivity itself is a form of agency.

Mazzarella argues that the central act of collective mimesis – people imitating each other – is a basic human practice. He writes against Gustave Le Bon's critique: "in a crowd, every sentiment and act is contagious" which is a, "phenomena of a hypnotic order."[757] The concern is with human agency. Does the disease spread? Is it something we can't control? Mazzarella responds with William Mcdougall's claim that the "reciprocal influence" in crowds might be a "primitive form of sympathy," a "suffering with" or feeling for other people's emotions when together.[758] Likewise, Alexandre Kojeve argues that "man can appear on earth only within a herd."[759] Mazzarella also builds from Elias Canetti's argument that the pleasure and potential in mimesis relies on an, "interplay between sensuous reflex and conscious reflection."[760] If so, it has elements of reason and of irrational viscerality that cannot be disentangled. He thus challenges both the neovitalist splitting of abstraction and energy and the parallel liberal divide between reason and passion as polarizing

---

[757] William Mazzarella, "The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who's Afraid of the Crowd?," *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 4 (June 2010): 716.
[758] William McDougall, *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (Boston, 1923), p. 97 cited in Mazzarella, "The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who's Afraid of the Crowd?," 2010, 716. This argument for the social emergence of humanity is increasingly well established in social science. See : Baron-Cohen, Tager-Flusberg, and Cohen, *Understanding Other Minds*; Fiske and Taylor, *Social Cognition*; Scheve and Salmella, *Collective Emotions*. Mazzarella's challenge to liberal autonomy also poses problems for the pessimism about recognition common to post-structuralism: See Foucault, "Nothing in man–not even his body–is sufficiently stable to serve as the basis for self–recognition or for understanding other men."Foucault, Bouchard, and Sherry, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, 153.
[759] Mazzarella, "The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who's Afraid of the Crowd?," 2010, 718.
[760] Ibid., 720.

dualisms that miss the necessary entanglement of fluidity and structure. Mimesis, for Mazzarella, is "habit in motion" containing within it both imitation and innovation. And, as such, it is an active, agentive human activity, certainly not especially irrational. Thus to, "escape from the constant return, in both liberal and postliberal thinking to the opposition between freedom and determination,"[761] Mazzarella proposes Gabriel Tarde's neovitalism in which repetition and vibration is the fundamental vitality – including when we copy each other. Here the "contagion of imitation" involves collision, creativity and the "magnetizer," a facilitative being that triggers the actualization of potentials that are virtually present. Perhaps this normalizes spiritual and human mediation as nature, magnetizer, love, and/or the Holy Spirit.

Refiguring Agency: Agency in Submission_R Marie Griffith

Recently, several authors intervened in this debate over agency aiming especially to challenge the false consciousness arguments applied to contemporary conservative religious practitioners. They developed influential claims for agency and resistance within submission and inhabiting norms within a particular community. Further, some provide a critique of theories of agency that emphasize the resistant gap in hegemonic structures, for perhaps gaps, like autonomous agents, do not effectively account for people deeply enmeshed in power structures.[762] I argue that while the expansion of the categories of agency and resistance does important

[762] Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*.

work in recognizing the humanity of all people, it also might expand the concepts to the point that they no longer have significance. If all power is resistance, and all being is agency, then the concepts have new, and perhaps overly expansive, definitions.

Instead of gaps or internal resistances, R. Marie Griffith suggests a version of agency in which evangelical women find space for creative activity within the bounds of particular constraint.[763] For instance, submission might be a tool for shaping the family. As *You Can Be The Wife of A Happy Husband* suggests, "Submit to your husband… and you too will discover the man you always longed for, his seeming harshness softened by your willing obedience to his demands." For "submission never imprisons you. It liberates you, giving you the freedom to be creative under the protection of divinely appointed authority."[764] Griffith thus sees wifely submission within the family as a "strategy of containment" that women use to, "maintain domestic harmony as well as their own security." She reads Phyllis Schlafly's *The Power of a Positive Woman* for its "tactical notion of submission as a means for turning men into happy husbands who then want to please their wives."[765] One could argue that agency here is limited. Griffith certainly does. On the other hand, when is agency ever free of constraint? Further, this isn't a new strategy. As Amy Hollywood

[763] Griffith, *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*, 175.
[764] Ibid., 179.
[765] Griffith, *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*.

argues, nearly every woman who produced religious writings in the middle ages saw submission as a precondition for their agency.[766]

Griffith says that for evangelical women, submission is both creative and pragmatic. "Far more than simple passivity," she argues, submission allows women to "rework their identities, creatively balancing compliance with strength as they transform themselves into ideal Christian women." What she calls "mediated agency" involves the ability to act within constraint, meanwhile gaining new channels for action in the process. When scaled to involve extended periods of time, submission to God and husband in certain moments might become "a valuable tool for containing husbands," thus enacting both yielding and control. In other words, "Out of a doctrine that would seem to leave them helpless, Evangelical women have generated a variety of substantial yet flexible meetings to which they experience some degree of control, however limited it may often appear." Here is a truly immanent theory in which agency does not depend upon external gaps, or consciousness, but rather is "mediated" via the relationships between freedom and constraint within a system.

Thus, Griffith aims to refigure the notion of resistance as it applies to her informants. Instead of liberation, resistance here becomes, "'a diagnostic of power' that illuminates the ways in which people are caught up in various forms of power, discipline, and control."[767] That agency is primarily a measure of relationships

---

[766] Amy M Hollywood, *Sensible Ecstasy Mysticism, Sexual Difference, and the Demands of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).
[767] Griffith, *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*, 16.

between communities seems an important proposition. However, here she is talking about resistance. And if resistance simply means power relationships it could very well apply to domination or to equality as well, and as such may lose some of its initial traction, perhaps losing its connection to the word resist. Finally, a note: in spite of the ostensive access to mutuality through wifely submission, the ideal among Griffith's evangelical interlocutors has shifted in the late 20th century from wifely submission to "mutual submission."[768] In other words, in spite of their sense that submission to husbands is a good thing, it is shifting.

Refiguring Agency: Inhabiting a Tradition_Saba Mahmood

Similar to Griffith, Saba Mahmood's study aims to still false consciousness claims, which consider Islamic women complicit in their own oppression by virtue of their participation in a revival of patriarchy. Mahmood articulates against "a theory of agency," insisting instead, "that the meaning of agency must be explored within the grammar of concepts within which it resides."[769] Mahmood's project for redefining agency has been read as either a radical call for contextualization – a binding to incommensurable tradition;[770] a rearticulation of the Rousseauian project of

[768] Ibid., 182.
[769] Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*, 34.
[770] Those who read Mahmood in this way include: Sindre Bangstad, "Saba Mahmood and Anthropological Feminism After Virtue," *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 28–54; Stathis Gourgouris, "Antisecularist Failures: A Counterresponse to Saba Mahmood.," *Public Culture* 20, no. 3 (2008); Peter Van Der Veer, "Embodiment, Materiality, and Power. A Review Essay.," *Comparative Studies in Society & History* 50, no. 3 (2008). Several readings of Mahmood accuse her more directly of cultural relativism, including Matt Waggoner, "Irony, Embodiment, and the 'critical Attitude': Engaging Saba Mahmood's Critique of Secular Morality," *Culture and Religion* 6, no. 2 (2005): 237–61.

sensory resistance;[771] or, a total yielding of hopes for progressive politics among feminists.[772] I argue, however, that her claim to agency within a particular tradition challenges both the liberal project of agency as autonomous and the equally liberal notion of a universal gauge – both of which are wielded to impugn communities who do agency differently. As such, she chooses a scale between the individual and the universal and suggests that this is the site for Muslim women's agency. In this reading, Mahmood's project is a close kin to my recognizing cultivation as the consequential site for pentecostal action.

For Mahmood, norms should not be understood as outside or subjectivity reaching in, but instead, they are the very substance of subject making. In other words, there is no choice against norms, but rather a choice through them. This she garners from Foucault and Butler's argument that the process and conditions of subordination are also the locus for subjectivation.[773] The reiterative structure of norms both stabilizes and destabliszes, such that resistance must be found inside. As

---

[771] In a fascinating essay, Ibrahimhakkioglu argues that the sensory in Mahmood offers traction for a kind of anti-rational agency. As Mahmood closes her book with, "transgressing gender norms may not be a matter of transforming 'consciousness' or effecting change in the signifacatory system of gender, but might well require the retraining of sensibilities, affect, desire, and sentiments – those registers of corporeality that often escape the logic of representation and symbolic articulation." I suggest, however, that this misses Asad's rebuttal in which he shows secularism is also embodied, or Butler's riposte that the text of the West is also uncertain. In other words, it is a repeat of the argument for sensory agency given special power by virtue of its lack of rationalization, which I rebut throughout this dissertation. Embodied Affective Experience in Politics Of Piety: Reformulating Agency for An Inclusive Transnational Feminism, F. Ibrahimhakkioglu https://www.academia.edu/2227627/Embodied_Affective_Experience_in_Saba_Mahmoods_Politics_of_Piety_Reformulating_Agency_for_an_Inclusive_Transnational_Feminism and Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*, 188.

[772] For such reading see: Julius Bautista, "The Meta-Theory of Piety: Reflections on the Work of Saba Mahmood," *Contemporary Islam* 2, no. 1 (2008): 75–83.

[773] "Instead of limiting agency to those acts that disrupt existing power relations, Foucault's work encourages us to think of agency: (a) in terms of the capacities and skills required to undertake particular kinds of moral actions; and (b) as ineluctably bound up with the historically and culturally specific disciplines through which a subject is formed." Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*, 29.

such, her notion of agency calls into question Butler's gap theory of resistance. Instead, Mahmood appears to accept a wholly immanent postmodern logic – thereby rejecting any notion of the resistant self, or transcendental lens.[774] It is thus very much akin to Mary Keller's argument that nurtured receptivity is another form of agency, Phyllis Mack's story of Quaker agency as surrender,[775] or my argument that pentecostal receptivity is agentive.

At first it appears that, like Griffith's tale, Mahmood does not provide a clear space for agency that is disentangled from control. Perhaps this is immanent agency? For Mahmood relies on Foucault's self-fashioning theories which claim immanence, but do not offer the motility provided by Hegelian or other dialectical systems with back and forth between internal poles or synthetic moments. Everyone within Mahmood's stream is subject to its flow. I wonder then if in this schema the meaning of freedom is effectively defanged. Not that freedom requires autonomy -- but it may need motility, friction, space, something other than a determinist grid, some reason to think groups or people have an effect. Agency purely within, with no gaps, or dialectic or dualism between agency and structure seems Mahmood's project. What such total enmeshment portends for the concept of agency is unclear.

However, and this is key, the agency Mahmood recuperates for Muslim women is not simply immanent to the system, as with Griffith's mediated agency. Instead, Mahmood's agency depends upon the incommensurability of Muslim

---

[774] Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*.
[775] Keller, *The Hammer and the Flute Women, Power, and Spirit Possession*; Mack, "Religion, Feminism, and the Problem of Agency."

tradition in relations to other, most crucially to its critics.[776] Because Islam is isolatable in her schema, she suggests that the grammar for agency within its tradition is the one by which one can and ought to measure its practitioners. Here Mahmood builds from Talal Asad and Alisdair Macintyre's narrative of agency as emergent within a particular tradition that includes a *telos*, or path.[777] Here agency shifts scales from a liberal emphasis on the individual to a position within a collective. As such, individuals or groups inhabiting norms might be diving into a stream, where the energy is not so much their own as the channelled water's - agency is externally engendered. Within the stream, there is no need for a space, or gap, for the stream is its own mode of immanence and its own agent. The challenge comes when the stream (community of Muslims) is seen (by western feminists, for instance) as encouraging a problematic structure (like patriarchy) that, in turn, oppresses the individuals within it. That would be to focus on the individual caught in the flow. However, one might discern an agentive relationship here at two other scales: at one, Muslims might be resistant to the norms within their tradition; or scaled differently, they might participate in the collective Muslim project of resistance or agency in relation to the banks of the river. The first case involves agency as action vis a vis a community, the second, which is a more common reading of Mahmood, involves participation in the community vis a vis the rest of the world. It relies on a clear distinction between traditions.

[776] Her work aims at the "specificity of terms internal to the practices of the mosque movement." Mahmood, *Politics of Piety*, 154, for more on specificity see also pp.1, 25, 26, 188.
[777] Ibid., 115.

Mahmood's incommensurability thesis, however, seems questionable. Crucial to her notion of agency through participation in a *telos*, Mahmood insists on the cultural "specificity" of her community of informants.[778] In other words, agency within a tradition cannot be compared to agency elsewhere and the criticisms of Muslim women supporting patriarchy in the long run, or in "the final analysis," miss the local agency people inhabit. Yet, what makes a tradition incomensurable? This seems quite unclear. In fact, one of the more visible critiques of Mahmood's work suggests that her polarity between Islamic traditions and liberal ones is historically "incoherent."[779] The line between incomensurable traditions does seem a relatively difficult one to draw.

Further, I struggle to accept Mahmood's binding of agency to tradition. One might ask, for instance, is there something more agentive about inhabiting Muslim, or pentecostal norms, rather than sitting on a chair, or eating a potato. Both are actions less clearly attached to a religious tradition, but likely involved in other histories. Does the repetition, the textual support, the authority, or the attention to detail in a religious tradition add traction to an action? Perhaps? Is this agency? How about the position of the individual within the group? For instance, is my Jewish latke eating more agentive than a pentecostal eating the same food because I am tied historically to Jews who have often eaten latkes? How about davening? What is the value of measuring this kind of agency? Does it get us closer to understanding the human,

[778] See note 88
[779] Here Bangstad cites others, but they seem more specificly directed in their critiques, so I use his language precisely. Bangstad, "Saba Mahmood and Anthropological Feminism After Virtue," 2011, 36.

posthuman, or the resistant? Does it clarify the power to act that pentecostals strive for? I am not so sure.

In some sense – and here is the challenge – while quite appealing in its inclusivity, agency via inhabiting norms, or through receptivity to a greater power, also seems to invert the concept of agency. If agency simply signals receptivity, either it means the opposite of its initial conception as action, or perhaps it now covers all activity and inactivity, and thus everything. Mahmood responds by rejecting the autonomous agent eating fish, preferring those within an established tradition. At the same time, she chooses the local tradition while rejecting the "universal" feminist challenging Islam's sexism. In other words, she is choosing a scale, the middle, the tradition, within which to stake her claim to agency. For scaled immediately and individually we find the ecstatic agent. Scaled in or through a community, there is room for some agency. And scaled at the level of society, the state, or patriarchy it is much more difficult to see how Muslim women shape the world for themselves and not simply in the service of these larger structures. I suggest that each is useful in different ways, for different projects.

In sum, while Mahmood's project aims to understand the *da'wa* practiced among Muslim women in Cairo as a "lifeworld" that altogether escapes the antinomies of liberal thought, I don't think it quite succeeds. For in the process of defining her Muslim world as altogether "other," so different that it engenders it own grammar of human action, she reinvigorates previous dualisms, especially when the sensory capabilities of such communities is not only registered as distinct, but also

especially visceral. That is, to call Muslim women altogether other by emphasizing their especially sensory lifeworld is reminiscent of colonial narratives. Even so, I think there is a valuable lesson in her reworking of agency. By pushing agency to its limit, she demonstrates that, without close attention to scale, the concept of agency likely means very little.

Agency: Relational Hierarchies

I think also that the work to refigure the agency in receptivity, passivity or inhabiting norms makes clear how agency is a relational concept, made powerful through its articulation of power relationships. In other words, agency is about the power of one group to act but only in relationship to another group's potential for similar action. This is what Braidotti calls, "the connection between this mode of submission and relative autonomy and agency."[780] Likewise, Griffith's mediated agency for women becomes meaningful only in relation to male agency. This opens the question further: isn't all autonomy, to some degree, constrained? Where is pure agency? What is agency other than the relative ability to act? In other words, as the receptivity claims make clear, we all engage agency always, sometimes in our exceptional yielding, and sometimes in something more active, but always within constraints; that is, agency is always relational, which is not how it is usually portrayed.

Thus, in addition to scale, one can respond to concerns that agentizing

[780] Braidotti, "In Spite of the Times."

everything denudes the term by making relationality explicit as in Mel Chen's animacy hierarchies. Chen describes the ways cultural norms ascribe a certain kind of liveliness, what she calls "animacy" to groups of people that builds hierarchies of agency.[781] In other words, agency for Chen might be relational which means agency is a term that is used in a hierarchical description of others and an experience of the self. More importantly, if agency is relational – then we don't simply have it or not, and it does not disappear when we all have some as in Mahmood's ethnography.

Conclusion

Pentecostal agency-anxiety inspires worry that humans eschew the commands of the Spirit, that they involve themselves overmuch in molding their environment towards worldly purposes. Yet, pentecostals are as engaged with our world as any other people – this is the obvious lesson of all anthropology. But, more specifically, they shape their communities by cultivating the capacity to yield, to experience a collective effervescence, and to participate in a tradition. This is agency, scaled locally and relative to the constraints of the community. Yet, the most commonplace reading of pentecostals offers their "irrationality" little space within liberal democracy. For the agency-anxiety of the West invites trepidation. Yet, this same sense that pentecostals are lost to the irrational gains them a following among those searching for a break or crack in the totalizing structures of contemporary rationality. Both readings, however, miss something important about pentecostals – their

[781] Chen, *Animacies Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect*.

rationalized irrationality, or cultivation. But this miss and the energy around defining pentecostal agency provides an opportunity to learn something intriguing about agency. When seen through pentecostalism, agency must engage the brilliance of scholars who encounter the world through their particular, spiritual, visceral, and sensorially compelling sensorium. Further, among pentecostals, concepts of agency meet a passivity, receptivity, and collective effervescence that are all carefully cultivated. In fact, there is the potential for the word agency to simply disappear in its expansion. But, I want it to continue its crucial work of describing resistances, and finding the effectivity of people struggling to share power - it is disconcerting (anxiety producing) to see agency emptied of meaning. My initial reply is that scale and relational hierarchies might offer useful tools. By scaling the reading of agency and recognizing that it serves to measure relationships of power, agency could gain some useful specificity.

Prologue: Section III, Chapter VIII

Opening: One Pentecostal World

11 students stand in a circle, each speaking in tongues. It is a systematic project, a practice of love surely, but also of progress, a telos towards God. It is something they do regularly, with a serious intent and a carefully manicured sense of direction and unity. The girl, nearly woman, in the center crying, struggling to keep up. After weeks of effort, she hasn't got the knack, but her friends are supportive, they all made it through this point. She mournfully gives up trying. Of course, that is the trick: action via un-volition, becoming out of nothingness, a rupture emerging. She find her space of babble. Once fully yielded, completely given up to outside force, no longer straining, studying and gridded to this earthly project, she begins to speak. It is nonsense, glossolalia, far outside the semiotic frame or discursive turn, not beholden to the laws of Saussure. If there is pure freedom, this is it. If there is a place in mind and spirit that has its own vitality, chaos and contingency, it is here. She is suffused by the glow, the energy of motion, and the sense of spontaneous connection with the Holy Spirit. They celebrate.

If there is one image/conception I want you to get from this project it would be this group yearning, deeply, richly aspiring, yet systematic, meticulous and persistent – this is pentecostal cultivation. They are not especially atavistic or irrational, nor are they especially tied to reason as a mode of discernment. Instead, they gather and carefully align their tremendous energies to feed a kind of openness to spontaneity, a carefully modulated, overtly embattled, practice of yielding towards discontinuity. These gatherings are structured by history and culture and, more

immediately, by the training mechanisms built throughout the AG network, including trained bodies and texts on how to speak in tongues. And when you tie this experience of nonsensical meditation (as contingent and incoherent as it gets) to a politics of resistance (against the late gilded age magnates, the 1930s big box stores and then the effete New England elite of the Democratic party),[782] *and a practice of ruptural event (conversion, baptism in the Spirit), it makes sense that Donna Haraway's call for "a feminist speaking in tongues to strike fear into the circuits" of the new right would resonate far and wide.*[783]

Opening: One Theory World

Haraway's call resonated throughout feminist critical theory and postmodern efforts to break out of mechanistic structure. As Prosser MacDonald explains, challenging the violence of the rationalizing system is the central act of contemporary theory.[784] *In response, pentecostals, feminist and critical theorists often valorize immediacy, the event, rupture, and degridded moments of resistance. Like many pentecostals, they regularly leave off the practical side of things – the hard work of cultivation. However, unlike pentecostals, post-structuralists do not have a rich cultural structure in which I can dig for and find the actual materials of that broader scale of action - perhaps due to a lack of real world organizing.*

The terror of Foucauldian discipline sits heavy within cultural and feminist studies. This involves a strong sense of neoliberal permeation into, and appropriation of, all that might be good. No more communist outside, that was far too statist anyways. No more white male revolutionary hopefuls, but the queer women of color and indigenous people struggle to replace them. Meta-narratives

[782] Bethany Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart the Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
[783] Donna Jeanne. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 181.
[784] Diane Louise Prosser, *Transgressive Corporeality: The Body, Post-structuralism, and the Theological Imagination* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995).

fractured, pluralism disseminated, multiplicities abounded, but they seemed contained within an immobile hegemony. It left many searching for gaps in the totalizing dominance of Cartesian dualisms; cracks in the structure of liberal subjectivity, so individual and autonomous; a response to totalizing fixity. Our first answer? Change, uncertainty, a challenge to any gridding or predictability, the refashioning of phenomenological pre-objectivity,[785] *transgression, queering, resistance, and a love affair with the spontaneous – or even retrospectively recognizable – "event." Mazzarella calls it the "romanticization of immediacy."*[786] *Theorists of affect and the body added the valorization of holism to his story as well.*[787] *And both of these – ungridded uncertain spontaneity, and the rich sensuous holism of mind-body-spirit – are deeply appealing. I suspect they provide a glimpse of what might become an ontological foundation for a better world, or better worlds. Problem is, as I will try and show, this hope for either the gap or the whole to replace the solid, or the dual gets inverted, refashioned, re-politicized, and de-politicized when seen through the lens of those of us studying pentecostals and other primarily right wing movements. We can't help it, many apologies.*

[785] A set of theories that argue for a fundamental human space that comes either before or outside of society's construction, sometimes called alterity, sometimes phenomenology. More recently, some "affect theories" also fit this mold. Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable"; Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*; Leys, "The Turn to Affect."

[786] William Mazzarella, "Affect, What Is It Good For?," n.d.

[787] Kathleen Lennon and Margaret Whitford, *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology* (Psychology Press, 1994); Lynn Hankinson Nelson and Jack Nelson, *Feminist Interpretations of W.V. Quine* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003).

Chapter VIII: Do the Subaltern Speak in Tongues?

Romanticizing Immediacy, Resistance, and the Event.

This chapter argues that certain capacities to inhabit altered states have the potential to bring people out of their day to day discipline and grasp the possibility of an alternate way of existing - an evental rupture can inspire resistance. When combined with intensive inequality, and then channeled through a vibrant organization, this poses a tremendous potential threat to the status quo. How this plays out, however, as reactionary or progressive, may be contingent. For, like all post-structural critique, resistance and rupture focus a poignant challenge to disciplinary institutions, but it is a challenge that can lead either to kindness or meanness, to refiguring power relations, or enfleshing them further. In this story, the parallels between pentecostals and post-structuralists[788] are striking. Facing similar elements of capitalist modernity with similar critiques of their dehumanizing potential, they developed resonant

[788] In this paper I work with the tradition of Foucault, Deleuze, Badiou, and Spivak, what might be called feminist and critical theory, what I call post-structuralism. I understand that some would balk at this composition. Badiou especially avers strong differences here. However, for my purposes, they share anxiety about the lack of agency within contemporary capitalist modernity and a similar set of responses, especially the sense that events, limit-experiences and the like are crucial to escaping an otherwise totalizing hegemony.

While Badiou claims to access an ontological structure and a strongly shaped fidelity, his event is anti-structural in its effort to escape outside the grid, and particularly in its emergence from nothing in particular, which means it is not pre-gridded, but only post-facto. Thus, for the sake of this project, post-structuralism functions as a flexible means of expressing symmetry in the effort to escape the grid, a heuristic that encompasses these, otherwise disparate thinkers. In *Logics of Worlds* he develops more Platonic clarity, some pre-evental signaling and with less subjective participation although he continues to eschew pre-evental cultivation. Alain. Badiou, *Logics of Worlds: Being and Event, 2* (NY: Continuum, 2009).

strategies in response.[789] Rupture and immediacy were primary among them. Pentecost, for instance, can mean rupture: "the violent tornado like wind accompanying the Spirit's coming, the cloven tongues as a fire, the mystical utterances in other tongues–these were the harbingers of the apocalyptic manifestations of the end–time."[790] What better means to transform modern discipline. Likewise, the other worldliness of the pentecostal experience resonates nicely with Slajov Zizek's theory of the event as, "not something that occurs within the world, but is *a change of the very frame through which we perceive the world and engage in it*."[791] Starting from some very different positions, both groups – pentecostals and post-structuralists – developed similar theory and (for some), practice of change.

As such, this chapter uses pentecostalism as a case study to explore the real life effects of the strategic thinking that they share with post-structuralism. I first compare pentecostal and post-structural responses to modernity emphasizing their compatible focus on immediacy and resistance. I then look at claims that pentecostal practices and their subaltern social position make their experiential resistance highly

[789] Many in affect and religious studies argue that a activity within religious mobilization comes from human capacities to experience the mystical, or the spiritual, and the rupture it brings about. See Taves, *Religious Experience Reconsidered*. Some call this innate, others see it in the pre-objective or unconscious realms. (Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*; Csordas, "Asymptote of the Ineffable.") My argument, by contrast, does not rely on essential selves for by the late 1800s, when this story begins, sedimented amongst evangelicals was a capacity, or perhaps the necessity, for a spiritual alterity or pre-linguistic affect that can help us understand pentecostal mobilization. They had developed the sensory aptitudes and dispositions necessary. As such, the question of cultivation is less about the innate, but rather, to what extent, and how quickly can this capacity be expanded and mobilized and how does it change?

[790] McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*, 93.

[791] Zižek, *Event*, 10.

significant. This means first examining debates over pentecostal social positions and then literature that discusses the social effects of pentecostalism. In particular, I lay out competing claims to conservatism and transformation, especially in regards to the intertwining experiences of poverty and gender. In doing so, it becomes clear that, while pentecostalism has a credible claim to social change, it does not link to a particular political trajectory. That is, although much of the movement leans far to the right, the pentecostal practice, while effective, is politically empty – it must be filled by context.[792] This suggests that mobilization is distinct from the political. As such, the last section of this chapter returns to rupture as transformation and queries its relationship to politics: does the radical break, or limit-experience, that is suggested in post-structuralism and practiced in pentecostalism, offer critical insight, and what might be necessary to give it political direction. For instance, do totalizing disciplinary mechanisms work such that all speech from the subaltern - even glossolalic nonsense – effects resistance to the dominant grid? Does the increased focus on bodies, affect, and desire within the biopolitical mechanisms of power of neoliberalism provide a resistant channel lacking under less intrusive regimes of disciplinary power? Perhaps the pentecostal focus on feeling can help battle the neoliberal state on its own terrain? Or, more likely, does the evangelical history of

[792] Effectivity as I use it: "under some conditions, what is important about a statement is not whether it is true, but whether it is effective. 'Effective' means that passions are mobilized, motives are changed, and new possibilities of action are created." Timothy Jenkins, "The Anthropology of Christianity: Situation and Critique," *Ethnos* 77, no. 4 (December 2012): 472. Politics: I am working from Gramsci's notion that politics ought to involve an intervention in power structures, but also his sense that hegemony is configured throughout multiple scales and fields in society. Thus, as I see it, to engage with the relationships of power, in the broader society can involve images, actions, ideas, and sensibilities that either support or challenge hegemonic power structures including sensibilities. Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*.

joining feeling to planning demonstrate that organizing, political or otherwise, has rarely, if ever, functioned simply via cognitivist argument, but rather, has always – at least for a few hundred years – involved emotion and sensory development among organizing communities? That is, feeling, and ruptural feeling especially are means of new possibility.[793] In simple terms, this chapter explores the lessons that pentecostal practice might bring regarding the political possibilities of the post-structural romanticization of immediacy and resistance?

The Post-Structural Context

The critique of modernist rationalization and objectification gained new life among post-structural thinkers concerned with activism in the second half of the 20th century. Responses to World War II's essentializing racism resonated closely with feminist arguments for gender fluidity and thus "constructivist ontology was lauded as a form of resistance to fascism, racism and totalitarianism."[794] As such, essentialism and the solidity implied became a central concern for critical theory. As Diana Fuss explained regarding essentialism: "few other words in the vocabulary of contemporary critical theory are so persistently maligned, so little interrogated and so predictably summoned as a term of infallible critique."[795] Meanwhile, Cartesian dualism was seen as the perfect cultural shape for nurturing violence and hierarchy. Further, visions of perfection through rationalized *telos* had already lost credibility

[793] It seems that ruptural thought might be similarly placed, if one could distinguish it from feeling.
[794] Blencowe, *Biopolitical Experience*, 178.
[795] Diana Fuss, *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference* (New York: Routledge, 1989), xi.

with Kruschev's 1956 admission that the horrors of Stalinism were more than a capitalist scheme. They suffered even more from the stories of development schemes in the global South that, perhaps aimed to help, but were often portrayed as either failed, or simply cultural imperialism.[796] Finally, the perceived failures of the May 1968 revolt in Paris suggested that systematic organizers – the communists – were unable to realize actual possibilities of revolt.[797] Theorists thus wondered how they might engender change without repeating the mistakes of previous political movements that sought liberation but seemed to end in repression and fundamentalism. This set of concerns layered upon a longstanding anxiety regarding the constraining force of modernity, its tendency to rationalize and dehumanize. Thus the post-structural moment evoked serious trepidation regarding the concrete, the solid, the progressive, and anything that smacked of essentializing or positivistic clarity.[798]

In this context, social theory developed an increasingly bleak picture of the modern as primarily disciplinary. Foucault exemplified the impulse to pose the world as deeply, perhaps completely,[799] gridded by discipline, governmental, or biopolitical

---

[796] Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995).
[797] Jay, "Historicism and the Event."
[798] It is worth noting that in the same moment as contingency opened doors for queer parenting and new gender roles, biological essentialism was the argument with the most traction when it came to queer marriage and homophobia more generally.
[799] As O'Hanlon writes, "Almost all contemporary discussion of discourse stresses – and herein lies its appearance of great explanatory power – that it imposes a total milieu, institutional as well as intellectual and informational, to whose hegemonic sway its subjects must inevitably succumb." Rosalind O'Hanlon, "Recovering the Subject Subaltern Studies and Histories of Resistance in Colonial South Asia," *Modern Asian Studies* 22, no. 1 (1988): 216.

forms of seemingly totalizing power.[800] While he claimed an ever-present resistance, his subtly enraged descriptions of the deep permeation of panoptical power into the institutions of and psyches of the modern provided a dismal sense of possibility. Extending and complicating Foucault's impulse, Gayatri Spivak questioned whether those excluded from power could even be heard. They could utter words, but would these land and have traction.[801] Out of the convergence of postcolonial nationalisms, Gramscian theories of hegemony, and their consolidation in post-structuralism, Spivak's asked if there was space within hegemony for resistance - can the subaltern speak? Much of critical theory following Spivak and Foucault, I suggest, hopes to respond to this particular form of anxiety about agency.

As such, scholars replied with several decades of proliferating creativity in developing arguments to explain resistance as necessary and possible. As Rosalind Morris explains, there emerged, "a new and powerful drive to discern and articulate something that was variously termed resistance, unconscious resistance, and, sometimes, the agency of the oppressed."[802] The search for hope within a seemingly all-pervasive power structure became the central project of critical theory. Some expanded on what was essentially Godel's incoherency and incompleteness theorem which suggested that completeness and coherence were not mutually viable, thus no

---

[800] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; Michel Foucault et al., *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan : République Française, 2007).
[801] She later questioned this move: " I was so unnerved by this failure of communication that, in the 1st version of this text, I wrote, and the accents of passionate lament: the subaltern cannot speak! it was an inadvisable remark." Morris and Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, 63.
Ibid.
[802] Morris and Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, 11–12.

truly totalizing schema made sense.[803] Others described a means to escape the gridding through events, poetics, affect, emotions, narrative, or pre-objective phenomenology.[804] Think, perhaps, of Deleuze's valorization of, "becoming imperceptible," something completely beyond the grasp of the presumed disciplinarian.[805]

The response – contingency, multiplicity, immediacy - ostensibly argued for the sake of its ethical premonitions, rather quickly developed into a philosophical movement with its own sedimentation. Even while critiquing previous progressivisms for their attachment to a *telos* validating motion, in this new vision, it was structure and shape, solidity and systems that became the antagonists to feminism and freedom in its own right. As Prosser MacDonald explains, "For if this… discourse of post-structuralism has anything constant running through it, it is the tacit understanding that the very enterprise of systematizing the complex phenomena of this world is a violent act…"[806] Thus, what emerged, I will argue, was a kind of ideal subjectivity within theories of liberation that instead of battling primarily for class control, or for a militant collective subject along the lines of Rousseau and the Jacobins, clashed with control and structure of all sorts. So as to avoid any instance of using the master's tools, they aimed to break with tradition to the extent that there

[803] Livingston places Badiou, Lacan and Butler in this camp. Livingston, *The Politics of Logic*.
[804] Foucault explained that the impulse towards "disclocation, resistance, hybridity and resignification stems from rejection of marxist revolutionary praxis dominant in theory of change and agency in the 1970s." Michel Foucault and Colin Gordon, *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 78–108. (Foucault 1980 78-108)
[805] Rosi Braidotti, "The Ethics of Becoming-Imperceptible," in *Deleuze and Philosophy*, ed. Constantin V. Boundas (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006).
[806] Prosser, *Transgressive Corporeality*, xi.

eventually formed a broadly applied "romanticization of immediacy" posed against planning, coordination, and other forms of mechanization.[807]

It is likely apparent that, given this schema, pentecostals might, to some extent, be the paradigmatic practitioners of this resistant model of humanity – and there were many, as I will show, who both philosophically, and empirically made the case. Pentecostals are to a large degree subaltern, they respond to hegemony in ways that resonate closely with post-structural mobilization philosophies, and their movement is massively successful. I will argue that pentecostals, and post-structuralists in general, can be usefully described as contemporary posthumanist romantics. This means they assert the primary elements of romanticism – valuing flow against stasis, and affect against reason – while replacing earlier romanticism's emphasis on the human subject with a broader posthuman form of subjectivity. And while romance is beautiful, inspiring, and absolutely crucial for mobilization, it is likely only effective when combined – as pentecostals do it – with systematic cultivation. Further, it is only political when sedimented in a particular moment within a dynamic of power. Thus, whereas it is quite possible to dismiss the recent emergence of the evental and resistance paradigm as a desperate, and apolitical, perhaps even accommodating, attempt from inside a disconnected academia to salvage hope from neoliberal and/or Foucauldian totalizing, global pentecostalism links this theory to practice, and as such, provide lessons as to both the value, and the misses of the academic project.

[807] Mazzarella, Affect What is it good for

So, we have a global case study with which to explore some of our theorizing. A vastly successful movement that uses the event, the immediate, and other resistances all posed as modes of working outside the disciplinary structures of modernity, and yet also is a movement primarily right wing, neoliberal, and globalizing along with the worst of international capital.[808]

The Romanticization of Immediacy: Spontaneous Events

Both pentecostals and post-structuralists pose human mediation against an immediacy beyond the bounds of culture or society to control. For pentecostals, this is the intervention of the Holy Spirit. For post-structuralists it resides in a more seemingly mundane originary force: an event, energetic flow, body, limit-experience, something that escapes control.[809] In both cases, however, the effect is a profound refiguration of the logic of a situation not realizable through human will and unmediated by society, but rather, a singularity.

In perhaps the most explicit aversion to mediation in contemporary theorizing, religious versions of rupture described as "event" recently became something of a cause *celebre* among academics interested in left movement building. The event initially became central to continental political philosophy following the perceived failures of 1968, but only in the past few decades did its appeal translate more

[808] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals.*; Seaman, *Swaggart*; Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*; Diamond, *Not by Politics Alone*; McGirr, *Suburban Warriors.*

[809] It seems important to note that this does not fit with the typical description of post-structuralism or their self-description. However, I will argue that these escapes are central to the thinking of the theorists I explore.

broadly.[810] When post-1989 communism lost cogency as the "outside" to capitalism, a "widespread search for a new militant figure,"[811] a new outside, began. As such, "the event," writes Bosteels, "is precisely that which unites almost all the great thinkers on the scene of French philosophy today."[812] Further, left-anarchist thinkers involved in the Occupy movement closely engaged this analysis of political possibility as well.[813] Meanwhile, some framed the growing force of global Christianity - especially pentecostalism - as reliant on a similar radical discontinuity.[814] For some continental philosophers then, the Bible story of Paul's revelation on the road to Damascus where he is suddenly born again, became a paradigm of militant political radicalism.[815] As Slavoj Zizek writes, "Christianity is the first and only religion of the event."[816] Likewise, for Alain Badiou, "Paul is a poet-thinker of the event, as well as one who practices and states the invariant traits of what can be called the militant figure."[817] Here, militancy and spiritual experience blend.

---

[810] See Jay, "Historicism and the Event."
[811] Alain. Badiou, *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), 2.
[812] Bruno Bosteels, *Badiou and Politics* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2011), 175.
[813] i.e. Andrew Stein, "Event and Ideology.," *Culture, Theory & Critique* 53, no. 3 (2012); Joseph G. Ramsey, "Revolution Underground? Critical Reflections on the Prospect of Renewing Occupation.," *Socialism & Democracy* 26, no. 3 (2012).
[814] Robbins, "Continuity Thinking and the Problem of Christian Culture"; Philip Jenkins, *The next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
[815] Agamben, *The Time That Remains*; Badiou, *Saint Paul*; Zizek, *The Puppet and the Dwarf*. See also J. Robbins, "Anthropology, Pentecostalism, and the New Paul: Conversion, Event, and Social Transformation," *South Atlantic Quarterly South Atlantic Quarterly* 109, no. 4 (2010): 633–52; Jon Bialecki, "Disjuncture, Continental Philosophy's New 'political Paul,' and the Question of Progressive Christianity in a Southern California Third Wave Church," *American Ethnologist* 36, no. 1 (2009): 110–23.
[816] Zizek, *Event*, 38.
[817] Badiou, *Saint Paul*, 2.

In fact, the event that emerged post-1968 did not simply reiterate previous efforts to challenge the *longue durée* by recognizing historical causation in prominent moments, but rather, posed a moment of explosive, and deeply ontological, transformation, something outside of the ordinary, in kind as well as temporality – a close kin to mystical experience.[818] "The return of the event," offered a new sense of the power of immediacy to refigure being.[819] For Jean-François Lyotard, it signaled a, "dimension of *force* that escapes the logic of the signifier,"[820] perhaps, "the occurrence after which nothing will ever be the same again."[821] It was a moment that could not even be represented without losing its essential otherness. Partly through its link to affect, or "enthusiasm," Lyotard's event eluded both subjectifying and capitalist versions of constraint.[822] Similarly, for Derrida the metaphysical conception expanded, with events providing a complete interruption of, "any performative organization, any convention, or any context that can be dominated by conventionality."[823] As Martin Jay explains, the deconstructionist event thus is unforeseeable, deeply disruptive, absolutely singular, and incorporates the mystery of both loss and the trace of the past into what Derrida calls the "hauntological," a contrast with the ontological. It is, says Jay, "a ghost of a presence that can never be,

[818] The following discussion owes much to the summary of eventual thought in: Jay, "Historicism and the Event."
[819] Ibid., 144.
[820] Jean-François Lyotard, *Political Writings*, trans. Bill Readings and Kevin Paul. Geiman (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 64.
[821] Bill Readings, *Introducing Lyotard Art and Politics* (NY: Routledge, 1991), 58.
[822] Jay, "Historicism and the Event," 147.
[823] Jacques. Derrida, *Without Alibi*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002), 234.

indeed never was, fully present."[824]

Deleuze also built a theory of event, one emergent within endless flow, unconditioned by the gridding of the modern. Here events manifest "intensities" of flow, yet they are no more concrete for their connection to a broader becoming. As, "very special things: events, pure events," are, "jets of singularities," that avoid essences, escape the present and thus all distinctions of linear time.[825] The "pure difference" of Deleuze's event, says Foucault, allows it to resist concept or category, subsumption as the real, negation, or seemingly any of the processes previous philosophers used to describe what might happen with some sort of form. Instead, events remain "indefinitely indefinite."[826] As such, the internal structures of modernity are, perhaps, undone.

For Deleuze, these grids are the problem to be overcome. Thus, as William Mazzarella argues, the Deleuzian political philosophy of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, devolves into anxiety that modernity necessarily betrays, "vital energy by mediation." Deleuzian hope attaches to the "multitude" which through "vital autonomy, represents the immediate recuperation of life." By contrast, says Mazzarella, "crowds, in their passive heteronomy, represent the thoroughly mediated, and thus lifeless, collective." As he concludes, "for Hardt and Negri, mediation

[824] Jay, "Historicism and the Event," 154.
[825] Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 1, 54.
[826] Foucault summarized in Jay, "Historicism and the Event." Foucault's own event theorizing backed away from the more mystical claims, but emphasized the multiplicity and uncertainty of a history built on unmediated events. To be fair, Jay points out that for Foucault and to some extent Deleuze, events manifest via series, and may not be fully incommensurable. Ibid., 147–150. See note 45 for more.

ultimately means death."[827] Thus, very much reminiscent of 19th century romantics, neovitalists in this tradition develop a binary between unmediated liveliness and the ugliness of control.

That is, the "romanticisation of immediacy," which captures the direction of Deleuze and Guattari quite well – at least as they are generally read – poses a relatively simple binary between life and death, the multitude and the crowd, or more simply, fluidity and stasis. Modernity is seen to pit "order against desire" and is defined by "uninterrupted conflict between the immanent, constructive, creative forces and the transcendent power aimed at restoring order."[828] In other words, like pentecostals, the terror is order. However, unlike pentecostals, Hardt and Negri haven't yet built a massive institutionalizing movement that makes this fear useful and revitalizing as it plays against the structures emergent in systematic organizing.

By contrast, Alain Badiou argues that his vision of event, what one philosopher called, the "transformative access to the Real of extra-structural truth,"[829] escapes the romantic flow of Deleuzian neovitalism as well as the constraints of the modern. Perhaps a Platonic absolute truth rooted in unchanging mathematics that underlies evental rupture should set Badiou's event apart from other post-structural thinkers – he, for one, would not accept the category. Yet, for several philosophical reasons,[830] and because very much like Lyotard, Derrida and Deleuze his project is

---

[827] Mazzarella, "The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who's Afraid of the Crowd?," 2010, 713.
[828] Ibid., 713–14.
[829] Paul M Livingston, "Badiou, Mathematics and Model Theory," July 13, 2011, https://www.unm.edu/~pmliving/Badiou,%20Mathematics,%20and%20Model%20Theory.pdf.
[830] On the surface, like the other post-structuralists, Badiou also offers an escape from the grid via a ruptural event, which suggests an ontological break from the everyday. Yet, he would argue that his

explicitly aimed at finding an outside to the gridding of being, for the purposes of this project, his work resonates usefully with the others. Thus, despite his pains to differentiate his "pure break" from Deleuze's intensification of becoming, they both aim to escape the grid. Deleuze imagines unmediated flow with evental intensities. In Badiou, "one of the names of the Outside is 'event.'"[831] Thus, as some observers noted, "both philosophers explicitly repudiate mediation."[832] Deleuze degrids the

---

project is importantly unlike the others. First, he claims that an affinity for unending truth makes his ontology distinct. I think this is true, to some degree. Badiou aims at solidity outside the event that is unpredictable when viewed from a human lifeworld, but from a God's eye view fits into one of the existent Platonic forms of truth. Yet, in *Being and Event* the ontology only emerges via the moment of escape from what is perhaps a corrupted, or simply not so truthful, realm of everyday life. In fact, the event is only visible in the retrospective consolidation of the event. Further it is ontologically founded on a void that makes the connection between ontology and ontic history ambiguous, if not untenable. Second, both his and Deleuze's work rest on a contested reading of mathematics. I am not prepared to decide which would be more ontologically truthful than the other, but simply point out that the solid foundations are contested. And third, in *Being and Event* Badiou's ontology claims access to essential truth, yet it is explicitly a formalism in which a structure of truth is built upon a set of axioms formed via decision. More than simply his clearly affirmed notion that fidelity to the event is key to the process of post-evental consolidation (here lies his politics – both is a sense of possibility and in the struggle over interpreting the past), here Badiou seemingly poses ontology as subjective, certainly pertinent when the process of distinguishing one event from the other seems a bit random (i.e. why are Nazi event not so aligned with eternal truth while French revolutionary ones are?). Badiou himself recognizes this challenge, when he acknowledges that, "reaction, and even the powers of death, can be stamped with the creative force of the event… [for] an event opens a subjective space," which allows for multiple politics. Alain Badiou, *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil* (NY: Verso, 2001), lvii. Some believe that he resolves this in *Logics of Worlds* by asserting that events disrupt rather than reify the status-quo. This seems lacking in clarity. Further, Meillassoux argues that here he also redefines the process of subjective evental consolidation, to some degree, weaning the ontological from the participatory. In either case, my focus is on Badiou before *Logics of Worlds* in what might be considered his post-structural phase. That is back when his event was clearly a break from the past with little ontological or political clarity. Later things get muddier, both in the potential for an event to achieve the evental break with the past and also its possible connections to cultivation and contemporary gridding. Even so, the relative lack of mediation continues to link Badiou with other post-structuralist romantics. For more on these questions see Badiou, *Being and Event*. Livingston, *The Politics of Logic*; Livingston, "Badiou, Mathematics and Model Theory"; Peter Hallward, *Badiou: A Subject to Truth* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2003); Bosteels, *Badiou and Politics*; Badiou, *Logics of Worlds*; Quentin Meillassoux, "Decision And Undecidability Of The Event In Being And Event I And II," *Parrhesia* 19 (2014): 23–35.

[831] Alain Badiou, "The Event in Deleuze," *Parrhesia* 2 (2007): 37.

[832] Justin. Clemens and Feltham, "The Thought of Stupefaction; Or The Event and Decision as Non-Ontological and Pre-Political Factors in the Work of Gilles Deleuze and Alain Badiou," in *Event and Decision: Ontology and Politics in Badiou, Deleuze, and Whitehead*, ed. Roland Faber, Henry Krips, and Daniel Pettus (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010), 18.

inside, while Badiou moves beyond the grid.

For Badiou, the event explicitly connects to Paul's ruptural experience, as an unpredictable seizing by grace without any prefiguration: "unconditioned," "suddenly emerging," "a thunderbolt, a caesura."[833] Within Badiou's mathematical ontology, the event is, "supernumerary."[834] He does, however, link the event to process in the "thought-practice that is this rupture's subjective materiality,"[835] the institutions to ensure fidelity, and the event as reiterable, however – and this is key - all his examples of process follow, instead of preceding the event.[836] In other words, there is none of the tarrying, waiting, hoping, and training of the prospective work of cultivation that we see among pentecostals or among early Jews awaiting the messiah. The event is made political for Badiou in its connection to a universal notion of equality of the multiple and to the disciplinary practice of fidelity to the event – thus he very explicitly disavows a connection to spontaneity.[837] His model then, is processual for sure, however, only retrospectively. Thus, in spite of the extensive focus on disciplined fidelity and post-evental process, Badiou's radicalism, initially emerges as something akin to "breaking with,"[838] rather than digging deep to uproot

[833] Badiou, *Saint Paul*, 17,18,36.
[834] Badiou, *Being and Event*, 98.
[835] Badiou, *Saint Paul*, 2.
[836] Hallward, *Badiou*, xxxii, 159.
[837] Alain. Badiou, *The Concept of Model: An Introduction to the Materialist Epistemology of Mathematics*, trans. Zachary Luke. Fraser and Tzuchien. Tho (Melbourne: Re.press, 2007), 104.
[838] Even Robbins' rich and well balanced evaluation of the European analysis of Christianity succumbs to a sense that radical means ruptural. Robbins, "Anthropology, Pentecostalism, and the New Paul."

problems. The event here is, in essence, a political opening, a search for "novelty," or escape from modern mediation.[839]

This seems likely to provide a useful tool. The event might fracture the modern grid, perhaps offer a surprise, something spontaneous, something lacking in the modern, especially in modern rationality. Maybe "scientific method is the institutionalized maintenance of sangfroid in the face of surprise," as Brian Massumi writes.[840] The event might thus challenge the secularist "surprise free world."[841] For Jean-Luc Nancy, surprise is not only a quality of the event, but "the event itself."[842] Likewise, for Slavoj Zizek, "the basic feature of an event: [is] the surprising emergence of something new which undermines every stable scheme."[843] The "every" in Zizek's formulation is key. Badiou's events, like Deleuzian flow, challenge all previous shape, anything that smacks of solidity - except the truth of the event itself.[844] As is perhaps obvious, they also, very explicitly, use Christianity as a model for metaphysical access to the singular transformative moment that requires a decision to emerge and fidelity to become meaningful. Further, I can't help but see the notion of an ontological break as a wonderful way to explain how immediate and collective ruptural experience can stick like very little else. The energy of evental

---

[839] His emphasis on novelty and unfolding continues throughout much of his ouvre. Badiou, *The Concept of Model: An Introduction to the Materialist Epistemology of Mathematics*, xiii, xvi, xvii.
[840] Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual*, 233.
[841] Peter L Berger, *A Rumour of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural* (London: Allen Lane, 1970), 30.
[842] Jean-Luc Nancy, "The Surprise of the Event," in *Hegel after Derrida*, ed. Stuart Barnett (NY: Routledge, 1998), 91.
[843] Zižek, *Event*, 5–6.
[844] He sees thought as a new, but emergent, form. Badiou, *The Concept of Model: An Introduction to the Materialist Epistemology of Mathematics*, xvi.

rupture is real, has traction, and moves people. To call it ontological, rather than epistemological might then expand the being-knowing polarity that captures much of philosophical discussion so that it includes experience as a kind of ontological being.[845]

Similar to post-structural evental immediacy, pentecostals also developed a philosophy of the event, surprise, and what some call a "theology of immediacy"[846] that could signal a genuine connection to something outside the mechanistic worldview of the modern – to the Holy Spirit. Surprise, it seems, is a basic element of this spontaneity, perhaps even a synonym in some cases. And even the most meticulous and systematic theorists of pentecostal training and development insist upon the spontaneity of the practice. For instance, among AG missiologists, Grant McClung, titles his essay, the "Spontaneous Strategy of the Spirit."[847] Likewise, Russell Spittler explains that a message in tongues, "comes unplanned, unprogrammed,"[848] and the sensibility permeates outside of ritual with, "spontaneity in personal conduct as well as corporate worship."[849] Even Donald MacGavran, a man most famous for joining rationalized sociology and missiology, calls pentecostal practices spontaneous: "[the] principle of spontaneous action under the control of the spirit of Jesus as revealed in the scriptures lies at the heart of the pentecostal faith."[850]

---

[845] This is not how Badiou or any of the others seem to describe it.
[846] McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*, 53.
[847] Ibid., 101.
[848] Spittler, "Implicit Values in Pentecostal Missions," 415.
[849] Ibid., 409.
[850] Donald MacGavran et al., *Church Growth in Mexico* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publ. Company, 1963), 114–115.

This is perhaps not surprising in a missiological tradition where the originary text is Roland Allen's *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church and Causes Which Hinder It*.[851]

Thus, at least on the surface, post-structural and pentecostal theories of mobilization sit nicely together. When Christensen, for instance, delineated four core elements to pentecostal practice, the first "was the priority of the *event*."[852] The event here is not just kin to, but very much the same referent as the rupture so prized by Badiou in his tale of Pauline militancy. Likewise for Paul Pomerville, AG missiologist, "the immediacy of God,"[853] is key to mobilization and ethics. Pomerville, tells how the event energizes activism beyond the immediate moment: "the great commission [to evangelize] derives its meaning from the internalizing event. The pentecostal *event* then is decisive for an understanding of the spiritual role in initiating and universalizing mission."[854] Pomerville is especially eloquent in arguing for immediacy over modern rationalization. He explains that in non-pentecostal fundamentalist rationalization of contemporary theology the "noetic principle of theology (inflection, reason, epistemology, propositional statements on the confrontation of being) [was] eclipsed the ontic principle (immediacy, presence,

[851] Roland Allen and Vedanayagam Samuel Azariah, *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church: And the Causes Which Hinder It* (London: World Dominion Press, 1927).
[852] McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*, 6.
[853] Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*, 9.
[854] Emphasis added. Ibid., 73. It should be recognized that post-structuralists would likely not find the notion of universalizing mission appealing. Yet, if underneath their project we find a universalizing flow with which to break, there may be room for translation.

'the earnest' of God, confrontation with reality)."[855] As such, he aims to resuscitate the "ontic" event. These ontic, immediate, evental, and surprising moments all delineate a space, ephemeral as it may be, for transformation and inspiration, one shared, at least in the rhetoric, of both pentecostals and post-structuralists.[856] One could, however, argue that these altogether distinct notions of event are simply linked by a shared semantic field and thus function quite differently – the pentecostal model might be less than useful. That, I suppose, remains to be seen.

Post-structural Critique as Evental Limit-Experience

Perhaps even the basic project of deconstruction that permeates post-structural thought aligns with the pentecostal event. The ontological transformation that escapes gridding might be found in something as mundane as critique. Some argue, in fact, that the "limit-experience" invoked in critique very much parallels pentecostalism's more visceral version. David Hoy makes the case most broadly, by suggesting that, "Critical resistance that promotes… social desubjectification will open the door to social change resulting from the accompanying denormalization, depsychologization and deindividuation."[857] In other words, if critique deconstructs all that currently holds us together, it likely opens a space for something new. What exactly that may be, however, is less clear. Like Lyotard, Deleuze connects the

[855] Ibid., 68.
[856] As Cargill writes, Pentecostal interpretation has shown continuity, "with their emphasis on the immediacy of the text, and that this precritical stance is more amenable to a post-modern paradigm than to the modern paradigm dominated by positivism and historicism." 84
[857] Hoy, *Critical Resistance from Poststructuralism to Post-Critique*, 206.

process of critique to the sensory, as a rupture that elides gridding: "the point of critique," he says, "is not justification, but a different way of feeling: another sensibility."[858] Thus, the sensory here appears as something essentially distinct from rational argument. Like pentecostal theorists, the aim is to transform the senses, not simply cognition or reason.

Martin Jay argues that, in spite of treatises to the contrary, post-structuralism actually resuscitates the notion of experience. This is surprising, he explains, since the challenge to experience once seemed so central to post-structural thought. Post-structuralists are usually seen to argue that experience either naively elevates subjectivism, mistakenly invokes a metaphysics, or simply expresses far too much confidence in the coherence and commensurability of people and/or encounter. Thus, it appeared quite clear that post-structuralism's hostility to phenomenology and the like, "welcomed, even sought, what one observer has called 'the demise of experience.'"[859] Yet, Jay argues otherwise. He suggests that Derrida and Foucault both mobilize experience as important elements of their political philosophy. Here he cites Rei Terada's claim that Derrida mobilizes pathos and emotional instability, "a moment of self-surrender and passivity rather than self-productive activity," such that self-difference, "falsely resolved in the Cartesian tradition, rejected as nonsense in the realist tradition – is experience itself, nonsubjective experience." Instead of self-reflexive affectivity (emotionality) as self-recognition in liberal theory, she says,

[858] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 94.
[859] Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 363–4.

"hetero-affectivity" undermines the ideal of the self-sufficient subject.[860] Experience, then, might serve as another version of dispersed power, like postmodern notions of text. David Wood goes further and argues that Derrida should be read as a radical phenomenologist: "Deconstruction is, if you like, the experience of experience."[861]

Jay continues by suggesting that Foucault also valorizes experience and limit-experience in particular. Foucault describes how among many thinkers (he lists Nietzsche Mallarme, Artaud, Klossowski, Blanchot and Bataille), the "discourse of the limit, of ruptured subjectivity, transgression," requires that, "experience finds new life."[862] Their projects aimed more at moments than at the processes of cultivating them. As Foucault explains, "What struck me and fascinated me about them is the fact that they didn't have the problem of constructing systems, but of having direct, personal experiences."[863] And not simply experience, but experience that pushes the limits of previous understanding and sensation. They "try through experience to reach that point of life which lies as close to the impossibility of living, which lies at the limit or the extreme. They attempt to gather the maximum amount of intensity and impossibility at the same time." Thus, experience has a role in both subjectification and desubjectification, " the task of 'tearing' the subject from itself in a way that it is not longer the subject as such.. so that it may arrive at its annihilation, its dissociation. It is this desubjectifying undertaking, the idea of a 'limit-experience'

---

[860] Rei Terada, *Feeling in Theory: Emotion after the "Death of the Subject"* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 24.
[861] David Wood, "The Experience of the Ethical," in *Questioning Ethics Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, ed. Richard. Kearney and Mark. Dooley (NY: Routledge, 1999), 110.
[862] Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 393.
[863] Ibid., 397.

that tears the subject from itself, which is the fundamental lesson I have learned from these authors." Foucault thus elaborates Bataille's excessive experiences of ecstatic denial as potentially prefigurative, that is, providing spaces in which to nurture resistant sensibilities: "It is possible that the rough outline of a future society is supplied by the recent experiences with drugs, sex, communes, other forms of consciousness, and other forms of individuality. If scientific socialism emerged from the Utopias of the nineteenth century, it is possible that a real socialism will emerge, in the twentieth century, from experiences."[864] And further, these experiences permeate out beyond the individual – experience, in these conceptions are ruptural, prefigurative, and somehow collective as well. "Starting from experience, it is necessary to clear the way for a transformation, a metamorphosis which isn't simply individual but which has a character accessible others: that is, this experience must be linkable, to a certain extent, to a collective practice and way of being."[865]

Thus, while it is commonly recognized that Foucault's tendency to emphasize control and discipline led other thinkers to search far and wide for a means to escape the panopticon, and that this would logically include interest in multiple versions of immediacy, such as the event, it is less obvious that, at times, Foucault also explicitly advocated for a certain kind of "limit-experience" that might push against the current conditions of possibility. As David Hoy argues, Foucault's toying with limit-experience suggests a point where people, "no longer know what to do" such that the

[864] Emphasis in the original. Foucault, Bouchard, and Sherry, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, 231.
[865] Michel Foucault and Duccio Trombadori, *Remarks on Marx: Conversations with Duccio Trombadori* (New York: Semiotext(e), 1991), 38–39.

habitual activities, gestures, and discourses that, "had seemed to go without saying become problematic, difficult, dangerous." Critique, for Hoy, does not then give explicit directives, "but instead brings them up against the limit that disrupts their deepest convictions and their sense of who they are." It is a process that Hoy translates from Foucault's French as "distancing oneself from oneself," or "detaching oneself from oneself," or even better, "dissolving oneself."[866] In a similar recognition, Drucilla Cornell connects this kind of refiguration to its boundary when she names deconstruction, "the philosophy of the limit."[867] In other words, as with pentecostalism, the goal here might be the dissolution of the subject, and the yielding to new possibility. However, one group has the Holy Spirit to facilitate and ensure the process, while the other is either riding on the ethical foundations of an underlying vital flow or body, or aiming beyond the edge of the grid and into the ether for something different.

Rupture or Limit-Experience as a Concrete Solution

The imperative of both pentecostalism and post-structuralism emerges in response to the gridding of modernity: perhaps we desperately need a means to push beyond the limits of modern discipline, a strategy for manifesting "limit-experiences" or "events" which might, simply in their break with the old, open space for new ways

[866] Hoy writes, "For Foucault, the force of critique is that the encounter with one's limits dissolves one's background belief that there are no other ways to experience the phenomenon in question insofar as the dissolution of this background belief amounts to dissolving fundamental beliefs about oneself, it opens up other possibilities and reshapes one's sense of what can be done. Critique is thus a crucial condition of freedom." Hoy, *Critical Resistance from Post-structuralism to Post-Critique*, 91–92.
[867] Drucilla. Cornell, *The Philosophy of the Limit* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

of being. This is their call. Both groups offer the problematic, pentecostals provide a concrete means to enact it. Further, they suggest that reaching and breaching limits has real effects.

Pentecostal experience, it is commonly argued, changes lives. It thus does more than simply provide a moment of change, but rather, does the work of, "bestowing a capacity of action"[868] resulting in long term transformation, "an altered perception of reality."[869] Peter Berger describes these kinds of shifts as meaningful in the long run, for they entail, "passing from one level of experience and perspective to another that is totally new and different."[870] Further, the physicality of pentecostal experiences seem quite portable, and likely permeate out into the sensibilities and social relations of a community. As d'Epinay writes, "All accounts of conversions which we've been able to gather underscore the converts physical sensation of change. The world, their own neighborhoods and streets, as well as the people close to them appear to be transformed. The experience is a strong psychological shock which demands expression."[871] Poloma calls it a, "radical, trans-sensory metamorphosis of the subject's mode of consciousness that takes place while he or she is awake."[872] Likewise, Cheryl Bridges Johns argues that pentecostal practice is perfectly placed to engender social justice theology, and the key is rupture for, "[rupture] creates a new consciousness." Thus, given the immediacy of

---

[868] Lalive d'Epinay, *Haven of the Masses*, 54.
[869] Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 89.
[870] Peter L Berger, "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," *Social Research* 51, no. 1/2 (1984): 482.
[871] Christian Lalive D'Epinay in Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 92.
[872] Margaret M Poloma, *Main Street Mystics: The Toronto Blessing and Reviving Pentecostalism* (Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2003), 27–8.

transformation, "The gospel of the kingdom is here and now."[873] Or so it seems. Contemporary pentecostal philosophers also describe transformation. For "the Spirit invites us to see the world otherwise."[874] In other words, these scholars agree that ruptural experience changes minds and, for some, even bodies.

McClung agrees that the spontaneous nature of pentecostal practice provides power to transform lives. "This spontaneous liturgy, which is mainly oral and narrative with an emphasis on a direct experience of God through his Spirit, results in the possibility of ordinary people being lifted out of their mundane daily experiences into a new realm of ecstasy, aided by the emphases on speaking in tongues, loud and emotional simultaneous prayer and joyful singing, clapping, raising hands and dancing in the presence of God–all common pentecostal liturgical accoutrements."[875] This resonates closely with the tendency to "spontaneist populism" Pierre Bourdieu says haunts cultural studies.[876]

Posthuman Romanticism

I find it useful to think of both pentecostals and post-structuralists as refiguring romanticism, a posthuman or postliberal romanticism, romanticism with the autonomous subject replaced by flow, structure, or tradition. The point of this naming is twofold – first of all, it gives me a sense of the continuity between modernity and postmodernity, and secondly it makes even more clear the lack of a

[873] Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 93.
[874] Smith, *Thinking in Tongues*, 47.
[875] McClung, *Azusa Street and beyond*, 184.
[876] Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 81.

prescriptive politics that might attach to either version of romanticism. Martin Jay describes romantics as emphasizing the role of feeling, or "the immediate, embodied self-consciousness that subtends the faculties of willing and thinking and that indeed is prior to their very differentiation," and "self-cultivation." [877] In a similar vein, Isaiah Berlin describes romanticism as a claim that there is no structure to things – "There is no pattern to which you must adapt yourself." And a related notion of the individual "indomitable will."[878] Thus, what I call posthuman romanticism involves a contemporary search for a break with the gridding of modernity and a dichotomous relationship between experience/vitality/the viscera and any version of form or structure.

Berlin describes romanticism in very Deleuzian terms, where patterns seem an imposition. There is no underlying pattern to be repressed, the only patterning is that which we make. "There is only, if not the flow, the endless self creativity of the universe… a process of perpetual forward creation, and all schemas, all generalizations, all patterns imposed upon it, are forms of distortion, forms of breaking… When Wordsworth said 'to dissect is to murder,' this is approximately what he meant… to attempt to draw up a set of rules, or a set of laws, or a formula, is a form of self-indulgence, and in the end suicidal stupidity. That at any rate is the

[877] Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 87, 95.
[878] Berlin describes Dadaism, surrealism and the theater of the absurd as all aiming to break the barrier between self and the imaginary, "to produce a sense of the absolutely unbarred universe, and of perpetual change, perpetual transformation." Here he makes clear the difference between humanist and posthumanist romantics, for the goal of earlier versions was, according to Berlin, change, "out of which someone with a powerful will can mold, if only temporarily, anything he pleases." This, would be in opposition to change without an individual will, but beholden to collectivity or flow. Berlin, *The Roots of Romanticism*, 119, 116.

sermon of the romantics."[879] For Berlin, Johan George Hamann exemplifies the story when he argues, "there is a flow of life," and any attempt to cut this flow into segments kills it. People do not want happiness or contentment, says Hamann, but rather for, "all their faculties to play in the richest and most violent possible fashion." The sciences applied to society would thus produce a fearful bureaucratization. As such, Hamann rails against scientists and bureaucrats, "persons who made things tidy, smooth, Lutheran clergymen, deists, everybody who wanted to put things in boxes, everybody who wished to assimilate one thing to another." For Hamann, creation was the "most ineffable, indescribable, unanalyzable personal act." As Berlin describes, "the whole of the Enlightenment doctrine appeared to him to kill that which was living in human beings, appeared to offer a pale substitute for the creative energies of man, and for the whole rich world of the senses, without which it is impossible for human beings to live, to eat, to drink, to be merry..." To divide body and souls thus offers a typical dissecting view. Instead, the sensuous provides crucial access to recognition: "if you really wish to enter the contact with human beings, you really wish to understand what they think, what they feel and what they are, then you must understand every gesture, every nuance, you must watch their eyes, you must observe the movement of their lips… and then you come to direct acquaintance with the actual sources of life. Anything less than that, … is the way to kill, that is the way to apply concepts and categories, hollow baskets, to the palpitating, unique,

[879] Ibid., 120.

asymmetrical, unclassifiable flesh of living human experience."[880] In other words, like contemporary neovitalism, like the post-structural fear of classification, and like pentecostal terror of modern human control, romantics valorized the deep natural – perhaps God-given – flow of life.

Key, however, is that this valorization of flow did not determine their politics. For, "the romantics could be either progressive or reactionary." As Hamman explained, "what men wanted was to create, what men wanted was to make, and if this making led to clashes, if it led to wars, if it led to struggles, then that was part of the human lot."[881] In fact, as Berlin puts it, "it is impossible to pin romanticism down to any given political view, however often this has been tried."[882] They were, however, quite appealing in their efforts to mobilize, and to inspire new thoughts.

I am, of course, not the first to make this connection.[883] Elizabeth Grosz describes the work of Deleuze and Guattari as, "a romantic elevation of psychoses, schizophrenia, becoming, which on one hand ignores the very real torment of suffering individuals and, among other hand, positions it as an unlivable ideal for others."[884] And while Foucault certainly had his romantic moments,[885] Deleuze and Guattari are perhaps the best examples of theorists who are read as simply valorizing

---

[880] Ibid., 43–45.
[881] Ibid., 43.
[882] Ibid., 127.
[883] See also Justin Clemens, *The Romanticism of Contemporary Theory: Institutions, Aesthetics, Nihilism* (Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003).
[884] Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*, 163.
[885] For Foucault's romanticism see: "genealogy must record the singularity of events outside of any monotonous finality; it must seek them in the most unpromising places, in what we tend to feel is without history–in sentiments, love, conscience, instincts." Foucault, Bouchard, and Sherry, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, 139–40.

fluidity. And it might make sense to see their work as a critique of all internal structure. In Deleuze's writing's on Nietzsche, the ethical valence is quite clear: "multiplicity, becoming and chance are adequate objects of joy by themselves."[886] His major tropes all lean towards the unmediated. For instance, "the body without organs is not a dead body but a living body all the more alive and teaming once it is blown apart the organism and its organization… [and] populated by multiplicities."[887] Likewise, "becoming imperceptible," another Deleuzian image, suggests a micro-scaled sense of freedom, freedom at the expense of any shape. For "becoming–imperceptible replaces, dismantles, problematizes the most elementary notions of entity, thingness. In this inability, imperceptibly… the freeing of absolutely miniscule micro–intensities to the nth degree…."[888] The concern then is with "microfascisms just waiting to crystallize."[889] Deleuze's emphasizing locally scaled hierarchies, resonates closely with anarchisms of the Occupy Movement, yet with the humanism – the sense of human as basically good - replaced by a feel for nature's flow as essentially good. This is a problem, for when flow is posed against stasis with such blunt force we recreate harsh dualisms; and there are no means to make the strategic decisions to solidify blackness (i.e. the Nigerrati or Black Power), women as resistant flesh, or simply any political position, for all require cutting and solidifying. Finally, perhaps most crucially, pure flow is not life, but death, at least for the living.[890]

---

[886] Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, 190.
[887] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 30.
[888] Grosz, *Volatile Bodies*, 179.
[889] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 9.
[890] Yet, there is more to Deleuze and Guattari than is generally recognized. For, in spite of their emphasis on motility, they actually move back and forth between fluidity and moments of the solid. At

Again, Badiou would argue his distinction. He very explicitly attacks romanticism when he asks, "how can we emerge from, *finally* emerge from, our subjection to romanticism?"[891] For Badiou, romantics are lost in thought and tied to a unity of being, not to his emphasis on ontological multiplicity. And in some sense, his claims to mathematics as ontological foundations does appear to provide something far more concrete and materialist than a romantic evocation of affect or flow. Further, that Badiou's events are constructed with fidelity to a limited set of Platonic truths could, as he suggests, instate a patterning, again not a romantic flow. Yet, Badiou's version of event is, a resistance founded "outside" and via primordial ontological multiplicity irreducible to the unity he criticizes in Deleuze. Further, and most decisively, his original event emerges from nothing in particular, it is in clear opposition to any prefigurative structuring.[892] Thus, if romanticism means escape from the current grid, or from patterning, it can manifest in either Deleuzian flow within, or Badiou's events outside the grid.[893]

There is, however, one crucial difference between 19th century and recent romanticisms – the human is the consequential actor in the 19th century narrative but

---

times, they very explicitly call for a balance between fluidity and stability, perhaps a tension: "just keep enough of the organism for it to reform each dawn… you have to keep small rations of subjectivity in sufficient quantity to enable you to respond to the dominant reality." Ibid., 160.

[891] This is partly due to his definition of romanticism as a fidelity to the finite, a gesture that very much opposes my reading of the romantic as unlocking the containment of a given moment. Alain. Badiou, *Conditions* (NY: Continuum, 2008), 94, 97.

[892] Livingston, "Badiou, Mathematics and Model Theory"; Livingston, *The Politics of Logic*; Badiou, "The Event in Deleuze"; Badiou, *Being and Event*.

[893] In Badiou's more recent work, *Logics of Worlds*, his claims that an event engages a preexisting ontological structure of truth, has some connection to points of current existence, and is then formalized via retrospective recognition suggests that Badiou is beginning to differentiate himself from the other posthuman romantics in his legitimation of post-evental forms and emergent pre-evental structures. Or perhaps returning to a more dialectical notion of existence in which events could not simply emerge from nothing. Badiou, *Logics of Worlds*.

drops out in more recent versions. I argue, however, that this distinction does not eliminate the useful resonance between humanist and posthumanist romanticisms. For instance, in challenging Caren Kaplan's suggestion that post-structuralism romanticizes deterritorialization and nomadicism, Rosi Braidotti says that post-structuralist dissolution of the center and radical critique of all dominance dispenses with originary and authentic entities central to earlier romantics. If origins could be effaced, perhaps philosophy might be different in some significant sense?[894] However, it seems that Braidotti's next move reinstates an originary formation, no longer the self, but equally viable for romantic elevation. For she then follows Deleuze in describing what seems to be a rescaling of resistance, emphasizing "microdespotism" instead of broader hegemony as the challenge to be overcome. Here she focuses on the "need for a qualitative shift away from hegemony, whatever its size and however 'local' it may be."[895] In other words, any structure is "despotism," if it clogs the flow. Thus while perhaps successfully eluding the originary 'subject,' she instates instead, an originary flow that she romanticizes. To some degree, it follows Wilhelm Reich's repressive hypothesis, which was aimed at precisely the constraint of such an originary flow, rather than a particular subject.[896] Braidotti then could be outlining a posthuman romanticism, romanticizing unmediated flux and vitality. Yet, the comparison with Reich demonstrates its major weakness as well: Braidotti's flow lacks the dialectical intelligence of previous vitalisms: i.e. Reich's orgone energy or

[894] Exactly how is unclear.
[895] Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*, 26.
[896] Reich, *The Function of the Orgasm; Sex-Economic Problems of Biological Energy*.

the qi of contemporary acupuncture rely on a membrane. They seek flow, but coconstitutively within a form.

Resistance to Linguistic Totalization

While the event and immediacy might offer tools for resistance, the category of resistance itself is deeply inscribed in post-structuralism as the effort to find space in relation to the grid. If language is the major tool for postmodern discipline, it makes sense to try and find resistance in formations that are not contained by language and calculative thinking, or perhaps outside of its normal use. As Judith Butler defines it, subversion is, "the kind of effect that *resists calculation.*"[897] Modernists made the same move in earlier religious studies projects. Williams James, for instance, played a crucial role in a tradition of scholars of religion who posed religious experience as outside of language. James – summed by Martin Jay - argued that experience was, "richer and more complex than our feeble attempts to capture it in language or concepts."[898] Weber agreed that religious experience was distinguished by its "absolute incommunicability."[899] Similar things can be said of Rudolf Otto's, "wholly other" numinous.[900] Thus, religious language is often imagined as a space outside the calculative control of modernity.

Pentecostals emerge from a resonant tradition, with their pietist forbears arguing that "religion must be a matter which is able to be grasped thorough

[897] Butler Critically Queer GLQ A journal of lesbian and gay studies 1:17-32, 29.
[898] Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 283.
[899] Ibid., 110 note 114.
[900] Otto, *The idea of the holy*.

experience alone without any concepts."[901] More recently, Paul Pomerville's missiology criticizes textual rationalization as both fundamentalist and modern. Instead of certainty and the predictability of scripture, he finds change in, "the principle of the dynamic nature of the Christian faith [which] involves the *activity of God* in contemporary Christian experience."[902] Here text is stasis, stasis is rationalization, and, by contrast, Spirit is motility. Further, for Pomerville, fundamentalist doctrine, what he calls orthodoxy, equals modern rationalization: "The principal of orthodoxy is likewise held in a static manner… an unchangeable doctrinal deposit handed down from either the 16th or 19th century. The rationalization of the Christian faith is especially evident here… "[903] Thus, for Pomerville, the challenge to rationalization is a central quality within pentecostal practice. Michael Dowd agrees, "when the only 'language game' in town is rationalism it is not hard to understand why an experiential, relational, emotional and oral faith would choose not to play by the rules."[904] In other words, if language is the constraint, pentecostalism might offer a riposte.

Do The Subaltern Speak in Tongues?

But more than simply a language that might resist the grid, pentecostalism is language from the subaltern. Here we come to the crux of the argument. For

[901] Count von Zizendorf is cited in Peter C Erb, *Pietists: Selected Writings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 291.
[902] Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*, 7–8.
[903] Pomerville, *The Third Force in Missions*.
[904] Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 84.

pentecostals and post-structuralists do not simply share affection for limit-experience, but, for many, especially postcolonial thinkers in both camps, their limit-experience is channeled by a positionality that might lend direction to the breaking of boundaries – a politics born in the confluence of rupture and oppression. That is, if pentecostals are subaltern, their subalternity might involve an exceptional barrage of limits and control, so much so that any regular speech is either silenced or simply enveloped in a hegemonic haze. As Gayatri Spivak argues, the subaltern cannot speak and be heard because in her seemingly totalizing logic, language is fully awash with the power relations of society; to speak is to reiterate dominant hierarchies.[905] She does, however suggest "poetics" as a potential escape. Similarly, as Michel De Certeau, Donna Haraway, and others have suggested,[906] speaking in tongues and the ethos generated in such experiences also might not conform to hegemonic norms. Perhaps it even offers a means of expression outside of hegemony. Maybe when posed from the position of the subaltern, it is quite likely, maybe almost inevitably, that tongues serve as resistance to dominant power structures?

Scholars have certainly argued that pentecostals are being heard through thickets of dominance. As David Martin writes, pentecostalism, "picks up the mute and the strangled voices of those unheard throughout Latin American history. At least in the sphere of faith they are now giving 'tongue'. They are making their voices

[905] Morris and Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak?*
[906] See chapter 7

heard in vast assemblages where they finally *count* for something."[907] Walter Hollenweger agrees, for, "if the inarticulate peon in Latin America realizes that he has something to say, if the despised Indians of Mexico begins to sing and make music with the instruments of his persecuted ancestors, if the Chilean begins to dance the dances of his forefathers… this seems to me to be of a more revolutionary quality than the copying of Western revolutionary theories, which makes them again puppets of a foreign ideology, albeit a so–called revolutionary ideology."[908] In other words, given the context of colonial oppression, perhaps any form of incitement to subaltern speech helps uproot the problem.

Hollenweger argues that this is very much the case. He talks about resistance purely in the linguistic sphere, but then turns towards radicalism in pentecostal social practices, not simply the propensity towards radicalizing semiosis. Hollenweger begins with language: "pentecostalism is revolutionary because it offers alternatives to 'literary' theology and defrosts frozen thinking… It allows for a process of democratization of language by dismantling the privilege of the abstract, rational and propositional systems."[909] The process of change comes through the experience of gifts of the Spirit. "These gifts' can liberate people and free them from authoritarian structures."[910] Here he sounds very much like other pentecostal and post-structural thinkers arguing for a discursive battlefield. Even so, he does offer quite a critique of

[907] David Martin, *Tongues of Fire: The Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America* (Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., USA: B. Blackwell, 1990), 108 (emphasis in original).
[908] Walter J Hollenweger, "The Social and Ecumenical Significance of Pentecostal Liturgy," *Studia Liturgica*. 8, no. 4 (1971): 213.
[909] Walter J Hollenweger, "Pentecostalism and Black Power," *Theology Today* 30, no. 3 (1973): 234.
[910] Hollenweger cited in Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 19.

modern culture. "[For William Seymour at Azusa,] Pentecost meant more than speaking in tongues. It meant the love in the face of hate, to overcome the hatred of a whole nation by demonstrating that Pentecost is something very different from the success–oriented American way of life."[911]

Yet, experience, for pentecostal theorists, offers more than new language. Pentecostal experience is a game changer, says Cheryl Bridges Johns: "It was a subversive and revolutionary movement, not based upon philosophic ideology nor totally upon critical reflection. It was a movement that experienced through the Holy Spirit's divine liberation."[912] Likewise, for Hollenweger, experience of rupture leads to activism – not simply Badiou's radical break, but the cultivation of deep transformation of social relations. In *Pentecostalism and Black Power,* Hollenweger describes black pentecostal evangelist Arthur Brazier's program of self-determination for the people of Woodlawn. According to Hollenweger, the Woodlawn Organization, organized and directed by blacks in Chicago slums, provided a just-price regulator for local markets by checking shop prices and the quality and weight of goods, and then publishing the names of offending markets. They used press and TV to challenge absentee landlords with ridiculously high rent, organized rent strikes, and formed a youth organization trained to help prevent violence in schools. For Hollenweger, this is a distinctly pentecostal process. Gifts of the Spirit, as he sees it, include political activism. "In addition to the charisms which are known in the

[911] Walter J Hollenweger, "After Twenty Years' Research on Pentecostalism," *International Review of Mission* 75, no. 297 (1986): 5.
[912] Johns, *Pentecostal Formation*, 69.

history of pentecostalism, such as speaking in tongues, prophecy, religious dancing, prayer for the sick, they [at Woodlawn] practice the gift of demonstrating, organizing, and publicizing as another kind of prophecy."[913] In other words, rupture plus subalternity along with a serious dose of cultivation engenders revolutionary organization, for Hollenweger.

Mike Davis, in *Planet of Slums* tells a similar story. As he describes, "Marx has yielded the historical stage to Mohammed and the Holy Ghost. If God dies in the cities of the industrial revolution, he has risen again in the postindustrial cities of the developing world." He explains that the positionality of pentecostalism, in particular its emergence from and through extreme poverty, provides a trajectory for its liberatory potential. "Pentecostalism is the first major world religion to have grown up almost entirely in the soil of the modern urban slum." And as such, pentecostalism evinces radical possibilities, perhaps due to its subaltern status.[914] Davis does balk at the claim that pentecostalism provides a deeper radicalism than, "participation in formal politics and labour unions."[915] Yet, for both Davis and Hollenweger, the position of the pentecostal as subaltern provides their ruptural practices something to push against, a power dynamic from which to free themselves, a space in which the subaltern might, and do, speak in tongues.

[913] Hollenweger, "Pentecostalism and Black Power," 228.
[914] Davis, "Planet of Slums," 30–31.
[915] Davis, "Planet of Slums."

Pentecostals and Social Change

However, Hollenweger's optimism, which is shared, to some degree by Davis, is not commonly held by many scholars. In fact, the literature review regarding pentecostals and social change is basically contradictory. In other words, it is unclear if social change benefitting the poor and oppressed might emerge from a group of people usually categorized as subaltern who have developed a set of strategies for breaking out of hegemonic modes of thinking is deeply unclear.

Many see pentecostal practices as reactionary. For Anderson, gifts of the Spirit famously meant channeling frustration at class inequality into useless religious protests - a diversion.[916] Likewise, d'Epinay believes that an insurrectionary potential built up over centuries is neutralized by prescribed noninvolvement in politics. Also compelling is his suggestion that pentecostalism creates good workers for US economic interests and defuses revolutionary impulses.[917] Others look at the Ugandan right wing and its anti-queer movement, or more simply just the deep resonance between pentecostalism, especially prosperity doctrines, capitalist modernization theories, and neoliberalism.[918] There is a strong case that these social effects are conservative.

On the other hand, some see democracy, class mobility, and increased freedom. David Stoll suggests that scholars ought to notice poor people who, "turn

---

[916] Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 142.
[917] Lalive d'Epinay, *Haven of the Masses*.
[918] Comaroff and Comaroff, "Occult Economies and the Violence of Abstraction"; Comaroff and Comaroff, *Millenial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism*; Simon. Coleman, *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

an imported religion to their own purposes."[919] For Emilio Willems, for instance, pentecostal leadership experience teaches values of equality regardless of wealth, educational background, or occupation and non-hierarchical ritual provides a training ground for democracy.[920] Likewise, several scholars argue that in spite of its lack of articulated social ethic, pentecostal practices function to transform the economic lives of its practitioners. As a modern day protestant work ethic, the frugality and mutual aid within pentecostal communities might bring about class mobility.[921] According to D'Epinay, "by teaching industriousness at work, refusal to waste anything and thus a kind of asceticism, pentecostalism, like all other forms of Protestantism, enables its members to improve their personal position…" But not just personal change. "By creating an improvement in living conditions for thousands of families, pentecostalism works towards the transformation of the whole of Chilean society."[922] On the other hand, Bryan Roberts suggests that pentecostals seem to endure poverty better than other religious groups, but not necessarily overcome it.[923] And Mariz says their local influence on capitalist structures matters but no more than other religions.[924] For the most part, there is little definitive, except that pentecostalism comes glued to change, perhaps as a cause, perhaps effect, perhaps conservative, perhaps something else.

For women, however, in some cases, pentecostalism might provide some

---

[919] Stoll, *Is Latin America Turning Protestant?,* xvi.
[920] Emílio. Willems, *Followers of the New Faith; Culture Change and the Rise of Protestantism in Brazil and Chile*. (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 1967).
[921] Martin, *Tongues of Fire*.
[922] Lalive d'Epinay, *Haven of the Masses*, 146.
[923] Mariz, *Coping with Poverty*, 42.
[924] Mariz, *Coping with Poverty*.

liberation from hierarchies. Religion has often offered a space of power for women otherwise constrained by patriarchal norms. Further, there is a case to be made for the power of submission as an active and creative element in an agential life – which I discuss elsewhere.[925] But, more specifically, Elizabeth Brusco argues that, in the context of poverty and machismo, pentecostal rupture and refiguration is good for women, and perhaps families, in very concrete material terms.[926] For instance, pentecostalism has claimed tremendous success in its drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs. It makes sense that a trance-like experiences of drugs or alcohol could be replaced by similar ones, only now framed as a gift of the Spirit. AG runs a drug (and queerness) rehabilitation program across the globe called Teen Challenge that claims roughly 1000 residential programs. Of the first 5 preachers I met in the US, 4 were ex cocaine addicts. Perhaps the new experience is better for family life in a context where drugs and alcohol combine with poverty to make life difficult?

Quite simply, according to Brusco, in Columbian pentecostal households, 20 to 40% of the household budget is no longer consumed by a husband in the form of alcohol. Pentecostal ascetic codes also stifle other extra-household consumption that, she says, characterizes Columbian masculinity: smoking, gambling, and visiting prostitutes. Thus, she says, Columbian pentecostalism, "can be seen as a 'strategic' women's movement… because it serves to reform gender roles in a way that enhances female status… as an antidote to machismo…"[927] She argues that, because machismo

[925] See Chapter 7
[926] Brusco, *The Reformation of Machismo*.
[927] Ibid., 5–6.

flourishes in the contradictions between the different relationships men and women take vis a vis the expansion of modern individualism, the fact that evangelicalism changes both men and women, not simply women - as Brusco describes western feminism - means that pentecostalism becomes, "as desirable to women in terms of improving their conditions (and surely to some men) as any feminist reform movements I know of… something that Western feminism, despite having labored mightily, cannot claim to have achieved to the same degree."[928] Aside from scholars restating Brusco's "pentecostal gender paradox," the consensus among several thinkers that pentecostalism can benefit poor women, there is little agreement on its effect upon the subaltern more generally.[929]

This debate over pentecostal politics, as a subaltern movement with tools in excess of language, is made more confusing by recent arguments that the foundational claim – poverty, or subalternity – is mistaken. Grant Wacker hopes to upend much of this discussion by arguing that US pentecostals, in fact, are not especially poor, not subaltern, and have never been other than "middle American." Wacker's study of the early Assemblies of God offers a critical nuance to Anderson's image of barely literate, low social status and deep levels of agrarian poverty. Wacker suggests that, "contrary to stereotype, the typical convert paralleled the

[928] Ibid., 140. Judith Stacey also sees evangelicalism subverting traditional gender roles
[929] Bernice Martin, "The Pentecostal Gender Paradox: A Cautionary Tale for the Sociology of Religion," in *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion*, ed. Richard K. Fenn (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2001).

demographic and biographical profile of the typical American in most though not quite all respects."[930]

However, Wacker's data is a bit thin for such a broad claim. He argues that although they saw themselves as outsiders, some early pentecostals were wealthy, and respected, the most famous of them lived longer than the average American,[931] they were literate as many wrote tracts, and hints about economic situations incommensurable with poverty can be unearthed from accounts of funds raised and snippets of data on jobs held. It is an impressive rooting for clarity among very little useful data. Even so, his claim has been taken up in several follow up studies.[932] There is certainly something important about questioning the conflation of enthusiastic religion and poverty. Yet, in addition to my uneasiness about Wacker's methodology, which is likely the best that can be done with existing data, current data and trends seem to push the other way. First of all, nearly every current study of pentecostals continues to describe them as poor, although that may be, as Wacker suggests, a part of the bias. But more concretely, a Pew Foundation study suggests that even in 2008, after 100 years of potential for upward mobility, US pentecostals still have significantly less higher education, are roughly 33% more likely to be poor and 50% less likely to be wealthy than the average American. And then, while relatively average economically compared to the norms in the global south, they

[930] Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*, 2001, 197–216; 205.
[931] Ibid., 206.
[932] R. G Robins, *A.J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Modernist* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2004); Randall J Stephens, *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008).

certainly are among the subaltern when considered globally.[933] In other words, while not at all monolithic, there seems evidence for at least correlation, and likely more, between pentecostalism in 2008, lower levels of education, and significantly higher levels of poverty. This is after 100 years of mutual aid and economic mobility. Their subaltern position seems likely to be preserved.

In all, perhaps subalternity plus rupture generates the "revolutionary" politics described by Hollenweger. However, much of the evidence is to the contrary. That class mobility might improve conditions for women in extreme poverty makes a great deal of sense. But, as a whole, the politics of pentecostalism is ambivalent, deeply uncertain, and in most analyses, primarily right wing. The subaltern speaking in tongues likely opens vast new spaces for speaking and mobilizing, but that trajectory - its political implications - seem far from clear.

Is There A Politics Here?

More abstractly, post-structuralism suggests that limit-experience and the social transformation it engenders provides possibility. A debate thus emerges between those that see degridding as either innately healthy, as simply healthy within the clutches of modern discipline, or subalternity, or not at all healthy when purified of its dialectic with structure. However, I show that right wing politics can emerge from those valorizing immediacy as well as denigrating it. In other words, the politics likely resides someplace other than the question of either immediacy or mediation.

[933] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals*., 36–37.

The simplest argument, of course, rests on body foundationalism in which the gridding of society is removed from the pure body and something healthier is necessarily revealed.[934] The same logic applies to neovitalist stories of the originary flow or energy that might be released, as with Deleuze or Braidotti.[935] However, one of the foundational arguments of my project shows bodies cultivated over time. If that claim is well founded, then it doesn't really matter if there is or isn't a healthy flow at the core, for by now we are new creatures, the product of thousands of years of nurturing and containing. If epigenetics can be solidified and transmitted across generation, think of the changes possible over centuries.[936] In other words, if there is an originary flow or body, we likely do not have access to it unmodified, so the question of health is better asked within our cultivated possibilities.

For others, the escape from modern gridding is context enough to prove a politics. For instance, William Connolly suggests that regardless of flow, there is something generous in the impulse towards uncertainty. Thus privileging "becoming" over "sediment" he very explicitly claims uncertain foundations as generating an ethical good. Similarly, for Badiou, and Zizek, the power of the event breaks out of modern habituation regardless of its origin. There is, however, no coherent ethical argument here – as many have observed, no reason to distinguish between the evental qualities of Nazism, the French revolution, or love - different is simply assumed to be better. And the ethics of uncertainty seem quite variable.

---

[934] Jackson, "Knowledge of the Body."
[935] Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*.
[936] Carey, *The Epigenetics Revolution*.

David Hoy, however, takes the case one step further and argues that, given the power of modernity to control, rupture is a necessary element. Critique is crucial regardless if it lacks clear direction.[937] In other words, contingency, flow and rupture might offer a useful opening for political refiguration in the context of a modern control society where hegemony provides any form of resistance a modicum of political direction simply through its role in disjuncture.

Others disagree. Talal Asad points out that contingency might be seen as the positive spin on precarity, which is a bit more difficult to valorize.[938] Mazarella argues that efforts to purify pure desire (and I would assume bodies as well) are mistaken. He says mediation between order and desire is the basis for human community, and health.[939] As such, Mazarella borrows a page from Bruno Latour's critique of modern purification, only aimed at neovitalism instead.[940] Terry Eagleton provides a much more aggressive analytic when he critiques what he calls a Tel Quel group model for revolution as, "ceaseless disruption and overturning" that "betrays an anarchistic suspicion of institutionality as such, and ignores the extent to which a certain provisional stability of identity is essential not only for psychical well–being but for revolutionary political agency." However much Eagleton mistakenly conflates anarchism with its individualistic subset, his overall challenge has some traction. As he continues, "It contains no adequate theory of such agency, since the

[937] Hoy, *Critical Resistance from Poststructuralism to Post-Critique*.
[938] David Scott and Charles Hirschkind, *Powers of the Secular Modern Talal Asad and His Interlocutors* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006).
[939] William Mazzarella, "Affect, What Is It Good For?," in *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. Saurabh Dube (New Delhi; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2009).
[940] Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*.

subject would now seem no more than the decentered effect of the semiotic process; and its valuable attention to the split, precarious, pluralistic nature of all identity slides at worst into an irresponsible hymning of the virtues of schizophrenia. Political revolution becomes, in effect, equivalent to carnivalesque delirium; and if this usefully reinstates those pleasurable, utopian, mind–shattering aspects of the process which a puritanical Marxism has too frequently suppressed, it leaves those comrades drearily enamored of 'closure' to do the committee work, photocopy leaflets and organize the food supplies."[941] Eagleton thus equates rupture with apolitical chaos as well as the inability to function in any significant organizational capacity. Interestingly though, pentecostals do the dreary work of organizing, they do the day to day. But they also do the rupture. In doing so, they are far more effective at mobilization than most 20th century organizing efforts. But perhaps the drudgery breeds conservatism?

It is true that, in most situations, pentecostalism leans way to the right.[942] Further, it is not simply the rule bound elements that move this way, but also the ruptural. This seems odd, how can conservatism validate change so explicitly? It sounds oxymoronic. However, plenty of other right wing politics also valorize immediacy or challenge rationalism. Think of Carl Schmitt's "unmediated immanent life" in the *Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*.[943] Or Mike Oakshott's conservative

[941] Eagleton cited in Hoy, *Critical Resistance from Post-structuralism to Post-Critique*, 209.
[942] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals*.; Seaman, *Swaggart*; Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*; Diamond, *Not by Politics Alone*; McGirr, *Suburban Warriors*.
[943] Carl Schmitt, *The crisis of parliamentary democracy* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985).

antidote to the "rationalism in politics" in which he posed a practical knowledge – again – practice is not a politics.[944] Jeffrey Herf explains that "experience" was key to defenders of "reactionary modernism" in early 20th century Germany.[945] As Mazzarella points out, "romantic-intuitionist refusals of analytic critique appeal as much to the authoritarian as to the anarchist imagination…"[946] In other words, there is little historical support for the idea that simply valorizing change gets at something more democratic, or less oppressive.

Further, the same can be said for the rationalist side of things. There is little evidence that mechanical ritual supports especially conservative politics, however technocratic it gets. Just as ritual, or the mechanical inverse of rupture can be the foundation for health, "a natural mitigator of the harsh and unwanted aspects of modern life," it can also be a mode of violence. Tom Driver writes that "the human longing for ritual is deep," it is essentially liberating, and yet he also recognizes Gandhi but also Goebbels as differently aimed practitioners.[947] In sum, I don't buy Jane Gallop's claim that "a politics of experience, is inevitably a conservative politics,"[948] for experience can very clearly inspire radical change. But, I also don't buy its inversion by which experience is the crucial contagion that frees us from history's container. Politically speaking, both experience and rupture are empty. Politics lies elsewhere.

---

[944] Jay, *Songs of Experience*, 183,189.
[945] Herf cited in Ibid., 170.
[946] Mazzarella, "The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who's Afraid of the Crowd?," 2010, 715 and footnote 38.
[947] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, 255,258.
[948] Jane Gallop, "Quand Nos Lèvres S'écrivent: Irigaray's Body Politic," *Romanic Review* 74, no. 1 (1983): 77–83.

Those of us who study right wing movements find it difficult to link resistance, uncertainty, or the event to a particular ethics because we see these approaches to culture or being playing in all sorts of directions. We see reactionary as well as emancipatory forms of resistance. In fact, these fundamental attitudes and modes of challenging mediation do not seem to determine, or even have a crucial role, in forming violent or more peaceful and kind formations. There are kind dualists and kind holists and kind contingent immediacists and multiple mean, nasty versions of the same.[949]

Could There Be A Politics Here?

In the end, I think there are several ways to salvage a politics from the practice of encouraging visceral limit-experience. Here, I argue that there is no necessary politics of rupture as such, or of cultivated rupture as such, and very likely not even a necessary politics of cultivated rupture in the context of neoliberalism, which some have argued provides extra punch in organizing. However, while there is nothing historically unique about the importance of feeling in mobilization, I argue that there is something quite valuable about cultivating discontinuity in its systematic ability to open possibilities and garner hope.

First of all, yes - rupture can create openness. Experiences of immediacy are certainly possible, and clearly useful. If communities nurture these skills, they can be

[949] Likewise, while I absolutely value a sensory starting point for its unusual and useful analytic lens, and its potential for mobilization, perhaps the question of violence and power is not in the sensory ontology.

engaged to help break with previous traditions. As I have shown, however, they do not encourage any particular politics. But, if we add cultivation and the sedimentation of sensory aptitudes as the necessary conditions for rupture – both for making it happen and also for generalizing its effects through a movement – then is there a politics? Now we have extended the basic elements to include cultivation, which much like habituation suggests a more conservative direction, something less liable to ephemerality, less likely to change. Yet, this also is not enough for a politics – there is no reason to think that Nazism was any less effective at cultivating rupture and ritual than the anarchists of Spain.

However, adding cultivation to rupture does enhance the chances of building a movement that will function for more than a moment. The material of bodies and of their sedimented dispositions cannot be ignored. Rupture allows for new possibilities, but if they are to last more than ten minutes, they need bodies that can manage them. Why did communism fail in the USSR? One could argue, with Reich, that the imaginary was ahead of the sensorium – bodies trained in the greed and selfishness of the previous sensoria were incapable of the altruism that communism required of them. The concepts were ahead of the bodies.[950] This, perhaps obviously, leads to a prefigurative politics, one in which the cultivation of rupture, if it is to stick as an event that matters, if it is to last long enough to go through Badiou's retrospective consolidation, must be entangled in the cultivation of bodies that can handle the new, that are disposed to, or at least open to, refiguration.

---

[950] Wilhelm Reich and Theodore P. Wolfe, *The Mass Psychology of Fascism,* (New York: Orgone Institute Press, 1946).

Finally, visceral rupture likely does not provide a politics even when more specifically matched against the increased attention to controlling the visceral from the neoliberal state. However it does offer a both an example of how the sensory and the rational might effectively entangle, and a model for mobilizing that accounts for the increasing strength of the nation-state when it comes to controlling affect.[951] Claire Colebrook argues that neoliberal state power depends upon controlling emotion, and thus activists ought to turn away from sedimented political positions to emphasize shifting, and contingent, but powerful, feelings. Eric Alliez agrees that to resist the, "total managerial monitoring of the social,"[952] without returning to the compromises of the welfare state, requires attention to affect, not voluntarist decisions. In other words, an effective response to the mutations of contemporary capitalism and its new modes of containing struggle requires a shift in register. For instance, racism might be a "non-cognitive issue," best approached at the "level of affective investments."[953] Colebrook further suggests that rational political projects destabilize and lose direction when faced with fluid, affective neoliberal contexts.[954] The political problem then, is the, "mobilization of desire."[955] Further, Colebrook argues for a movement that is relatively supple, perhaps in ways that pentecostalism has evolved. For the dangers of "being identified and stable" require "a notion of redefinition that is inbuilt."[956] This certainly sounds like the beginnings of a claim that

[951] Between Eric Alliez, Claire Colebrook, Peter Hallward, Nicholas Thoburn, and Jeremy Gilbert.
[952] Alliez et al., "Deleuzian Politics?," 165.
[953] Ibid., 172.
[954] Ibid., 160.
[955] Ibid., 175.
[956] Ibid., 151.

anti-neoliberal politics might benefit from the visceral rupture of pentecostal practices. However, Colebrook also argues against Peter Hallward who suggests that politics requires concrete decisions, a plan, however provisional, and efforts at developing a collective will. He agrees that neoliberalism is especially effective at shutting down activism, but suggests that to trade decisionist and voluntaristic politics for local, contingent affect is to yield the field. We have, in effect, affect versus decision.

However, I think pentecostal practices undo the polarity between these two positions. Pentecostal practices resonate with both Colebrook's affective and self-revitalizing decentralization and Hallward's voluntarist project of consolidation. For clearly, in pentecostal mobilization, affect is inseparable from decision and voluntarism. Among pentecostals, feeling is cultivated quite systematically. If Colebrook is correct in identifying affect as the crucial site for contemporary political contest, pentecostal volitional affect might provide a way in.

Yet, without other decisions about whether or not to support contemporary political projects, there may be great potential for mobilization, but not a politics. For politics involves cutting, and cutting is a necessary part of what people do – we objectify and we solidify. Hallward's decisionism is a cutting, Colebrook's affective emphasis is crucial. Yet, any pretense to comfort with absolute flow, even under the pressures of neoliberalism, is a yielding of strategic impulse to whoever is in power at the moment. As David Hoy argues, as finite beings we cannot live with sheer multiplicity. We must delimit and narrow down our possibilities, and this happens

through the projection of a coherent interpretation."[957] As with the Hegelian anthropologists, politics, culture and even simply being all involve inevitable choices between elements of the flow, not simply riding it.[958]

Conclusion

Pentecostalism and post-structuralism share a critique of the mechanistic reductionism of modernity. They also share the sense that resistance and rupture make an effective response. Further, that limit-experiences might effectively open doors in an overly gridded context, perhaps break us out of our previous ways of being and invite the previously unimaginable, or even previously impossible, the Holy Spirit, or some other vital force. Examining scholarly accounts of pentecostalism demonstrates that this approach evokes tremendous interest in mobilization and a strong sense that pentecostal events effectively break them from hegemonic forms of control. For some, like Hollenweger, they even provide revolutionary potential. However, explored more broadly, this potential, for the most part, has not been realized, at least not yet. In fact, most pentecostal groups lean far to the right. In other words, the fact of rupture per se, and even rupture from within a context that seems especially constraining – i.e. subalternity or neoliberalism – does not provoke a particular politics. Rupture then, is politically empty. This has me wonder if any philosophy of this sort – focused on abstract questions of stasis and

[957] Hoy, *Critical Resistance from Post-structuralism to Post-Critique*, 55.
[958] Kramer, *Switchbacks Art, Ownership, and Nuxalk National Identity*; Miller, *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*.

change – provides a politics. In this case, the subaltern do often speak in tongues, and while this has not manifested a clear trajectory against the gridded oppression of modernity, the resistant evental immediacy of the project inspires tremendous mobilization.

Also, I do find rupture compelling in that politics, on a given scale, involves decisive action in the face of ambivalence. Regardless of the fuzzy boundaries that multiple analytic scales make visible, to act is to overcome uncertainty, to inhabit a faith in the possible, or perhaps "staying with the trouble"[959] as we strategically essentialize – choosing fidelity to a particular scale even while recognizing its narrow domain. Rather than Badiou's schema, where he emphasizes a militant practice of fidelity to the past while waiting for the event, perhaps we cultivate the capacity or the courage to do event now.[960]

Finally, there is assuredly something enlivening about romantic, or religious, moments of connection - ecstasy is not easily denied. But, it is quite difficult to predict if vitality naturally leans towards building or breaking patterns of hegemonic control. And, of course, the training involved is just as apparent. But neither systematicity nor vitality alone have ever been the harbinger of revolt. Now if vitality or systematicity meant kindness and that could be scaled big, we might have something – but passion can mean frenzy as well as ecstasy, and system can mean methodical care or mechanical reduction. Kindness and violence involve both flow

[959] Haraway, "When Species Meet."
[960] Badiou, *Being and Event*, 111. It is a challenge Badiou recognizes, but simply disavows with no explanation. Badiou, *Philosophy for Militants*.

and shape. Thus as Mazzarella describes it, the moment of productive derailment is not outside: "rather, it is the ghost in the machine," that ties us within – this is the role of the Holy Spirit, the magnetizer, the Deleuzian, Badiouian, Reichian flow, always mediated by doctrinal commitments, always enacting them and breaking with them, yet always through them.[961]

[961] Mazzarella, "The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who's Afraid of the Crowd?," 2010, 727.

Conclusion:

Love, Secularism, and the Future of Pentecostal Cultivation

The class is "Philosophies of Praxis," and it draws the most radical of undergraduate students at UCSC. The reading: Aristotle, Feuerbach, Marx and others, all difficult, all complex, and all aimed at thinking towards a revolutionary notion of praxis joining theory and practice so as to refashion life as we know it. These are the brightest and most politically astute of 18-22 year old undergraduates at a university known for its emphasis on social justice and transformative politics. Yet, when it comes to reading Paulo Freire, something falls apart. Freire is a socialist yet deeply religious. For him, religious love and social justice are equivalent. But, my students are not having any part of it. Several can't disentangle love from sex. Some find his writing cheesy. Others deem it irrelevant. What has love got to do with revolution?

That afternoon I travel the twenty minutes to Bethany University, up to the woods to talk with a similar demographic. 18-22 years olds, mostly aspiring missionaries, taking classes on missiology, church history, and communication theory in between visits to the beach, surf ministries, and food drives. They also imagine themselves as radical. A "radical" Christianity motivates their studies, their missions, their activism - not quite a revolution, but deeply inviting to some. I sit down to lunch with three students who promptly launch into conversion testimonies, one tells of a group of friends who decided to "go for it," others on their own. But most striking, they all talk of a rich feeling of love that washes through their bodies, a sensory and emotional experience of the Holy Spirit. Love for themselves, for Jesus, or for the world more generally, the feeling is central to their efforts at transformation. And they use the word love with comfort, it is part of their project to think systematically

and seriously about how to inhabit and implement this emotional valence. I remember the UCSC students and feel a bit disloyal.

Love, of course, sings multiple valences, from the social justice emphasis of Freire to the romantic twinning of western fantasy. The pentecostals I met were not digging especially deep here. However, they were working with the concept – unlike the other activists. As such, when Talal Asad describes the particular sensibilities cultivated as secularism he might be looking to the above-mentioned aversion towards feeling among secular activists. Not that coldness, or love-aversion, is without value as an affective valence, but I do suggest that the inability to pay careful, systematic attention to cultivating the sensory and to feeling is a problem. Many think rationality alone will do fine, but this is wrong. It is, perhaps, out of balance, or more precisely, lacking tension. Pentecostals, by contrast, entangle rationality with affect both explicitly and effectively. They are unafraid to love, sing, or generate strong feeling. So strong that they often feel completely remade. At the same time, their organizing technique has been impeccable. Since at least the 1930s - the lessons of the *Pentecostal Evangel* was clear: "The most inexpensive and effective way reaching the masses is through house to house visitation. This was the Apostolic method and it is hard to improve upon."[962] Together, affect and meticulous technique - that is pretty much the message here. The question then - how broad and deep is the impact of this cultivation strategy?

[962] PE 1932_07_02 p 8

Pentecostal Effects on Evangelicalism, the Christian Right, and Global Christianity?

The major engines in this dissertation – cultivation, reciprocity, and the discontinuity and contingency of the Holy Ghost – are differently positioned to impact the world. Cultivation is the ethos and approach of a movement that has permeated many others, perhaps the modern itself. Via the pentecostalization of US evangelicalism and the vast global conversions in the late 20th century, its impact has been expanding quickly. If left unto itself, this could mean a tremendous increase in religiosity of a deeply conservative and rigid flavor. And yet, at least two factors push in other directions, towards uncertainty, change, and either broader permeation of the secular, or accommodation among pentecostals. First, the reciprocity of missions in its cycling back and forth across cultures and through institutional networks of churches and universities appears to undermine the certainty necessary for rigid fundamentalism. In the face of very simple human connection between missionary and convert augmented by networked institutions we find theologies of premillennial pessimism and innerant stasis crumbling, if slowly. Further, the role of missionary as inadvertent, but extended, cultural mediator, deeply attached to persuasion, and admired back home, means any contact entangles, decenters, and serves to refigure pentecostalism. At the same time, pentecostal cultivation comes with its own internal impulses towards uncertainty. The experience of rupture as well as triangulation with an omniscient God makes human effort and clarity contingent and potentially even problematic. Here, the seemingly non-linear and ruptural experience of the Spirit might undo predictability just enough to open space for

cultural difference and historical change to wedge its way in against the doctrine and sediment of AG practice. How this all resonates with globalization, secularism and other elements of modernity is still to be seen. Will this growth slow or continue, and either way, how changed will the grower be?

What we know: pentecostal missions have had massive effect globally. Pentecostal higher education has grown and is deeply tied to missions. Both have transformed in the face of post-colonial pressure and are influencing AG political-theology away from innerancy and premillenialism and towards a kingdom theology. At the same time, the Christian right (as I will show) is likely deeply overlapped with pentecostals. Pentecostals are still, by far, among the most conservative religious groups in the US. So, if success in missions is changing AG political theology, it is likely influencing the farthest right sector of US evangelicalism – which might be interesting to watch. Further, measuring the influence of evangelicalism and the Christian Right in the US is highly contested, whereas pentecostal growth globally is quite clearly expansive. In fact, while the US has seen the first real signs of a European-like secularism in the growth of "nones" – those with no religious affiliation – from roughly 5-20% in the past 30 years, Christianity, and religion more generally has kept pace with population growth in the rest of the world, which has required tremendous growth.[963]

[963] The U.S. Census Bureau's August 2012 Current Population Survey Pew reports that: "In the last five years alone, the unaffiliated have increased from just over 15% to just under 20% of all U.S. adults. Their ranks now include more than 13 million self-described atheists and agnostics (nearly 6% of the U.S. public), as well as nearly 33 million people who say they have no particular religious affiliation (14%). In 2007 Pew Research Center surveys, 15.3% of U.S. adults answered a question about their current religion by saying they were atheist, agnostic or "nothing in particular." The

The numbers reported for evangelical, fundamentalist, and pentecostal churches in the US have shifted rapidly. At first, reports in the late 1970s surprised scholars and the non-fundamentalist public with the strength of conservative Christianity. As data was resifted, and questions redesigned, the numbers became more contested – perhaps belief in Jesus did not translate to right wing frenzy? From the present vantage, it looks as though the crucial elements to notice involve a growing interest in compassion ministries amongst evangelicals, a rapidly growing sector of "nones" with no religious affiliation, and three debates; one over the political and cultural inflection of non-liberal Christianity; another over the influence of evangelical, fundamentalist, charismatic churches and para-church groups; and another over the influence of pentecostalism in those churches. Overall, since the 1970s the number of born-again Protestants who were described as connected to the Christian Right hovered between 7 and 40% of the US depending upon the questions

---

number of religiously unaffiliated respondents has ticked up each year since, and now stands at 19.6%. The General Social Surveys (GSS), conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago for roughly four decades, show that the number of religiously unaffiliated adults remained below 10% from the 1970s through the early 1990s. The percentage of religiously unaffiliated respondents began to rise noticeably in the 1990s and stood at 18% in the 2010 GSS. The Protestant share of the population, by contrast, has been declining since the early 1990s. In the GSS, about six-in-ten adults identified as Protestants in the 1970s and 1980s. By 2000, however, 54% of GSS respondents were Protestant. And in the 2010 GSS, 51% of respondents identified themselves as Protestants." Pew Research Center, "'Nones' on the Rise," *Pew Research Center's Religion & Public Life Project*, October 9, 2012, http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/. In an extreme contrast, Baylor offered a more recent study of few thousand participants to refute the Pew findings. "The number of atheists in America has remained steady at 4 percent since 1944, and church membership has reached an all-time high. Inaccurate perceptions exist in part because traditional surveys do not ask respondents enough questions to accurately sort out religious affiliations. Johnson noted that some of the 'nones' — those who report no religious affiliation — indicated not only that they regularly attended church but even provided the name and address of their church. "The knee-jerk reaction that all "nones" are unaffiliated — or atheist — is false." Terry Goodrich, "Baylor Researcher Refutes Reports of Religion's Decline in America," *Baylor University Media Communications*, September 25, 2014, http://www.baylor.edu/mediacommunications/news.php?action=story&story=146819.

posed.[964] A growing percentage of these was pentecostal, or charismatic. Most importantly, these numbers trace a vast range.

Data beginning with the late 1970s and running to the mid 90s simply showed growth. A 1979 Gallup Poll called one of every 5 adults 18 years and older "evangelicals" - 31 million people – and said more than one third of adults had a life-changing religious experience, more than 8 of 10 people believe Jesus Christ is divine, 65 million believe the Bible is inerrant, and 84% see the 10 Commandments as valid today.[965] In 1981 Gallup said 40% of the American public claim that the Bible is the "actual word of God is to be taken literally, word for word." Ten years later, the 1992-3 Barna Report agreed. They reported that 40% of US adults made a personal commitment to Jesus, which, in a seemingly rapid rise, was 5% more than 1991.[966] By 1996 the Pew Research Center found conservative, white, evangelical Protestants, "the most powerful force in politics today," representing 24% of registered voters - up from 19% in 1987.[967] In the same year, Barna had 66% of adults claim a, "personal commitment to Jesus Christ that is still important in their life today," up from 60% in the 1980s.[968] Mark Shibley said that from 1971 to 1990 evangelical churches added more than 6 million new members while moderate

---

[964] One obvious challenge, Gallup, Baylor and Pew, the major institutions studying religion in the US, are all evangelically led groups who put out data so as to inspire evangelism. But it is as good as it gets.

[965] "*The Christianity Today* – Gallup Poll: an overview," *Christianity Today*, 21 December 1979, 1666-8

[966] George. Barna, *The Barna Report 1992-1993: An Annual Survey of Life-Styles, Values and Religious Views* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1992), 141.

[967] Andrew. Kohut, *The Diminishing Divide: Religion's Changing Role in American Politics* (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000).

[968] Cited in Diamond, *Not by Politics Alone*, 9.

Protestant churches lost about 2.6 million members. However, not incidentally, he noted that this was, "not because they are 'strict'; they grow by becoming more like the culture, not less."[969] During the same time, evangelical higher education expanded as well – far faster than secular schooling. The Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, reported that while from 1990 to 2006, public universities grew by about 13% and other private colleges by about 28%, enrollment at CCCU schools grew by nearly 71%.[970] Sociological conclusions suggested massive evangelical power. As Hunter's previous claims seems realized: "Evangelicalism has remained a cognitive minority but has emerged as a sociocultural majority."[971] In all, evangelicalism seemed huge, politically important, and growing rapidly.

The relationship between these numbers and pentecostalism, however, is difficult to discern. Subjective statements abound. Joel Carpenter's is symptomatic of a clear trend: "We are now entering a new chapter of evangelical history, in which the pentecostal–charismatic movement is quickly supplanting the fundamentalist–conservative one is the most influential evangelical impulse at work today."[972] The "pentecostalization" of Catholicism and evangelicalism is another often discussed impression. Some reports suggest that the NAE is now more than 80% pentecostal and charismatic.[973] We do know that depending upon your counting methods, global pentecostalism (which includes charismatics) is counted as roughly half a billion

[969] Mark A. Shibley, *Resurgent Evangelicalism in the United States: Mapping Cultural Change since 1970* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 27.
[970] Joeckel and Chesnes, *The Christian College Phenomenon*, 11–12.
[971] Hunter, *American Evangelicalism*, 47.
[972] Carpenter, *Revive Us Again,* 237–8.
[973] Cloud, *The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement*.

participants and growing rapidly. The Pew 2006 report found 23 % in this category. (5% of the US pentecostal and 18% charismatic). At the same time it showed pentecostal numbers for Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, Kenya, Nigeria and the Philippines at 72, 59, 58, 50, 48, and 37% of their populations.[974] Her are the vast majority of the roughly 500 million pentecostals.

We also know that, on average, US pentecostals still, to some degree, fit the stereotype of passionate believers, active participants, poor, uneducated and culturally conservative. Pentecostals are far more likely than other Christians to attend church regularly, to experience God directly through tongues, prophesying or other signs of the Spirit, to watch religious media, evangelize non-believers weekly, believe in innerancy, miracles, and active angels and demons, and to be intolerant of homosexuality, (34% saw AIDS as God's punishment), abortion, Palestinian rights, and alcohol use while expecting religious leaders to follow Christian values. In the US, 76% claim innerancy, compared to 35% amongst all US Christians. Deeply attached to freedom of religion but not freedom of speech, 90% believe in the rapture. While 33% say they speak in tongues weekly or more, it is unclear if this is a change from the past. And when measuring signs of the Spirit as part of religious service (tongues and other), the US moves to 51% participation and other countries up to 79%.[975]

The education numbers are significant as well for they show lower levels of education than the average in the US. According to Pew, pentecostals are 20% more

[974] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals*.
[975] Ibid.

likely than the average US citizen to have only a high school degree, and 17% less likely to have completed college or more. They are about 10% more likely to be low income and 10% less likely to be high income than the average. Yet, it seems that they do not conform to Thomas Frank's stereotypes of neoliberal dupes, at least to any greater extent than the rest of society. For instance, their sense that they ought to work for justice for the poor is equivalent or better than other Christians. And, they are 8% more likely than other Christians to think women ought to be pastors, although 20% more likely to think women must obey their husbands.[976] In all, pentecostals are relatively undereducated and poor and their politics would likely fit well within the Christian Right. It also seems likely that many of the wealthy and more highly educated among them share the same politics. One has to wonder how much of Bethany's position as a political-cultural outlier within pentecostalism is in the education, its liberal arts focus, the class structure or the focus on evangelism.

In fact the most striking data in the past few years suggests both that secularism is emerging in the US, and that pentecostals are central to the Christian Right. Recent surveys show a massive increase in the new category of "nones" and they also reassess the connections between born-again beliefs and politics. The General Social Surveys (GSS), conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago showed folks unaffiliated with religion at below 10% from the 1970s through the early 1990s, but by 2010 the number was nearly 20%.[977] At the same time, new studies show that, in spite of tremendous belief in God, innerancy,

[976] Ibid.
[977] Pew Research Center, "'Nones' on the Rise."

and Jesus' divinity, only 7-9% of the US fit the more nuanced characteristics now attributed to the Christian Right.[978] In other words, while secularism is likely growing in the US, the Christian Right is probably far smaller than projected, and lots of born-again believers have moderate politics. But key as well, pentecostals might play a major role in the Christian Right. For if pentecostals and charismatics make for 23%[979] of the US and are deeply conservative and the Christian Right is only 7-9% of the US, there is likely a great deal of overlap. Just by itself, AG includes a bit over 1% of the US population.[980] In other words, pentecostal culture and even AG culture likely matters to the Christian Right in the US, not simply to global evangelism.

Impact of Bethany Pedagogy: From Fundamentalism to Evangelicalism

If AG matters in global evangelism and in the Christian Right, it is still unclear how significant Bethany's evangelically tinged pedagogies have become within AG. Bethany University seems a bit of an anomaly in the AG culture – at least that is the impression I got from broader studies of AG communities and conversations with faculty. Just looking quickly at AG's addiction rehabilitation program (for "homosexual" and alcohol addiction), one can see extremes of rote learning and rigid psychological control taught through a massive institution, very

[978] Smith, *American Evangelicalism*; Christine Wicker, *The Fall of the Evangelical Nation: The Surprising Crisis inside the Church* (NY: HarperOne, 2008); David T. Olson, *The American Church in Crisis: Groundbreaking Research Based on a National Database of over 200,000 Churches* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008).
[979] Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals*., 4.
[980] http://www.ag.org/top/About/Statistics/index.cfm

different from the Bethany ethos.[981] However, within the missions world and AG higher education, Bethany may exemplify longer term trends towards evangelicalism - cultural sensitivity, kingdom theology and crisis pedagogy. Marilyn Alplanalp leads AGs central higher education support system, a team of administrators who collect data from and give advice to AG's multiple universities. She explains that crisis pedagogy is more than Bethany's project, but permeates all of AG's liberal arts higher education. "Higher Ed is all about you coming out of your rather provincial world and meeting a new one, hopefully knowing how to think critically in so many ways that is different from the local church." With broader trends in the US rapidly putting higher education at the fore, this influence could continue and grow. Rote fundamentalist bible colleges provide another possible trajectory as well.

The only other significant evidence I collected about the effects of liberal leaning approaches to higher education in AG comes from the battle between the evangelical liberal arts college Evangel University and its fundamentalist neighbor Central Bible College (CBC), both AG universities in Springfield, Missouri. At the same moment that NCN watched Bethany die, Evangel merged with CBC. CBC became a subsidiary, its campus no longer independent and many of its alumni cried foul. The CBC Facebook page traces roughly the same set of arguments as Bethany's Facebook.[982] The rage over bad budgeting, weak theology and deploying bureaucracy over spirit runs just like at Bethany. But here the fundamentalists are angry that their

[981] 223 centers in North America with the capacity to sleep over 7,536 people http://www.truthwinsout.org/blog/2011/01/14007/

[982] The CBC Facebook pages are available in the Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center in Springfield MO.

sensibilities are being given short shrift while the administrators claim that merger was a logistical and budgetary necessity. In other words, the result was different, for even if CBC's budgetary woes were real, and the merger does actually support a more vital blend of practical theology and liberal arts education, it is a case in which evangelicalism gained the upper hand. Evangelicals got the name, the top administrators and the ethos.

In fact, the new AG national leadership seems increasingly highly educated, cosmopolitan, and interested in entering American culture – willing to put their theology at risk. Perhaps this is confidence, or perhaps a rash move. In either case, the choice here was to keep Evangel whole and let CBC's sensibilities find a new outlet. Since they ostensibly taught the same material, there was no need for two of the same colleges in the same town. Yet, their approaches differed tremendously. The difference was very much about a way of touching and feeling the world, a set of entrained dispositions that were easily recognizable to the participants but did not translate well in the public debate.

George Wood, the current AG president, made the call to close CBC. If indicative of his general direction, it could mean a deep influence for Bethany-styled pentecostalism. This is difficult to discern – it is clear that, at least in Southern Texas, a fundamentalist movement to unseat him is growing. Wood certainly is more comfortable with the evangelical ethos than the fundamentalist version. As early as 1983, in the Spiritual Life Committee report that he led, he called for ecumenicism and continued rupture. According to the report, AG ought to, "encourage national,

district, and local leadership to continue and deepen ties of fellowship with Christians and Evangelicals and/or charismatic churches outside our fellowship. We believe there is much profit in the learning and sharing which occurs across church traditions and ecclesiastical boundaries…" It is not accepting of Muslims or Jews, but perhaps offers a flavor of openness. And then to the challenge of change, "As a revival movement, the things of God must itself stay continually open to revival." Wood argues that the Spirit is, in itself, an opposition to bureaucracy. "[The church] must not formalize or routinize the Spirit. It must not take pride in its acceptance, accomplishment, or gain; but offer itself in fresh humility to God than simply a vessel through which he can pour forth the Spirit upon all flesh."[983] How this translates to everyday AG policy is an open question, although Evangel's survival and expansion is one sign.

Are Young Evangelicals Skewing More Liberal

In fact, there may be a generational shift within evangelicalism, away from the harshest of fundamentalisms and towards compassion ministries. This is most evident in softening lines against homosexuality and tremendous rates of participation in short term service missions built around rhetorics of anti-poverty.[984] However, exactly how much evangelical politics have changed is unclear. I certainly had 18

[983] Poloma, *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, 180.
[984] Wuthnow, *Boundless Faith.*

year olds telling me how they were not going to be the fighting fundies of their parents' generation.[985] But, the data once again is mixed.

On one hand, The Baylor Religion Survey of 2014 pushes against broad claims of transformation in terms of faith and politics. According to Baylor's analysts, young evangelicals are more likely than older evangelicals to care about the environment (57 percent versus 43 percent) and less likely to critique government intervention (52 percent versus 61 percent). But, says the Baylor study, they are still far more conservative than nonevangelicals: "Fifty-five percent of young evangelicals affiliated with the Republican Party, compared with only 21 percent of young nonevangelicals, and fully 70 percent of young evangelicals identified themselves as conservatives, compared with only 19 percent of young nonevangelicals."[986] As they conclude: "We find no strong evidence to support the notion that young evangelicals are retreating from traditional positions or increasingly adopting more liberal positions on hot-button or controversial social issues."[987]

On the other hand, a series of Pew studies suggest differently. In 2004, John C Green reported, "The most dramatic change we are seeing is generational." Among people under 30, he said, the shift has the dimensions of a "sea-change" including

---

[985] ABC *World News* ran a story titled "Are Young Evangelicals Skewing More Liberal?"

[986] "Evangelicalism Isn't Shrinking and the Young Are Not Becoming Liberals," *First Things*, accessed October 24, 2014, http://www.firstthings.com/article/2011/02/the-good-news-about-evangelicalism.

[987] "We examine two separate measures of evangelical identity as well as a wide variety of political identifications and attitudes. Our study indicates that young evangelicals (1) are significantly more likely than older evangelicals to think that more should be done to protect the environment; (2)hold views similar to older evangelicals regarding abortion, same-sex marriage, stem cell research, marijuana use, government welfare spending, spending on the nation's health, and the war in Iraq; and (3) remain significantly more conservative than nonevangelicals on these same social issues." Buster G. Smith and Byron Johnson, "The Liberalization of Young Evangelicals: A Research Note," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49, no. 2 (2010): 351–60.

increased concern over environment and social justice issues, like poverty and AIDS and a lessening of commitment to the Republican party. For, "evangelical voters remain solidly conservative and still lean Republican, but less reliably so."[988] And recent Pew studies continue to show tremendous change, as evidenced in their portrayal, challenged by Baylor, of the increase in "nones." Further, the 2012 Pew study of the unaffiliated suggests that they skew far more liberal and towards the democratic party than others.[989] In all, however, this shift, if real, is not clearly established.

Is Secularism Coming?

Thinking even bigger, perhaps it doesn't matter that pentecostals provide this lovely blend of affect and system, for secularism (manifesting as declining religious participation) will soon overcome? Perhaps the increase of "nones" suggests as much? This one I can answer with a relatively strong, "not for a long time, if at all." AG continues to grow massively across the globe and if modernity means secularism, it has a long way to go before it affects most of this organizing project. In fact, the big project in AG today is reverse missions, sending folks from the global south to the West. While currently 2,000 AG missionaries start out from the US, far more are starting out from other locations around the world. Some estimates place the number

[988] Peter Whener, "Among Evangelicals, a Transformation," *National Review* 59, no. 24 (December 31, 2007), http://eppc.org/publications/among-evangelicals-a-transformation/.
[989] http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/.

of Protestant missionaries from Africa, Asia and Latin America in 2000 at about 170,000, a bit over 70% of the world's Protestant missionaries.[990]

Further, it had been assumed that evangelicalism was on its way out, and then later that by virtue of its expansion through the 20th century pentecostalism undid the secularism thesis. I think it is a bit more complex. If secularism means rationalization or technocracy,[991] then clearly pentecostalism resonates deeply with rigorous bureaucracy. But, if secularism suggests that religion will disappear or be weakened, the answer is less obvious. Many pentecostals have chosen against dogmatic innerancy and separatism and for the road of missions and expansion - which also means transformation. Whether they can hold to something that could still be called pentecostal in 100 years is an open question. Even so, it seems likely that there is no global secularism burst coming anytime in the next hundred years.

However, the shift between fundamentalist and evangelical within AG does suggest a refiguration of what we think of as the secular. For these sensibilities differentiating evangelicals and fundamentalists do not fit within the modern and pre-modern as suggested by stories equating fundamentalism and atavism.[992] Perhaps then we have reached "postsecularity" when, " the modern… becomes envisionable without the secular," what Rosi Braidotti calls, "this historically novel disarticulation between the modern and the secular."[993] For while the late 20th century has shown

---

[990] McClung, *Azusa Street and beyond*. The Role of the Majority Church in Missions Reuben Ezemadu 245

[991] Gorski, "Historicizing the Secularization Debate."

[992] They may better sit within the modern and the post-modern. But either way, there is no confluence here of modernization and secularity.

[993] Braidotti, "In Spite of the Times," 59.

that previous narratives of a linear *telos* towards irreligious secularity in the US missed a good part of the boat, a significant lack of clarity around the relationship between modernity and secularism remains. Are they complementary, necessary partners, or completely distinct? In this story of Bethany, two deeply religious groups battle for control over the higher education project within AG. Both grasp at something easily called modern, one emphasizing positivist innerancy and a contemporary culture of wealth, another focused on complex critique and analysis. Here, the modern and the religious are not poles for antagonism.

In fact, the determinate factors differentiating one trajectory from another elide questions of the modern or of the religious and instead hinge on two separate collections of sensibilities for approaching the world. The evangelical emphasizes relational communication rather than the clear articulation of the protected self foregrounded by the other, the fundamentalist. Evangelical crisis pedagogy emphasizes the experience of students who face the outside world, and opposes the rote learning of the fundamentalist project. Evangelicals inculcate critique. Fundamentalists oppose it. Yet, neither yields their Christianity, their exceptionalism, their missions, or their contemporaneity. And for those secularists among you who find evangelical fluidity appealing, remember, it is fluidity in the service of conversion – not for its own sake.

This story further challenges previous notions of the modern and the secular as separate, for evangelical-pentecostals simply dispense with separate spheres. They bring the spiritual into all of life. In contrast with the fundamentalist distinction

between missionary and liberal arts education, the evangelical approach to missions wants everyday elements of life suffused with spirit. AG's academics argue this clearly. Charlie Self, for instance, argues against full time missions as opposed to missions integrated into other careers. For Self, with full time missions staff, "the radical nature what Jesus taught is subverted by hierarchy." Life divides into the spiritual and the quotidian. Instead, he says, "never use the word full-time ministry. Tell me your calling, your focus." Everett Wilson agrees, explaining that missions "is" training doctors and nurses. "Young people today look at whatever they do as mission." He references the new director of missions, Greg Mundis, who advocates a business-mission blend: "under Mundis the whole idea of business as mission: learn how to fish. Folks say please don't send us missionaries with no careers? … They want educated folks. They want learning. They wish to carry on professional lives. That's where we're finding all of our success." Likewise, Ben Aker, AGTS faculty, suggests building "relationships much broader and more biblical that can even involve lay ministry. Or being doctors or lawyers… the whole perception of missions is changing and the engine behind the change is culture." If secularism means finding the religious in the internal sublime or private devotion, there is a push here to do the opposite – to spiritualize the mundane.

For some scholars, postsecularism suggests an openness to religiosity in the future, where contemporary technology and rationality sit comfortably, maybe even in resonance, alongside passionate faith.

Cultivation

Cultivation describes the process of nurturing this coconstitutive enmeshment between modern systematicity and the visceral and affective elements of movements like pentecostalism. Cultivation here involves conjoining the Holy Spirit's fluid, ruptural, uncertainty to systematic execution. It also means methodically nurturing evolutionary processes of sensory development. Cultivation then is a kind of inhabitation – not simply passive, but actively engaging within an enabling and appealing structure. As Hodges explains, "The prominence given to the role of the Holy Spirit should not lead us to believe that the human role is one of complete passivity. There is need for engaging all of our mental, physical, material, and spiritual powers in the planning and execution of God's work."[994]

There is something important about community level organizing where the web of cultivation enters the space in-between individual subjects and broader disciplinary structures – it seems a place of vitality and a scale of analysis that offers important insight into the ways humans build lifeworlds. If Charles Taylor's vision of "The Age of Mobilization" has traction, then the last 150 years, the long 20th century, has been a moment with especially powerful realization of collective agency.[995] Likewise, Michel Foucault's vision of modern discipline implies something especially grouped and striated.[996] Cultivation then might be seen as, not the overt force of the state, not the heroics of the autonomous individual, but the

[994] McGee, "Assemblies of God Mission Theology: A Historical Perspective."
[995] Taylor, *A Secular Age*.
[996] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*.

micro practices of power envisioned as groups learning to systematize their feelings to gain traction in the cultural milieu around them. The Great Awakenings and the pentecostal movement seem a striking example of the power of organizing by very messy, but somewhat mutual, consent that includes the power of seduction, sensation, yielding, the strength of community, the possibility of hope among suffering, and the rage at the mechanization of modern life.

Maybe cultivation is modern. Modernity is portrayed as either the mechanical death of vitality or a kind of reasonable technocracy, both in opposition to romanticism or utopianism. Think of Flaubert: "The people have had enough of poets."[997] We know this as a response to modern object making, both its vital uses and its seemingly contractive calculations. But perhaps there is a middle ground for thinking the entangling of romance and the everyday, a bit less beautiful, even full of ugly moments, a poet playfully encountering and stacking the wooden blocks of boundary, forming the collapsible membrane within which pulsation might take place, the co-emergence of spirited energy and placental sheath. This is the practical message of pentecostal utopianism. If one could only systematically line up the slow accretion of these membranes and keep them in full vitality we might have a cultivation that is neither technocratic rationalism, nor proliferating organic plenitude, something organic, but gardener-like,[998] akin to a collection of cells, something we might call, perhaps, a body.

---

[997] David Harvey, *Paris, Capital of Modernity* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 14.
[998] Bauman, *Freedom*.

Cultivation is thus another third term effort to challenge Enlightenment dualisms, but not as one might initially think. Instead of a middle ground that debunks dualism, cultivation sees both polarities as real, but made. Further, they are not necessarily the most consequential story at any given moment. Instead, as with Bell's reformulation of ritual as ritualization, the primary energy can be found in their formation and the battles over boundaries.[999] In other words, yes, lets escape the narrative where agency is immediate, autonomous, liberal, and unhindered by social constraint. But to respond with regridding, or valorization of an extended temporal scale, is to miss the lessons of the critique of Cartesianism. It is to fall again into the simplicity of hierarchical dualism. More to the point, degridding is both impossible and undesirable. In life, there is always a tension between conceptual fixity and fluidity.

Regarding politics, folks valorize one or the other, and they land in multiple places, some of which are kind and caring and others quite nasty. That is, the relative fluidity of a movement isn't telling. It describes only the current battle, certain mobilizing possibilities, and certain constraints, not a universal political path. Things are made in relationship, they are bounded and defined by others, i.e. ritualization makes both the sacred, and the profane. Likewise, the making of holism is vital, as is the making of a dualism, or a decentering. Each of these acts serve part of the political processes of a movement, and then we – social scientists – do it again in our analysis. But, to valorize one or the other as more resistant misses the historical

[999] Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*.

situation – it lacks politics. Pentecostals resist, but you may or may not like their trajectory. In other words, the energy that drives critical theorists to debunk dualisms is muted upon encounter with pentecostals whose approach is so similar to the resistors of neoliberalism, yet with such opposing trajectories.

Thus, cultivation differs from most third terms in that it holds no ethical claim to the escape from Descartes. There is nothing especially ethical about holism or about immediacy. Dualism is not automatically a bad thing or a good thing. Yes, Western thought has been dominated by especially sticky dualisms that sediment around and validate relations of power and violence – race, class, gender, sexuality and more. This has led theorists to seek alternative versions of the self and society, ways to understand the world that do not reify dualist violence. However, dualism is not the only medium for violence and dualism is not necessarily violent, dualism per se is not the problem. First, dualism simply involves separation, or object making, a basic function of all interrelating, and certainly of all politics and culture. When dualisms become the rationale for violence, they can be usefully attacked, but to simply move to something else, pluralism, holism, or something so contingent that it cannot solidify into the hammer of the state or of discipline is to miss the lesson of pentecostalism. Pentecostals attack dualisms, they aim for contingent immediacy and holism – and yet they are just as likely as any other group, more than some, to encourage violence.

Dangers of Cultivation

There is certainly risk in the term cultivation. In close resonance with its connection to refined upper class manners traced by Raymond Williams, cultivation also serves colonial missionary discourse as a metaphor for the well organized garden and the well organized soul.[1000] Properly cultivated persons were the backbone of missionary expansion and the civilization efforts of so many colonialists. Deleuze draws a stark contrast between the healthy decentered rhizome and the cultivated tree with its attendant and troubling lack of flow. He cites Henry Miller's use of cultivation as a deeply violent metaphor: "China is the weed in the human cabbage patch… Eventually the weed gets the upper hand. Eventually things fall back into a state of China… The weed exists only to fill the waste spaces left by cultivated areas."[1001] Cultivation here stands in for imperialist racism.

However, cultivation, as I see it, doesn't claim to avoid violence. Instead, the power of cultivation may emerge from its flexibility. For it provides a broad range of possibilities – from industrial agriculture to native field burning for replenishment. Thus, in addition to colonial hierarchy, cultivation can also signal uncertainty and humility, as Hogan suggests. He says, "when a man casts seeds upon the earth," things are unpredictable. "He sleeps and he wakes night and day, and the seed sprouts and grows and he does not know how it does it. The earth produces fruit with help from no one, first the shoot, then the ear, then the full corn of the ear… 'The earth

[1000] Raymond. Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).
[1001] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 18–19.

bringeth forth fruit of itself…'" He clarifies, "Please understand me, I am not pleading for a kind of 'sitting where they sit and letting God happen' kind of attitude. But what I am pleading for is that at the end of every human endeavor there must be a simple dependence upon the Holy Spirit."[1002] In other words, just as resistance and event don't make a particular politics, cultivation is not a politics either. It is a process with varying degrees of tension, flow and containment. Politics is in the cutting.

Cultivation as Utopian

Cultivation evokes possibility. The pentecostal version engendered a mobilization effectivity perhaps without precedent. It suggests that movements are spaces to develop varieties of life. In cultivating sensory aptitudes, what is possible?

We know that pentecostals teach a particular relationship between the mind and body, one that manifests very clearly in the MRIs of those speaking in tongues.[1003] Does this mean the mind–body relationship is cultivated? Or is dualism intuitive, or universal?[1004] Today's AG pentecostals in the Bethany mode are aiming for a holism - we will see if that has effects. In other words, there are likely limits to the power of cultivation – how fast can bodies change? Luhrmann talks about 6-9 months for certain dispositions.[1005] What of others? How many generations might it

[1002] McClung, *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*, 125–5?
[1003] Newberg et al., "Measurement of Regional Cerebral Blood Flow Associated with the M Technique-Light Massage Therapy."
[1004] Astuti, "Are We All Natural Dualists?"; Cohen, *The Mind Possessed*.
[1005] Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back*.

take? How long did it take for African selection cultivated by the metal axe to breed resistance to malaria?[1006] Basically, how does one measure ontological plasticity?

It is clear that given hundreds of years, disease and immunological responses become part of a human community, and extended periods of time nurture physical characteristics like height and hair and skin color. New studies are showing that change can be congealed in as little as a generation. And then, within one lifetime, we learn lots. We know we can learn trance. But more somatically, think of multiple personality disorder and its capacity to enable significant physical change almost immediately. Some suggest we can learn enough to make our bodies bleed, to help them heal, and to keep them from degenerating.

Pentecostals are the savants of this utopian practice. They engender a volitional effort to change the world through extended institutional support for prefigurative exploration that comes tied to a parallel, but differently scaled, immediate and deeply transformative non-volitional yielding to a broader power. This expanded and enhanced the modern practice of cultivating our selves, our theories of mind, and our ratios of senses. By entangling the systematic and the sensory such that bodies, minds, their relationships, their communities, and even their doctrines, intermittently crystalize and/or crack wide open, consolidate and spill over, pentecostals caught the leading edge of modern capitalist proliferation and built a highly effective model for mobilization.

[1006] Daniel Lord. Smail, *On Deep History and the Brain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 102–103.

Bibliography

Citations from the *Pentecostal Evangel,* Gospel Publishing House, Springfield Missouri

PE, 1918_10_26 p. 9

Ernest S Williams, "Have Faith in God," PE 1925_1_25, p. 2

"Fallow Ground," *PE* 1929_07_06, p. 4

PE 1929_07_20, p. 4

PE 1932_07_02 p. 8

PE 1936_10_10, p. 5

Dan Crawford, "Good News, Faith IS A ROCK" PE 1940_3_2, p. 12

W.E. Moody, "Have You Become Entangled?" PE 1940_5_4 p. 2

Alice E Luce, "The Sunday School Lesson: Jesus The Vine," PE 1941_05_41, p. 11

Figure from PE 1931_05_31, p. 11

PE 1941_5_31, p. 11

PE 1944_07_15, p. 3

Ernest S Williams, "Take Heed," PE 1954_4_4, p. 6

Albert L Hoy, "How You May Inherit the Earth," PE 1963_3_17, p. 2

PE 1967_4_9, p. 26-7

PE 1969_7_20, p. 8-9

PE 1981_10_25

Jo Ann Craver, "The Parable of the Peach Trees," PE 1984_5_20, p. 14-15

General Bibliography of Works Cited

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Time That Remains: A Commentary on the Letter to the Romans*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Ahmed, Sara. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Albrecht, Daniel E. *Rites in the Spirit: A Ritual Approach to Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Alexander, Paul. "An Analysis of the Emergence and Decline of Pacifism in the History of the Assemblies of God." *Peace Research Abstracts* 41, no. 4 (2004).

Allen, L. Dean. *Rise Up, O Men of God: The Men and Religion Forward Movement and Promise Keepers*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2002.

Allen, Roland, and Vedanayagam Samuel Azariah. *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church: And the Causes Which Hinder It*. London: World Dominion Press, 1927.

Alliez, Éric, Claire Colebrook, Peter Hallward, Nicholas Thoburn, and Jeremy Gilbert. "Deleuzian Politics? A Roundtable Discussion." *New Formations* 68, no. 1 (March 1, 2010): 143–87.

Alofs, Karen M., and Norma L. Fowler. "Loss of Native Herbaceous Species due to Woody Plant Encroachment Facilitates the Establishment of an Invasive Grass." *Ecology* 94, no. 3 (2013): 751–60.

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. *Bible Believers: Fundamentalists in the Modern World*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1987.

Anderson, Allan. "Revising Pentecostal History in a Global Perspective." In *Asian and Pentecostal: The Charismatic Face of Christianity in Asia*, edited by Allan. Anderson and Edmond. Tang. Oxford, UK: Regnum Books International, 2005.

———. *Spreading Fires: The Missionary Nature of Early Pentecostalism*. London: SCM Press, 2007.

———. "The Contextual Pentecostal Theology of David Yonggi Cho." *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 7, no. 1 (2004).

Anderson, Allan, Michael Bergunder, A. F. Droogers, and Cornelis van der Laan. "Introduction." In *Studying Global Pentecostalism Theories and Methods*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

Anderson, Gordon. “Theological, Historical, and Practical Insights on Spirit Baptism.” In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God’s Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Anderson, Robert Mapes. *Vision of the Disinherited: The Making of American Pentecostalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute, 1987.

Appelby, R Scott. “Rethinking Fundamentalism in a Secular Age.” In *Rethinking Secularism*, edited by Craig J Calhoun, Juergensmeyer, and Jonathan VanAntwerpen. NY: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Arms, Phil. *Promise Keepers: Another Trojan Horse*. Houston, TX: Shiloh Publishers, 1997.

Asad, Talal. “Comments on Conversion.” In *Conversion to Modernities: The Globalization of Christianity*, edited by Peter van der. Veer. New York: Routledge, 1996.

———. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.

———. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Astuti, Rita. “Are We All Natural Dualists?: A Cognitive Developmental Approach.” *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7, no. 3 (2001): 429–47.

Badiou, Alain. *Being and Event*. NY: Continuum, 2005.

———. *Conditions*. NY: Continuum, 2008.

———. *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*. NY: Verso, 2001.

———. *Logics of Worlds: Being and Event, 2*. NY: Continuum, 2009.

———. *Philosophy for Militants*. NY: Verso, 2012.

———. *Saint Paul: The Foundation of Universalism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.

———. *The Concept of Model: An Introduction to the Materialist Epistemology of Mathematics*. Translated by Zachary Luke. Fraser and Tzuchien. Tho. Melbourne: Re.press, 2007.

———. "The Event in Deleuze." *Parrhesia* 2 (2007).

Bangstad, Sindre. "Saba Mahmood and Anthropological Feminism After Virtue." *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 28–54.

———. "Saba Mahmood and Anthropological Feminism After Virtue." *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 28–54.

Barad, Karen Michelle. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, 2007.

Barker, John. "Tangled Reconciliations : The Anglican Church and the Nisga'a of British Columbia." *American Ethnologist : The Journal of the American Ethnological Society*, 1998.

Barna, George. *The Barna Report 1992-1993: An Annual Survey of Life-Styles, Values and Religious Views*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1992.

Baron-Cohen, Simon., Helen. Tager-Flusberg, and Donald J. Cohen. *Understanding Other Minds: Perspectives from Autism*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Barrett, David B., Todd M. Johnson, and Peter F. Crossing. "Missiometrics 2008: Reality Checks for Christian World Communions." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 32, no. 1 (2008): 27.

Bartels, Larry M. "What's the Matter with What's the Matter with Kansas?" *QJPS Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 1, no. 2 (2006): 201–26.

Bassham, Rodger. *Mission Theology, 1948-1975: Years of Worldwide Creative Tension--Ecumenical, Evangelical, and Roman Catholic*. Pasadena CA: William Carey Library, 1979.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Freedom*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1988.

Bautista, Julius. "The Meta-Theory of Piety: Reflections on the Work of Saba Mahmood." *Contemporary Islam* 2, no. 1 (2008): 75–83.

Bays, Daniel. *The Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home : Explorations in North American Cultural History*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2003.

Beaver, R. *All Loves Excelling American Protestant Women in World Mission,*. Grand Rapids Mich.: Eerdmans, 1968.

Bebbington, D. W. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens, and Scott Lash. *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Beidelman, T. *Colonial Evangelism : A Socio-Historical Study of an East African Mission at the Grassroots*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

Bell, Catherine. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Berger, Peter L. *A Rumour of Angels: Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural*. London: Allen Lane, 1970.

———. *The Sacred Canopy; Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion,*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967.

———. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism." *Social Research* 51, no. 1/2 (1984): 367–85.

Bergson, Henri. *Matter and memory*. New York: Zone Books, 1988.

Berlant, Lauren. "Affect Is the New Trauma." *The Minnesota Review* 2009, no. 71–72 (2009): 131–36.

Berlin, Isaiah. *The Roots of Romanticism*. Edited by Henry Hardy. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Bialecki, Jon. "Disjuncture, Continental Philosophy's New 'political Paul,' and the Question of Progressive Christianity in a Southern California Third Wave Church." *American Ethnologist* 36, no. 1 (2009): 110–23.

———. "The Bones Restored to Life: Dialogue and Dissemination in the Vineyard's Dialectic of Text and Presence." In *The Social Life of Scriptures Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Biblicism*, edited by James S Bielo. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2009.

Blake, Amanda. "Developing Somatic Intelligence: Leadership and the Neurobiology of Embodied Learning." *Stonewater & Strozzi Institute*, 2009.

Blencowe, Claire. *Biopolitical Experience: Foucault, Power and Positive Critique*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

———. "Biology, Contingency and the Problem of Racism in Feminist Discourse." *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 3–27.

Bloch, Marc. *French Rural History: An Essay on Its Basic Characteristics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

Blumhofer, Edith Waldvogel. *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

———. *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

———. *The Assemblies of God: A Popular History*. Springfield, Mo.: Radiant Books, 1985.

Bordo, Susan. *Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Bosteels, Bruno. *Badiou and Politics*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2011.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *La Noblesse d'Etat: Grandes écoles et Esprit de Corps*. Paris: Les Editions de minuit, 1989.

———. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

———. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.

———. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. *Protestants in an Age of Science the Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977.

Brahinsky, Josh. "Cultivating Discontinuity: Pentecostal Pedagogies of Yielding and Control." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (2013): 399–422.

———. "Pentecostal Body Logics: Cultivating a Modern Sensorium." *Cultural Anthropology* 27, no. 2 (2012): 215–38.

Braidotti, Rosi. "In Spite of the Times: The Postsecular Turn in Feminism." *Theory, Culture & Society : Explorations in Critical Social Science*, 2008.

———. *Nomadic Subjects Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

———. "The Ethics of Becoming-Imperceptible." In *Deleuze and Philosophy*, edited by Constantin V. Boundas. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Brands Ward, Nancy. "Capital Christian Pastor Leads a New Kind of Church." *Sacramento News & Review*, July 24, 2008. http://www.newsreview.com/sacramento/capital-christian-pastor-leads-a/content?oid=697201.

Breitenbach, Esther. *Empire and Scottish Society the Impact of Foreign Missions at Home, c.1790 to c.1914*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Brereton, Virginia. *Training God's Army : The American Bible School, 1880-1940*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Brint, Steven, Schroedel, Jean Reith. *Evangelicals and Democracy in America Religion and Politics*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2009.

Brown, Norman Oliver. *Love's Body,*. New York: Random House, 1966.

Bruce, Steve. *God Is Dead: Secularization in the West*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2002.

Brumberg, Joan. *Mission for Life : The Story of the Family of Adoniram Judson, the Dramatic Events of the First American Foreign Mission, and the Course of Evangelical Religion in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Free Press, 1980.

Bruno-Jofré, Rosa. *Methodist Education in Peru: Social Gospel, Politics, and American Ideological and Economic Penetration, 1888-1930*. Waterloo Ont. Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1988.

Brusco, Elizabeth E. *The Reformation of Machismo: Evangelical Conversion and Gender in Colombia*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1995.

Bullock, Warren D. *When the Spirit Speaks: Making Sense of Tongues, Interpretation and Prophecy*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Pub. House, 2009.

Burgess, Stanley M, McGee, and Alexander. *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids, MI: Regency Reference Library, 1988.

Burke, Seán. *The Death and Return of the Author Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.

Busto, Rudy V. *King Tiger: The Religious Vision of Reies López Tijerina*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.

Butler, Jon. "Born Again America? A Critique of the New 'Evangelical Thesis' in Recent American Historiography." unpub'd OAH paper, 1991.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Carey, Nessa. *The Epigenetics Revolution: How Modern Biology Is Rewriting Our Understanding of Genetics, Disease, and Inheritance*. Columbia University Press, 2013.

Carpenter, Joel. "Fundamentalist Institutions and the Rise of Evangelical Protestantism, 1929-1942." *Church History.*, 1980, 75.

———. *Revive Us Again : The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Carver, William. *Christian Missions in Today's World*. First ed. London: Harper, 1942.

Casanova, J. "Religion, the New Millenium, and Globalization." *Sociology of Religion* 62 (2001): 415–42.

Cash, W. J. *The Mind of the South*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1941.

Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, 2011.

———. "Vocal Utopias: Glossolalias." *Representations.*, no. 56 (1996): 29.

Chen, Mel Y. *Animacies Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012.

———. *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2012.

Christensen, Larry. "Pentecostalism's Forgotten Forerunner." In *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, edited by Vinson Synan. Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1975.

Clark, Timothy. "Scale." In *Theory in the Era of Climate Change. Volume 1*, edited by Tom Cohen. Ann Arbor: Open Humanities Press, 2012.

Classen, Constance. *Worlds of Sense: Exploring the Senses in History and across Cultures*. NY: Routledge, 1993.

Clemens, Justin. *The Romanticism of Contemporary Theory: Institutions, Aesthetics, Nihilism*. Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.

———. "The Thought of Stupefaction; Or The Event and Decision as Non-Ontological and Pre-Political Factors in the Work of Gilles Deleuze and Alain Badiou." In *Event and Decision: Ontology and Politics in Badiou, Deleuze, and Whitehead*, edited by Roland Faber, Henry Krips, and Daniel Pettus. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010.

Cloud, David. *The Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement: The History and Error*. Port Huron, MI: Way of Life Literature, 2008.

Clough, Patricia Ticineto, and Jean O'Malley Halley. *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.

Cohen, Emma. *The Mind Possessed: The Cognition of Spirit Possession in an Afro-Brazilian Religious Tradition*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Coleman, Simon. *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff. *Of Revelation and Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

———. *Millenial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism*. na, 2005.

———. "Occult Economies and the Violence of Abstraction: Notes from the South African Postcolony." *American Ethnologist* 26, no. 2 (1999): 279–303.

———.*Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.

Connolly, William E. *Neuropolitics: Thinking, Culture, Speed*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

———. *Why I Am Not a Secularist*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Cornell, Drucilla. *The Philosophy of the Limit*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Corten, André., and Ruth Marshall. *Between Babel and Pentecost: Transnational Pentecostalism in Africa and Latin America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.

Covell, Ralph. *Mission Impossible: The Unreached Nosu On China's Frontier*. 1st ed. Pasadena CA: Hope Pub. House, 1990.

Cox, Harvey Gallagher. *Fire From Heaven: The Rise Of Pentecostal Spirituality And The Reshaping Of Religion In The Twenty-First Century*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Pub., 1995.

Cox, Jeffrey. *The British Missionary Enterprise Since 1700*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Crabtree, Loralie. *Youth Ministry Institute Manual: Bringing It All Into Focus*, 1998.

Cramer, Ken. "Preparing Yourself to Help Others." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Csordas, Thomas. *Language, Charisma, and Creativity : The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement*, 1997. http://ucsc.worldcat.org/title/language-charisma-and-creativity-the-ritual-life-of-a-religious-movement/oclc/43475125&referer=brief_results.

———. *The Sacred Self : A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

———. "Asymptote of the Ineffable: Embodiment, Alterity, and the Theory of Religion with CA Comment." *Current Anthropology.* 45, no. 2 (2004): 163.

———. *Body/Meaning/Healing*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

———. *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. *Language, Charisma, and Creativity: The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

———. "Ritualization of Life." In *Practicing the Faith: The Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin. Lindhardt. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011.

———. "Somatic Modes of Attention." *Cultural Anthropology : Journal of the Society for Cultural Anthropology*, 1993.

———. *The Sacred Self a Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Curtis, Heather D. "Pentecostal Missions and the Changing Character of Global Christianity." *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 36, no. 3 (2012).

Daughton, J. P. *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism, And The Making Of French Colonialism, 1880-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Davis, Mike. "Planet of Slums." *New Left Review* 2004, no. 26 (2004).

Dayton, Donald. "From Christian Perfection to the 'Baptism of the Holy Ghost.'" In *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, edited by Vinson Synan. Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1975.

De Landa, Manuel. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London; New York: Continuum, 2009.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

———.*The Logic of Sense*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

Deleuze, Gilles, Félix Guattari, Hugh Tomlinson, and Graham Burchell. *What Is Philosophy?* New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Dempster, Murray. *Called & Empowered : Global Mission in Pentecostal Perspective*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

———. "Christian Social Concern in Pentecostal Perspective: Reformulating Pentecostal Eschatology." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1, no. 2 (April 1, 1993): 51–64.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

———. *Without Alibi*. Translated by Peggy Kamuf. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Diamond, Sara. *Not by Politics Alone: The Enduring Influence of the Christian Right*. New York: Guilford Press, 1998.

Dochuk, Darren. *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt : Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism*. 1st ed. New York: W.W. Norton, 2011.

Donaldson, Dave. *The Compassion Revolution*. Eugene Or.: Harvest House Publishers, 2010.

Douglas, Bronwen. "Encounters With The Enemy? Academic Readings Of Missionary Narratives On Melanesians." *Comparative Studies In Society And History: An International Quarterly*, 2001.

Dresselhaus, Richard. "What Can the Academy Do For the Church?" *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3, no. 2 (July 2000): 319–23.

Dueck, Al. "Member Care." In *Evangelical, Ecumenical, and Anabaptist Missiologies in Conversation : Essays in Honor of Wilbert R. Shenk*, edited by Wilbert Shenk, 257–65. Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2006.

Durkheim, Émile. *Suicide, a Study in Sociology*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.

———. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.* New York: Free Press, 1965.

———.*The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.* New York: Free Press, 1965.

———. *The Rules of Sociological Method, and Selected Texts on Sociology and its Method*. London: Macmillan, 1982.

Dyrness, William A. *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959.

Elisha, Omri. *Moral Ambition Mobilization And Social Outreach In Evangelical Megachurches*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011.

Engelsviken, Tormod. *Spiritual Conflict In Today's Mission: A Report From The Consultation On "Deliver Us From Evil," August 2000, Nairobi, Kenya*. Nairobi Kenya: Association of Evangelicals of Africa, 2001.

Enloe, Tim. "Leading a Receiving Time." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Randy Hurst and Tim. Enloe. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

———. "Ministering the Holy Spirit Baptism in Today's Culture." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Randy Hurst and Gary Grogan. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

———. "The Nuts and Bolts of Ministering Spirit Baptism." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Randy Hurst and Tim. Enloe. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Enloe, Tim., and Randy Hurst. *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Erb, Peter C. *Pietists: Selected Writings*. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.

Erickson, Scott. "Fostering A Setting for People to Receive." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Faupel, David. *The Everlasting Gospel : The Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought*. Sheffield England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. *The Churching of America, 1776-2005 Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2005.

Finney, Charles G. *Revivals of Religion*. Virginia Beach, Va.: CBN University Press, 1978.

Fiske, Susan T., and Shelley E. Taylor. *Social Cognition: From Brains to Culture*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2008.

Flory, Richard. *Development And Transformation Within Protestant Fundamentalism: Bible Institutes And Colleges Within The U.S., 1925-1991*. University of Chicago Dissertation, 2003.

Fortun, Kim. *Advocacy after Bhopal Environmentalism, Disaster, New Global Orders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001. http://public.eblib.com/EBLPublic/PublicView.do?ptiID=557564.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1977.

———. *Society Must Be Defended*. London: Penguin, 2003.

———. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.

———.*Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

———. *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

———.*Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan : République Française, 2007.

Foucault, Michel, and Duccio Trombadori. *Remarks on Marx: Conversations with Duccio Trombadori*. New York: Semiotext(e), 1991.

Frank, Thomas. *What's the Matter with Kansas?: How Conservatives Won the Heart of America*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004.

Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Gallop, Jane. "Quand Nos Lèvres S'écrivent: Irigaray's Body Politic." *Romanic Review* 74, no. 1 (1983): 77–83.

Gayatri, Spivak. *In Other Worlds: Essays on Cultural Politics*. London: Metheun, 1987.

Gazzaniga, Michael S. *Who's in Charge?: Free Will and the Science of the Brain*. NY: HarperCollins, 2011.

Gee, Donald. *The Pentecostal Movement: Including the Story of the War Years (1940-1947)*. London: Elm Publ. Co., 1949.

Geertz, Clifford. *Myth, Symbol, and Culture.* New York: Norton, 1974.

"General Council of the Assemblies of God Minutes." General Council of the Assemblies of God, Springfield IL, 1921.

George, Randels, and Becky Beal 2002. "What Makes a Man?: Religion, Sport and Negotiating Masculine Identity in The Promise Keepers." In *In With God on Their Side Sport in the Service of Religion*, 160–77. Tara Magdalinski. ed. NY: Routledge, n.d.

Gerhold, Jim. "Communicating the Character of the Holy Spirit to Kids." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Gerlach, Luther. "Pentecostalism: Revolution or Counter-Revolution?" In *Religious Movements in Contemporary America,* edited by Irving I Zaretsky and Mark P Leone. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Geurts, Kathryn. "Consciousness as 'Feeling in the Body': A West African Theory of Embodiment, Emotion and the Making of Mind." In *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*, edited by David Howes. Oxford; New York: Berg, 2005.

Gillespie, Michael Allen. *Hegel, Heidegger, and the Ground of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Girard, René. *Deceit, Desire, and the Novel; Self and Other in Literary Structure.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.

Gleick, James. *Chaos: Making a New Science*. NY: Viking, 1987.

Glover, Robert. *The Bible Basis of Missions*. Los Angeles: Bible House of Los Angeles, 1946.

Goerner, Henry. *"Thus It Is Written" the Missionary Motif in the Scriptures,*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1944.

Goodrich, Terry. "Baylor Researcher Refutes Reports of Religion's Decline in America." *Baylor University Media Communications*, September 25, 2014.

http://www.baylor.edu/mediacommunications/news.php?action=story&story=146819.

Gorski, Philip S. "Historicizing the Secularization Debate: Church, State, and Society in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, Ca. 1300 to 1700." *American Sociological Review* 65, no. 1 (February 2000): 138.

Gourgouris, Stathis. "Antisecularist Failures: A Counterresponse to Saba Mahmood." *Public Culture* 20, no. 3 (2008).

Gramsci, Antonio. *Prison Notebooks*. Translated by Joseph A Buttigieg. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

Gregg, Melissa, and Gregory J Seigworth. *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Griffin, Allen. "Communicating the Baptism of the Spirit to Students." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Griffith, R. Marie. *Born Again Bodies: Flesh and Spirit in American Christianity*. University of California Press, 2004.

———. *God's Daughters Evangelical Women and the Power of Submission*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Gross, Edward N. *Is Charles Kraft an Evangelical?: A Critique of Christianity in Culture*. Elkins Park, PA: E.N. Gross, 1985.

Grosz, E. A. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

Grunlan, Stephen. *Cultural Anthropology : A Christian Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.

Guinness, Os. *Dining with the Devil: The Megachurch Movement Flirts with Modernity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1993.

Gunter, W. Stephen. *The Limits of "Love Divine": John Wesley's Response to Antinomianism and Enthusiasm*. Nashville, TN: Kingswood Books, 1989.

Hall, Catherine. *Civilising Subjects*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Halloy, Arnaud. "Gods in the Flesh: Learning Emotions in the Xangô Possession Cult (Brazil)." *Ethnos* 77, no. 2 (June 2012): 177–202.

Hall, Stuart. “New Ethnicities.” In *“Race,” Culture and Difference*, edited by Donald, James and Rattansi, Ali, 252–59. London: Sage, 1992.

Hallward, Peter. *Badiou: A Subject to Truth*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Haraway, Donna. “When Species Meet: Staying with the Trouble.” *Environment & Planning D: Society & Space* 28, no. 1 (2010).

———. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Hardin, Garrett. *Living within Limits: Ecology, Economics, and Population Taboos*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Harding, Susan Friend. *The Book of Jerry Falwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Hart, D. G. *Deconstructing Evangelicalism: Conservative Protestantism in the Age of Billy Graham*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004.

Harvey, David. *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Hemmings, Clare. “Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the Ontological Turn.” *Cultural Studies* 19, no. 5 (September 2005): 548–67.

Henry, Carl F. H. *Remaking the Modern Mind*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1946.

Hervieu-Léger, Danièle. “‘What Scripture Tells Me’: Spontaneity and Regulation Within the Catholic Charismatic Renewal.” In *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*, edited by David D Hall. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Heyrman, Christine Leigh. *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Hiebert, Paul. *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1985.

———. *The Gospel in Human Contexts : Anthropological Explorations for Contemporary Missions*. Grand Rapids Mich.: Baker Academic, 2009.

———. “Anthropology, Missions and Epistemological Shifts.” In *Paradigm Shifts in Christian Witness : Insights from Anthropology, Communication, and Spiritual Power : Essays in Honor of Charles H. Kraft*. Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2008.

Hill, Patricia. *The World Their Household : The American Woman’s Foreign Mission Movement and Cultural Transformation, 1870-1920*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1985.

Hirschkind, Charles. *The Ethical Soundscape Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

Hodges, Melvin. *The Indigenous Church Including The Indigenous Church and the Missionary*. Rev. ed. Springfield MO: Gospel Pub. House, 2009.

Hofstadter, Richard. *The Paranoid Style in American Politics, and Other Essays.* New York: Knopf, 1965.

Hollenweger, Walter J. “After Twenty Years’ Research on Pentecostalism.” *International Review of Mission* 75, no. 297 (1986): 3–12.

———. “Pentecostalism and Black Power.” *Theology Today* 30, no. 3 (1973): 228–38.

———. *The Pentecostals*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988.

———. “The Social and Ecumenical Significance of Pentecostal Liturgy,.” *Studia Liturgica.* 8, no. 4 (1971).

Hollywood, Amy M. *Sensible Ecstasy Mysticism, Sexual Difference, and the Demands of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Howes, David. *Empire of the Senses: The Sensual Culture Reader*. Oxford; New York: Berg, 2005.

———. *The Varieties of Sensory Experience : A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1991.

Hoy, David Couzens. *Critical Resistance from Poststructuralism to Post-Critique*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.

Huber, Mary Taylor, and Nancy Lutkehaus. *Gendered Missions: Women and Men in Missionary Discourse and Practice*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Huffman, Carey, and John Lindell. *Hungry? A Study in the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Pub. House, 2006.

Hunter, James Davison. *American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1983.

———. *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Hurst, Randy. "Foreward." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*. Translated by William Ralph Boyce Gibson. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

Hutchison, William. *Errand to the World : American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Ishii, Noriko. *American Women Missionaries at Kobe College, 1873-1909*, 1998.

Jackson, Michael D. "Knowledge of the Body." *Man* 18 (1983): 327–45.

Jacob, Margaret C. *The Enlightenment: A Brief History With Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.

James, Chrasta Michael. "Jesus People to Promise Keepers: A Revival Sequence and Its Effect on Late Twentieth-Century Evangelical Ideas of Masculinity." PhD, University of Texas at Dallas, 1998.

Jay, Martin. "Historicism and the Event." In *Against the Grain: Jewish Intellectuals in Hard Times*, edited by Ezra Mendelsohn, Stefani Hoffman, and Richard I. Cohen, 2014.

———. *Songs of Experience: Modern American and European Variations on a Universal Theme*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Jenerette, G. Darrel, and Jianguo Wu. "On the Definitions of Scale." *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 2000, 104–5.

Jenkins, Philip. *The Next Christendom: The Coming Of Global Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Jenkins, Timothy. "The Anthropology of Christianity: Situation and Critique." *Ethnos* 77, no. 4 (December 2012): 459–76.

Joeckel, Samuel, and Thomas Chesnes. *The Christian College Phenomenon: Inside America's Fastest Growing Institutions of Higher Learning*. Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2012.

Johns, Cheryl Bridges. *Pentecostal Formation: A Pedagogy Among the Oppressed*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Jones, Marge. *Psychology of Missionary Adjustment*. Springfield MO: Logion Press, 1995.

Juoni, Bill. "Encouragement in Receiving the Gift." In *Helping Others Receive the Gift: Insights on Spirit Baptism from God's Word and Personal Experience*, edited by Tim. Enloe and Randy Hurst. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 2008.

Kane, J. *Winds Of Change In The Christian Mission*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1973.

Kant, Immanuel, J. M. D Meiklejohn, Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, James Creed Meredith, Immanuel Kant, Immanuel Kant, and Immanuel Kant. *The Critique of Pure Reason.* Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1955.

Kaplan, Robert. *The Arabists : The Romance of an American Elite*. Toronto: Free Press, 1993.

Kazin, Michael. *The Populist Persuasion: An American History*. NY: Basic Books, 1995.

Keane, Webb. *Christian Moderns: Freedom and Fetish in the Mission Encounter*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Keller, Mary. *The Hammer and the Flute Women, Power, and Spirit Possession*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Kelley, Dean. *Why Conservative Churches Are Growing: A Study in Sociology of Religion*. NY: Harper & Row, 1972.

Kierkegaard, Søren, David F Swenson, Walter Lowrie, and American-Scandinavian Foundation. *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, for American Scandinavian Foundation, 1944.

Kintz, L. "Finding the Strength to Surrender: Marriage, Market Theocracy and the Spirit of America." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24, no. 4 (2007): 111–30.

Kirby, Vicky. *Telling Flesh : The Substance of the Corporeal*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Kirsch, Thomas G. *Spirits and Letters: Reading, Writing and Charisma in African Christianity*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2008.

Kohut, Andrew. *The Diminishing Divide: Religion's Changing Role in American Politics*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000.

Koop, Allen. *American Evangelical Missionaries in France, 1945-1975*. Lanham MD: University Press of America, 1986.

Kraft, Charles. *Anthropology for Christian Witness*. Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1996.

———. *Christianity In Culture: A Study In Dynamic Biblical Theologizing In Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979.

Kramer, Jennifer. *Switchbacks Art, Ownership, and Nuxalk National Identity*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006.

Kydd, Ronald. "The Contribution of Denominationally Trained Clergymen To the Emerging Pentecostal Movement in Canada." *Pneuma* 5, no. 1 (1983): 17–33.

Kyle, Richard G. *Evangelicalism: An Americanized Christianity*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2006.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jaques Lacan.* Translated by Jacques Alain. Miller, 1999.

Laclau, Ernesto. *On Populist Reason*. London; New York: Verso, 2005.

Lalive d'Epinay, Christian. *Haven of the Masses: A Study of the Pentecostal Movement in Chile;* London: Lutterworth P., 1969.

Lambert, Frank. *Inventing the "Great Awakening."* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Latour, Bruno. *An Inquiry Into Modes of Existence: An Anthropology of the Moderns*, 2013.

———. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Lennon, Kathleen, and Margaret Whitford. *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology*. Psychology Press, 1994.

Leslie, Sarah. *The Pagan Roots of Promise Keepers: Resurrecting Pagan Rites*. Cambridge: SMP, 1995.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude, and Rodney Needham. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Leys, Ruth. "The Turn to Affect: A Critique." *Critical Inquiry* 37, no. 3 (2011): 434–72.

Lillard A. "Ethnopsychologies: Cultural Variations in Theories of Mind." *Psychological Bulletin* 123, no. 1 (1998): 3–32.

Lindsay, D. *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Lindsell, Harold. *A Christian Philosophy of Missions.* Wheaton IL: Van Kampen Press, 1949.

———. *The Church's Worldwide Mission: An Analysis Of The Current State Of Evangelical Missions, And A Strategy For Future Activity.* Waco, TX: Word Books, 1966.

Li SC. "Biocultural Orchestration of Developmental Plasticity across Levels: The Interplay of Biology and Culture in Shaping the Mind and Behavior across the Life Span." *Psychological Bulletin* 129, no. 2 (2003): 171–94.

Little, Christopher. "In Response to 'The Future of Evangelicals in Mission.'" In *Missionshift: Global Mission Issues in the Third Millennium*, edited by David Hesselgrave. Nashville TN: B & H Academic, 2010.

Livingston, Paul M. "Badiou, Mathematics and Model Theory," July 13, 2011. https://www.unm.edu/~pmliving/Badiou,%20Mathematics,%20and%20Model%20Theory.pdf.

———. *The Politics of Logic: Badiou, Wittgenstein, and the Consequences of Formalism*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

López, José. *After Postmodernism: An Introduction to Critical Realism*. London: Athlone, 2001.

Luhrmann, Tanya. "Metakinesis : How God Becomes Intimate in Contemporary U.S. Christianity." *American Anthropologist*, 2004.

———. "The Absorption Hypothesis: Learning to Hear God in Evangelical Christianity." *American Anthropologist 112* 1 (2010): 66–78.

———. "Toward an Anthropological Theory of Mind." *Suomen Antro*, 2011.

———.*When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.

Lundskow, George N. *Awakening to an Uncertain Future: A Case Study of the Promise Keepers*. New York: P. Lang, 2002.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *Political Writings*. Translated by Bill Readings and Kevin Paul. Geiman. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Macgavran, Donald Anderson. *How Churches Grow: The New Frontiers of Mission.* London, 1959.

MacGavran, Donald, John Huegel, Jack Taylor, and Howard W. Yoder. *Church Growth in Mexico*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publ. Company, 1963.

MacIntyre, Alasdair C. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.

Mackenzie, Kenneth. *The Robe and the Sword the Methodist Church and the Rise of American Imperialism.* Washington,: Public Affairs Press, 1961.

Mack, Phyllis. "Religion, Feminism, and the Problem of Agency: Reflections on Eighteenth-Century Quakerism." *Signs Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29, no. 1 (2003): 149–77.

Madsen, Richard. *China and the American Dream : A Moral Inquiry*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Mahmood, Saba. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Majid, Asifa, and Stephen C Levinson. "The Senses in Language and Culture." *Senses & Society* 6 (2011): 5–18.

Makdisi, Ussama Samir. *Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the Failed Conversion of the Middle East*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Mariz, Cecília Loreto. *Coping with Poverty: Pentecostals and Christian Base Communities in Brazil*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.

Marsden, George. *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

———. *Reforming Fundamentalism : Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1987.

———. *Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids MI: W.B. Eerdmans, 1991.

Martin, Bernice. "The Pentecostal Gender Paradox: A Cautionary Tale for the Sociology of Religion." In *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion*, edited by Richard K. Fenn. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.

Martin, David. *On Secularization: Towards a Revised General Theory*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005.

———. *Tongues of Fire: The Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America*. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., USA: B. Blackwell, 1990.

Marty, Martin. *Missions and Ecumenical Expressions*. Munich: K.G. Saur, 1993.

———. “Pentecostalism in the Context of American Piety and Practice.” In *Aspects of Pentecostal-Charismatic Origins*, edited by Vinson Synan. Plainfield, N.J.: Logos International, 1975.

Marty, Martin E, R. Scott Appleby, and American Academy of Arts and Sciences. *The Fundamentalism Project*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Marx, Karl. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844.* New York: International Publishers, 1964.

Maslow, Abraham H. *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences*. New York: Penguin Arkana, 1994.

Massumi, Brian. *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.

———. “The Autonomy of Affect.” *Cultural Critique*, 1995, 83–109.

Mauss, Marcel. “Techniques of the Body (1935).” In *Sociology and Psychology: Essays. Transl. by Ben Brewster.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

———. *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Cohen & West, 1969.

Mazzarella, William. “Affect, What Is It Good For?” In *Enchantments of Modernity: Empire, Nation, Globalization*, edited by Saurabh Dube. New Delhi; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2009.

———. “Affect, What Is It Good For?,” n.d.

———. “The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who’s Afraid of the Crowd?” *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 4 (2010): 697–727.

———. “The Myth of the Multitude, Or, Who’s Afraid of the Crowd?” *Critical Inquiry* 36, no. 4 (June 2010): 697–727.

McAlister, Melani. “Guess Who’s Coming to Dinner: American Missionaries, The Problem of Racism and Decolonization in the Congo.” *OAH Magazine of History* 26, no. 4 (2012): 33–37.

McClung, Grant. *Azusa Street and beyond: Pentecostal Missions and Church Growth in the Twentieth Century*. South Plainfield, NJ: Bridge Pub., 1986.

———. *Readings in the Church Growth Dynamics of the Missionary Expansion of the Pentecostal Movement*, 1984.

McGee, Gary. “Assemblies of God Mission Theology: A Historical Perspective.” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 10, no. 4 (October 1986): 166–69.

———. *This Gospel Shall Be Preached : A History and Theology of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions since 1959*. V. 2. Springfield MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1989.

———. *This Gospel--Shall Be Preached : A History and Theology of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions to 1959*. Springfield MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1986.

———. *This Gospel--Shall Be Preached. Vols 1-2*. Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Pub. House, 1986.

———. “Assemblies of God Overseas Missions: Foundations for Recent Growth.” *Missiology: An International Review Missiology: An International Review* 16, no. 4 (1988): 427–37.

McGirr, Lisa. *Suburban Warriors : The Origins of the New American Right*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

McGuire, Meredith B. *Pentecostal Catholics: Power, Charisma, and Order in a Religious Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.

McLoughlin, William Gerald. *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham.* New York: Ronald Press Co., 1959.

———. *The American Evangelicals, 1800-1900; an Anthology.* New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

McNay, Lois. *Gender and Agency: Reconfiguring the Subject in Feminist and Social Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2000.

Meillassoux, Quentin. “Decision And Undecidability Of The Event In Being And Event I And II.” *Parrhesia* 19 (2014): 23–35.

Menzies, William. *Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God,*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Pub. House, 1971.

Menzies, William W, Wonsuk Ma, and Robert P Menzies. *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Meyer, Birgit. *Translating the Devil : Religion and Modernity among the Ewe in Ghana*. Trenton NJ: Africa World Press, 1999.

Miller, Daniel. *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*. NY: B. Blackwell, 1987.

Miller, Donald E. *Reinventing American Protestantism: Christianity in the New Millennium*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997.

Miller, Perry. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Millington, Mark. "Transculturation: Contrapuntal Notes to Critical Orthodoxy." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 26, no. 2 (2007): 256–68.

Moberg, David. *The Great Reversal Evangelism versus Social Concern*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972.

Mol, Annemarie. "GOOD TASTE: The Embodied Normativity of the Consumer-Citizen." *Journal of Cultural Economy* 2, no. 3 (November 2009): 269–83.

Moore, R. *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Moraga, Cherríe, and Gloria Anzaldúa. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press, 1983.

Moreton, Bethany. "The Soul of Neoliberalism." *Social Text.* 25, no. 3 (2007): 103.

———. *To Serve God and Wal-Mart the Making of Christian Free Enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Morris, Rosalind C, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Can the Subaltern Speak?: Reflections on the History of an Idea*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Mudimbe, V. *The Invention of Africa : Gnosis, Philosophy, and the Order of Knowledge*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. "The Surprise of the Event." In *Hegel after Derrida*, edited by Stuart Barnett. NY: Routledge, 1998.

National Association of Evangelicals. *United ... We Stand: A Report of the Constitutional Convention of the National Association of Evangelicals.* Boston: N.A.E., 1943.

National Association of Evangelicals. Conference. "Program of the Third Annual Convention [of The] National Association of Evangelicals ... Chicago, Illinois, May 1-3, 1945." The Association, 1945.

Naumescu, Vlad. "Learning the 'Science of Feelings': Religious Training in Eastern Christian Monasticism." *Ethnos* 77, no. 2 (June 2012): 227–51.

Neill, Stephen. *Colonialism and Christian Missions,*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1966.

Nelson, Lynn Hankinson, and Jack Nelson. *Feminist Interpretations of W.V. Quine*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.

Newberg, Andrew B, and Waldman. *How God Changes Your Brain: Breakthrough Findings from a Leading Neuroscientist*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2009.

———. *How God Changes Your Brain: Breakthrough Findings from a Leading Neuroscientist*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2009.

Newberg, Andrew B, Wintering N, Hutton E, Lido C, and Farrar JT. "Measurement of Regional Cerebral Blood Flow Associated with the M Technique-Light Massage Therapy: A Case Series and Longitudinal Study Using SPECT." *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine* 14, no. 8 (2008): 903–10.

Newman, Joe. *Race and the Assemblies of God Church the Journey from Azusa Street to the "Miracle of Memphis."* Youngstown, N.Y.: Cambria Press, 2007.

Nida, Eugene. "The Communication of the Gospel to Latin America." *Practical Anthropology* 7 (1960): 633+.

Niklaus, Robert. "Global Report." *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (October 1974).

Noll, Richard. "Mental Imagery Cultivation as a Cultural Phenomenon: The Role of Visions in Shamanism." *Current Anthropology : A World Journal of the Sciences of Man* 26 (1985): 443–61.

O'Hanlon, Rosalind. "Recovering the Subject Subaltern Studies and Histories of Resistance in Colonial South Asia." *Modern Asian Studies* 22, no. 1 (1988): 189–224.

Olson, David T. *The American Church in Crisis: Groundbreaking Research Based on a National Database of over 200,000 Churches*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. NY: Methuen, 1982.

Orta, Andrew. "'Living the Past Another Way:' Reinstrumentalized Missionary Selves in Aymara Mission Fields." *Anthropological Quarterly* 75, no. 4 (2002): 707–43.

Ortiz, Fernando, and Harriet De Onis. *Cuban Counterpoint; Tobacco and Sugar,*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1947.

Ortner, Sherry. "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26, no. 1 (1984): 126.

———. "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal." *Comparative Studies in Society & History* 37, no. 1 (1995).

Otto, Rudolf. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry Into the Non-rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Peel, J. *Religious Encounter and the Making of the Yoruba*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Perkin, Noel, and John Garlock. *Our World Witness: A Survey of Assemblies of God Foreign Missions*. Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Pub. House, 1963.

Peters, Joan K. "Mittelschmerz: A Lady's Complaint upon Reaching the Age of Forty-Four." *Michigan Quarterly Review.* XXIX, no. 4 (Fall 1990): 685–93.

Peterson, Douglas. "Missions in the 21st Century: Toward a Methodology of Pentecostal Compassion." *Transformation* 16, no. 2 (1999): 54–59.

Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. *Spirit and Power a 10-Country Survey of Pentecostals.* Washington, D.C.: Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, 2006.

———. *U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, 2008*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, 2008.

Pew Research Center. "'Nones' on the Rise." *Pew Research Center's Religion & Public Life Project*, October 9, 2012. http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/.

Peyer, Bernd. *The Tutor'd Mind : Indian Missionary-Writers in Antebellum America*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997.

Pfeil, Gretchen. "Imperfect Vessels: Emotion and Rituals of Anti-Ritual in American Pentecostal and Charismatic Devotional Life." In *Practicing the Faith: The Ritual Life of Pentecostal-Charismatic Christians*, edited by Martin. Lindhardt. New York: Berghahn Books, 2011.

Pierard, Richard, ed. "Pax Americana and the Evangelical Missionary Advance." In *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1990.

Pierson, Paul. "Sketching the Life of Charles H. Kraft." In *Paradigm Shifts In Christian Witness: Insights From Anthropology, Communication, And Spiritual Power:*

Essays In Honor Of Charles H. Kraft, by Charles Kraft, xxi – xxix. Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2008.

Poewe, Karla. *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture*. Columbia S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.

Poloma, Margaret. *The Assemblies Of God Godly Love And The Revitalization Of American Pentecostalism*. New York: NYU Press, 2010.

———. *Main Street Mystics: The Toronto Blessing and Reviving Pentecostalism*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2003.

———. *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads: Charisma and Institutional Dilemmas*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989.

Pomerville, Paul. *The Third Force In Missions: A Pentecostal Contribution To Contemporary Mission Theology*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1985.

Pratt, Mary. *Imperial Eyes : Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Predelli, Line Nyhagen. *Issues of Gender, Race, and Class in the Norwegian Missionary Society in Nineteenth-Century Norway and Madagascar*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2003.

Pritzker, Sonya. "Thinking Hearts, Feeling Brains: Metaphor, Culture, and the Self in Chinese Narratives of Depression." *Metaphor and Symbol* 22, no. 3 (2007): 251–74.

Prosser, Diane Louise. *Transgressive Corporeality: The Body, Poststructuralism, and the Theological Imagination*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995.

Ram, Kalpana. "How Is Afflictive Possession 'Learned'? Gender and Motility in South India." *Ethnos* 77, no. 2 (June 2012): 203–26.

Ramsey, Joseph G. "Revolution Underground? Critical Reflections on the Prospect of Renewing Occupation." *Socialism & Democracy* 26, no. 3 (2012).

Readings, Bill. *Introducing Lyotard Art and Politics*. NY: Routledge, 1991.

Regnerus, Mark. *Forbidden Fruit: Sex & Religion in the Lives of American Teenagers*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Reich, Wilhelm. *The Function of the Orgasm; Sex-Economic Problems of Biological Energy.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1973.

———.*The Mass Psychology of Fascism,*. New York: Orgone Institute Press, 1946.

Reinhardt, Bruno. “Soaking in Tapes: The Haptic Voice of Global Pentecostal Pedagogy in Ghana.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 20, no. 2 (2014): 315–36.

Rich, Adrienne. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. NY: Norton, 1976.

Robbins, Joel. “Anthropology, Pentecostalism, and the New Paul: Conversion, Event, and Social Transformation.” *South Atlantic Quarterly South Atlantic Quarterly* 109, no. 4 (2010): 633–52.

———. “Anthropology and Theology: An Awkward Relationship?” *Anthropological Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (2006): 285.

———. “Anthropology of Religion.” In *Studying Global Pentecostalism : Theories and Methods*, edited by Allan. Anderson, Michael Bergunder, A. F. Droogers, and Cornelis van der laan, 156–78. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.

———. “Continuity Thinking and the Problem of Christian Culture: Belief, Time, and the Anthropology of Christianity.” *Current Anthropology* 48, no. 1 (2007).

———. “Introduction: Global Religions, Pacific Island Transformations.” *Journal of Ritual Studies*, 2001, 15–2.

———. “On the Paradoxes of Global Pentecostalism and the Perils of Continuity Thinking.” *Religion* 33, no. 3 (2003): 221–31.

Robins, R. G. *A.J. Tomlinson: Plainfolk Modernist*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, and Donald A Cress. *On the Social Contract ; Discourse on the Origin of Inequality ; Discourse on Political Economy*. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1983.

Sahlins, Marshall David. “On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange.” *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, 1965, 139–236.

Sanbonmatsu, John. *The Postmodern Prince: Critical Theory, Left Strategy, and the Making of a New Political Subject*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004.

Sandeen, Ernest. *The Origins of Fundamentalism: Toward a Historical Interpretation,*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

Sanneh, Lamin. *Whose Religion Is Christianity? The Gospel Beyond the West*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub., 2003.

Sayre, Nathan F. “Ecological and Geographical Scale: Parallels and Potential for Integration.” *Progress in Human Geography* 29, no. 3 (2005): 276–90.

Scales, T. *All That Fits a Woman : Training Southern Baptist Women for Charity and Mission, 1907-1926*. Macon GA: Mercer University Press, 2000.

Scheve, Christian von, and Mikko Salmella. *Collective Emotions: Perspectives from Psychology, Philosophy, and Sociology*, 2014.

Schmalzbauer, John A., and C. Gray Wheeler. "Between Fundamentalism and Secularization: Secularizing and Sacralizing Currents in the Evangelical Debate on Campus Lifestyle Codes." *Sociology of Religion* 57, no. 3 (1996): 241–57.

Schmalzbauer, and Mahoney. "Religion and Knowledge in the Post-Secular Academy," 2008.

Schmidt, Leigh Eric. *Hearing Things: Religion, Illusion, and the American Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Schmitt, Carl. *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985.

———. *The crisis of parliamentary democracy*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985.

Schneider, David, and Roy Wagner. "Foreward." In *The Curse of Souw Principles of Daribi Clan Definition and Alliance in New Guinea.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Scott, David, and Charles Hirschkind. *Powers of the Secular Modern Talal Asad and His Interlocutors*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Scott, Joan Wallach. *The Fantasy of Feminist History*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2011.

Seaman, Ann Rowe. *Swaggart: The Unauthorized Biography of an American Evangelist*. New York; London: Continuum, 2001.

Sebastian, Mrinalini. "The Scholar-Missionaries of the Basel Mission in Southwest India." In *Cultural Conversions: Unexpected Consequences of Christian Missionary Encounters in the Middle East, Africa, and South Asia*, by Heather J Sharkey, 176–202, 2013.

Sehat, David. *The Myth of American Religious Freedom*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Sharkey, Heather J. *American Evangelicals in Egypt: Missionary Encounters in an Age of Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

———. *Cultural Conversions: Unexpected Consequences of Christian Missionary Encounters in the Middle East, Africa, and South Asia*, 2013.

Sharp, Hasana. *Spinoza and the Politics of Renaturalization*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Shenk, Wilbert. *The American Society of Missiology: The First Quarter Century*. Decatur, GA: American Society of Missiology, 1998.

Shibley, Mark A. *Resurgent Evangelicalism in the United States: Mapping Cultural Change since 1970*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1996.

Smail, Daniel Lord. *On Deep History and the Brain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Smedes, Lewis. "Evangelicalism - A Fantasy." *Reformed Journal* 30 (February 1980).

Smith, Buster G., and Byron Johnson. "The Liberalization of Young Evangelicals: A Research Note." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49, no. 2 (2010): 351–60.

Smith, Christian. *American Evangelicalism : Embattled and Thriving*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Smith, James K. A. *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2010.

Smith, Neil. "Contours of a Spatialized Politics: Homeless Vehicles and the Production of Geographical Scale." *Social Text*, no. 33 (1992): 54.

Spittler, R. P. "Implicit Values in Pentecostal Missions." *Missiology: An International Review Missiology: An International Review* 16, no. 4 (1988): 409–24.

———. "Are Pentecostals and Charismatics Fundamentalists?" In *Charismatic Christianity as a Global Culture*, edited by Karla O Poewe, 103–16. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.

———. "Corinthian Spirituality: How a Flawed Anthropology Imperils Authentic Christian Existence." In *Pentecostal Currents in American Protestantism*, edited by Edith Waldvogel. Blumhofer, Russell P. Spittler, and Grant Wacker. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999.

Spivak, Gayatri. *In Other Worlds : Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

———.*A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

———. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Stålsett, Sturla J. *Spirits of Globalization: The Growth of Pentecostalism and Experiential Spiritualities in a Global Age*. London: SCM Press, 2006.

Stein, Andrew. "Event and Ideology." *Culture, Theory & Critique* 53, no. 3 (2012).

Stephens, Randall J. *The Fire Spreads: Holiness and Pentecostalism in the American South*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Stewart, Charles. *Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2007.

Stoler, Ann, and Frederick Cooper. "Rethinking a Research Agenda." In *Tensions in Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeoise World*, 1–58. Berkeley: U Cal Press, 1997.

Stoll, David. *Is Latin America Turning Protestant? : The Politics of Evangelical Growth*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Stout, Harry, and Robert Taylor Jr. "Studies of Religion in American Society: The State of the Art." In *New Directions in American Religious History*, edited by D. G. Hart and Harry Stout. Oxford University Press, 1997.

Strathern, Marilyn. *Partial Connections*. Savage, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1991.

Sutton, Matthew Avery. *Aimee Semple McPherson and the Resurrection of Christian America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2007.

Sweeney, Douglas A. "The Essential Evangelicalism Dialectic: The Historiography of the Early Neo-Evangelical Movement and the Observer-Participant Dilemma." *Church History* 60, no. 1 (1991): 70–84.

Tambiah, Stanley. *A Performative Approach to Ritual*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1979.

Tarr, Delbert Howard. *Double Image: Biblical Insights from African Parables*. New York: Paulist Press, 1994.

Taves, Ann. *Fits, Trances, & Visions: Experiencing Religion and Explaining Experience from Wesley to James*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999.

———. *Religious Experience Reconsidered: A Building Block Approach to the Study of Religion and Other Special Things*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2009.

———. "The Camp Meeting and the Paradoxes of Evangelical Protestant Ritual." In *Teaching Ritual*, edited by Catherine Bell, 2007.

Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Terada, Rei. *Feeling in Theory: Emotion after the "Death of the Subject."* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Thompson, Evan. *Mind in Life: Biology, Phenomenology, and the Sciences of Mind*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.

Thorne, Susan. *Congregational Missions And The Making Of An Imperial Culture In Nineteenth-Century England*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Thornton, R. Michael. *Fire in the Carolinas: The Revival Legacy of G. B. Cashwell and A. B. Crumpler*. Charisma Media, 2014.

Tillich, Paul. *Christianity and the Encounter of the World Religions.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Towns, Elmer. *Evaluating the Church Growth Movement : 5 Views*. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 2004.

Troeltsch, Ernst, and Olive Wyon. *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005.

———. "On Nonscalability: The Living World Is Not Amenable to Precision-Nested Scales." *Common Knowledge* 18, no. 3 (September 21, 2012): 505–24.

Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process : Structure and Anti-Structure..* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

———.. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co., 1969.

Twells, Alison. *The Civilising Mission and the English Middle Class, 1792-1850: The "Heathen" at Home and Overseas*. Basingstoke [England]: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Van Der Veer, Peter. "Embodiment, Materiality, and Power. A Review Essay." *Comparative Studies in Society & History* 50, no. 3 (2008).

———. *Imperial Encounters : Religion and Modernity in India and Britain*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Wacker, Grant. *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

———. *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Waggoner, Matt. "Irony, Embodiment, and the 'critical Attitude': Engaging Saba Mahmood's Critique of Secular Morality." *Culture and Religion* 6, no. 2 (2005): 237–61.

Wagner, C. Peter. *Confronting the Powers: How the New Testament Church Experienced the Power of Strategic-Level Spiritual Warfare*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1996.

Wallace, Anthony. *Revitalization Movements*. Indianapolis IN: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1956.

Walter, Ong. "The Shifting Sensorium." In *In Howes*, 1991.

Weber, Max. *Economy and society; an outline of interpretive sociology.* New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* New York: Scribner, 1958.

Weber, Timothy. *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875-1925*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976.

Wesley, John. *Wesley's Standard Sermons Consisting of Fortyfour Discourses ... to Which Are Added Nine Additional Sermons ... Ed. and Annotated by Edward H. Sugden: Vol. 1-2*. London: Epworth, 1961.

Whener, Peter. "Among Evangelicals, a Transformation." *National Review* 59, no. 24 (December 31, 2007). http://eppc.org/publications/among-evangelicals-a-transformation/.

White, Geoffrey. *Identity Through History: Living Stories in a Solomon Islands Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Whiteman, Darrell. "Contextualization: The Theory, The Gap, The Challenge." In *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization 3 : Faith and Culture*, edited by James Scherer. Maryknoll N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1999.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wicker, Christine. *The Fall of the Evangelical Nation: The Surprising Crisis inside the Church*. NY: HarperOne, 2008.

Wiens, J.A. "Spatial Scaling in Ecology." *Functional Ecology* 3 (1989): 385–97.

Wigger, John H. *Taking Heaven by Storm Methodism and the Rise of Popular Christianity in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Wilkinson, Michael. *A Liberating Spirit: Pentecostals and Social Action in North America*. Eugene OR: Pickwick Publications, 2010.

Willems, Emílio. *Followers of the New Faith; Culture Change and the Rise of Protestantism in Brazil and Chile.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 1967.

Williams, Joseph W. *Spirit Cure: A History of Pentecostal Healing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Wilson, Dwight. *Armageddon Now! The Premillenarian Response to Russia and Israel Since 1917*. Grand Rapids MI: Baker Book House, 1977.

Wilson, Everett A. *Strategy of the Spirit: J. Philip Hogan and the Growth of the Assemblies of God Worldwide, 1960-1990*. Oxford, U.K.: Regnum, 1997.

Wimber, John. *Signs and Wonders and Church Growth*. Placentia, CA: Vineyard Ministries International, 1984.

Winkelman, Michael. *Shamanism a Biopsychosocial Paradigm of Consciousness and Healing*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010.

Winnubst, Shannon. *Queering Freedom*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G. E. M Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Wolfe, Alan. "The Opening of The Evangelical Mind." *Atlantic Monthly* 286, no. 4 (2000).

Wood, David. "The Experience of the Ethical." In *Questioning Ethics Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, edited by Richard. Kearney and Mark. Dooley. NY: Routledge, 1999.

Wood, George. "Kingdom Now and Missions." *Mountain Movers*, June 1988, 100–111.

Worthen, Molly. *Apostles of Reason: The Crisis of Authority in American Evangelicalism*, 2014.

Wuthnow, Robert. *Boundless Faith : The Global Outreach of American Churches*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

———. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Young, Michael P. *Bearing Witness against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Žižek, Slavoj. *Event: Philosophy in Transit.*, 2014.

———. *The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003.

Zwemer, Samuel. *Into All The World: The Great Commission: A Vindication And An Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 1943.

Zylinska, Joanna. *Minimal Ethics for the Anthropocene*, 2014.