

4

Borders and Abjections

Approaching Individualism in 'Pentecost'

In Chapter 1 we presented the significance of borders in 'Pentecost'. In this chapter we will set the ethnographic theory on borders in a comparative relation to other theories on borders. In the anthropology of Christianity, and in particular in the anthropology of Pentecostalism, the theory on individualism has a significant place (Bialecki and Daswani 2015; Mosko 2010; Robbins 2004 etc). In many respects, theories of individualism are also theories on borders, as they often emphasize reasons for and consequences of separation and autonomy. One might even claim that theories on individualism are among the most significant theories on borders in Western social thought, reflecting on a key concept in social theory (see, for instance, Strathern 1988), a fundamental value (Dumont 1980) and a key process in subject formation (see, for instance, Deleuze 1992; Foucault 1975; Kristeva 1982; Lacan 1968). There are other theories on borders, of course, such as the theory on ethnicity (Barth 1969), but the theories on individualism seem more relevant for the kind of borders the healers in 'Pentecost' articulate. Theories on individualism are manifold and cover a great variety of disciplines and perspectives. Roughly, one might point to cultural theories, social theories and psychological theories. In this chapter we will first give a brief recap of the main points in Chapter 1 and elaborate on the phenomenon we call 'Pentecostal borders' by also bringing in ethnography from what we might call 'elsewhere in Pentecost'. This ethnography, we claim, emphasizes the ways in which borders operate and the significance of them for social life in 'Pentecost'. We then give a brief overview

of what we call the main theories on individualism, focusing mostly on Kristeva's outline of borders in her 'Power of Horror' essays as well as on Foucault's theories on discipline and Deleuze's on control. Lastly, we offer some thoughts on how the theory on borders from 'Pentecost' relates to these.

Danger and Security

It might seem counter-intuitive to talk about 'Pentecostal borders'. Flow of the Holy Spirit, transcendence and the breaking down of borders might seem to be more in line with common descriptions of what Pentecostalism is about. Pentecostalism breaks with traditions, liberating the subject from the past – both the sinful personal past and the social past (see, for instance, Engelke 2010; Eriksen 2008, 2009; Meyer 2004). However, as is expressed by the healers described in Chapter 1, borders are even more fundamental. As they see it; prior to the break with the past, prior to the flow of the Spirit, there is the need for protection against danger. The believer is part of an already 'liberated space'. They are 'inside' the holy in their encounter with God. The sense of danger and insecurity is prior to salvation in the sense that it is the *context* for it. According to the healers, it is in this fundamentally insecure world that the Pentecostal borders are erected. There is a thoroughgoing sense of insecurity, of danger and the need for protection. 'Breaking with' or 'breaking away from' must be understood in this context of a threatening 'environment'. Establishing predictable and secure borders is primary (see also Chapter 6 on anti-relativism for a further discussion on this). The healers presented in Chapter 1 who can see what others cannot, and who are therefore more articulate about what the landscape of 'Pentecost' looks like, all emphasize the importance of the borders as protection against 'the roaming danger'. They express a clear sense of fear, danger and insecurity. The landscape is filled with threatening spirits, witches, sorcerers and general evil that can at all times potentially attack. The only protection that can give true security is protection through the Holy Spirit, the way the healers see it. The Holy Spirit creates and maintains the protective borders. In this fundamentally insecure world, the Holy Spirit, channelled through the healers, brings order, predictability and protection.

Hackman, in her description of spiritual warfare and spiritual mapping among Pentecostals in Cape Town, South Africa, points to a similar perception of the social and spiritual landscape. After years with

the ANC-dominated regime and with a new constitution and law, the end of censorship and the new freedom allowed with sexual rights, abortion and polygamy, the Pentecostals in South Africa experienced what they called ‘a country in a spiritual mess’ (2015: 6). She writes: ‘Capetonian Pentecostals used spiritual mapping at the time of nascent democracy as a way to monitor and police what they understood as uncertain physical, moral, and spiritual boundaries’ (2015: 6). Coloured, violent, gay or otherwise sinful neighbourhoods were mapped, encircled and spiritually contained behind borders created and upheld through mapping and prayer wars.

This sense of creating an ordered and secure world has also been underscored in O’Neill and Thomas’ book *Securing the City: Neoliberalism, Space, and Insecurity in Postwar Guatemala* (2015). For instance, O’Neill unravels the tight connection between ideas and language about the self and soul among neo-Pentecostals and the new language of ‘soft security’. In a high-risk world, where crime rates are astronomical and the state has withdrawn, security is the big topic. Security is, however, not only material – that is, about weapons and institutions. Rather, ‘soft security’ targets the heart and the mind and does not need high security buildings or incarceration in prisons or mental hospitals. Rather, soft security works with the self, in non-institutional programmes. Prayer warriors and spiritual warfare create secure borders for the Pentecostal citizen in a highly insecure world. This security can be gained by creating and maintaining borders on different levels. Dan Jorgensen (2005) has described the ways in which the Pentecostals secure the nation of Papua New Guinea, praying on the borders of the country by actually flying around the physical borders of the nation in a helicopter. Similarly, Annelin has described elsewhere how in Port Vila, Vanuatu, people pray at selected areas that in many ways symbolize the borders of the nation – the airport, the harbour and the highway into the capital city (see Eriksen and MacCarthy 2016).

Having established that borders seem to be fundamental not only in the Pentecostal world illustrated in Part II of this book but also in other areas of the world where Pentecostalism is growing in popularity, let us now look a little closer at these borders. What kind of borders are established and how do they operate?

A Theory on Borders

There seems to be a specific ‘phenomenology’ to these borders: firstly, the technology through which they are handled; and secondly, the

transformative space the borders themselves create. Let us take the first point – the technology. In the healing of a person the border appears to always be created from the outside; the healer never enters the internal space of the patient's body. This might seem self-evident, but when we give it a second thought it is also a little curious. Why cannot the healers, who are so spiritually powerful, enter the body in some spiritual sense and cleanse the patient from the inside? Very often healing technologies echo medical technologies (for instance, 'X-ray' sight) but why are not surgical procedures used? The bodies are never opened, spiritually or metaphorically. The healers will instead touch the skin of the person, massage and sometimes use anointed oil in the massage. It is the touching in this process that seems to be essential and which in itself is healing (because, of course, the healers channel the Holy Spirit). They have visual tools that are crucial here: the X-ray sight and visions they receive from the Holy Spirit. These technologies allow them, from the outside, to see through the skin as a border. They can thus identify the problem (this is the process of discernment described in Chapter 1), and by touching the skin, massaging and praying they can transform the person from sick to healthy or discover the demon that possesses the person and force it to leave. The inner space of the person, however, is impenetrable for the healer. It is only the Holy Spirit and the evil demons that can enter the body; the healers must work on the surface, *on* the border.

The healers have thus developed an elaborate technology for detection and removal from the outside. This healing practice reflects a theory of the body and the self that is closed and impenetrable. Furthermore, the healing cannot be effected from the inside. It might not be sufficient for the person to pray for him or herself, or to believe hard enough, or to commit him/herself to God, because it might be a false self committing. Committing to God is necessary but not sufficient. The commitment must be validated by an external observer who can confirm the truth of the commitment, like a pastor or a healer. They need the healer's eyes, their outside gaze, to be sure of their own clean 'insides'. The agency of the healing, so to speak, stems from the outside – from the healers and their technology for detecting and channelling the spirit. One might even say that there is a hierarchy between the inside and the outside. The inside is accessible only to the Holy Spirit, or to the evil spirit who can trick or lure the person to open up. It is not accessible to the healer herself. The inside is an elevated space and needs to be contained and kept pure. However, by working on the border, the healer can reverse the hierarchy and turn the outside into a privileged space for reworking the inside.

Sometimes the analogy between the person/the patient and the house or the yard is a necessary technology to employ in order to work on the inside from the outside. For instance, when healing her patient who had no luck in his career (see Chapter 1), Monique not only prayed for him, touching his skin and his head, but she also found it necessary to visit his house. She could there physically remove the bones from the entrance of the man's house and thus remove the cause of misfortune. Analogy is a technology that healers apply when working with patients. One border (that of the body) can be replaced with another border (that which surrounds the house). This analogy is also used in the process of the removal of 'evil' from the inside. Evil is a general term for the result of sorcery. A victim of sorcery might display any symptom from cancer to arthritis to bad luck and misfortune. Once, when Sarah was healing a patient with arthritis in her knees, she removed black stones from the ground where the patient was sitting and threw them out of the healing room. When I asked her why she had done this, she replied that she was getting rid of the cause of the illness. It was obvious that neither she nor the patient intended for me to believe that the stones had actually, physically, been inside of the patient's knees. Rather, Sarah worked on the outside in order to affect the inside. She worked through analogies.

The second aspect of the theory about borders from 'Pentecost' is the way in which the border itself is transformative. The Tokoists in Luanda wear white garments as a way of displaying the clean and pure inside. This enhances and emphasizes the border, but it also improves the purity of the inside by symbolically working the border. The Trobriand witches get rid of their evil insides by confessing to witchcraft and opening themselves to the Holy Spirit. It is through these acts of confessing, through spoken words and through the speaking mouth, that the evil is encountered. The main borders the healers in Chapter 1 talk about are the borders of the person, the house, the yard, the neighbourhood and, in some cases, also the nation. It is interesting that in regards to whatever entity is contaminated or problematic, healing takes place *on* the borders. In other words, not only are borders significant for the social landscape but the transformative processes must operate directly on the borders for healing to take place. For instance, Monique found the relics of the bones of a dead child *in* the entrance of her patient's house, not slightly inside of the house or a few metres outside of the house. This highlights a sense in which the inside is always inaccessible and healing is thereby always external. It also makes clear the power of the borders. The border can turn the inside into the outside, can force the demon to show itself and can channel the healing power of the Holy Spirit.

Theories of Individualism

Let us now move on to another theory in which borders are essential – in Julia Kristeva’s theory of abjection. We find her reflections on what we might call ‘abjective individualism’ interesting because of the connections she outlines between different biblical texts and notions of the self. First, however, we will set her theory into a larger context in order to ‘justify’ the claim that this can be termed ‘a theory of individualism’. Individualism is, of course, an expansive topic and can be covered from a number of angles. Here we will briefly mention three: a social theory, a cultural theory and, finally, a psychoanalytic theory.

As we see it, there are three anthropologists who have set individualism in social thought on the anthropological agenda, Louis Dumont (1980), Marilyn Strathern (1988) and, more recently, as a major debate within the anthropology of Christianity, Joel Robbins (2004). Although Dumont initiated the subject, let us start with Strathern.

Strathern was in many ways groundbreaking in her questioning of Western analytical apparatus in her outline of Melanesian ‘relationalism’ in the *Gender of the Gift* (1988). By giving portraits of Melanesian ways of understanding social relations, she set up a radical contrast to not only Western individualism but the ways in which Western social science has understood the nature of the social. The significance of her work, as we see it, was thus not so much the portraits from Melanesia (although, of course, these are also valuable) but the effort she made in not applying established analytical concepts: the individual, the actor, the society etc. She questioned Western universalism in a very effective way. *The Gender of the Gift* analysis makes us rethink the ways in which we understand social dynamics. Can we understand them differently? Are we stuck in analytical models where the starting point is always the individual actor or the only ‘natural’ counterpoint, the collective – in other words, the bounded unit at different scales? Strathern very effectively demonstrated a tendency in Western social science to begin our understanding of social dynamics with the individual actor.

The next question, of course, is: why? The focus on the actor (and his or her transactions) privileges a form of ‘economism’. As MacPherson (1962) pointed out, throughout much of social theory, ownership is constitutive of individuality. Property rights and the development of ‘possessive individualism’ are foundational for an understanding of the Western form of individualism. In the Pacific, as well, this connection has been emphasized (see Sykes 2007). However, the analyses focusing on religious change have had the strongest influence in

setting the question of individualism on the agenda in anthropological debates. When Robbins (2004) was faced with massive conversion to a Pentecostal form of Christianity among the Urapmin in Papua New Guinea in the 1990s, the role of Christianity in the establishment of the individual was highlighted. Whereas Strathern's intellectual interest had been on questioning key concepts and perspectives in Western social science and moving beyond individualism in social scientific thought, Robbins focused on another intellectual challenge – understanding radical change. If Strathern's focus was looking for analytical models challenging individualism, Robbins' focus was on how individualism was established. The focus in this chapter springs out of the latter kind of question, but it also extends it. The conceptualizations of borders in 'Pentecost' invite us to think about what kind of individualism this is and how forms of individualism change. Before becoming more concrete on these questions, however, let us turn briefly to Dumont, whose work has been central for how individualism has been understood in anthropology.

Dumont's 'Essays on Individualism' is a significant contribution to our intellectual understanding of, firstly, the significance of the individual as a value in Western (perhaps primarily European) culture; and secondly, how individualism, in its specific form, has become established in this context. Dumont connects the specific development of individualism in Europe to a specific development within Christianity that culminates with Calvin. The early form of individualism, however, had a very different quality. In the history of Christianity in Europe, we can see the development from a cultural system where the individual was submitted to the religious whole to a cultural system where the individual in itself was the only value, separated off from the religious whole. This is a development from what he calls holism to individualism. Dumont identifies a key factor in this transformation, the change from an 'outworldly individual' to an 'individual-in-the-world' – a religious person who is first and foremost concerned with material and present matters.

The idea of an individual who was not only secluded from the world in total immersion with God but also part of the world in active social engagements resulted in a particular form of individualism. The recent ethnography that in our opinion catches this phenomenon best is Luhrmann's description of Vineyard Pentecostals in the US. In her book *When God Talks Back* (2012), we encounter people who feel God's presence, and talk to and hear God, in their everyday activities. Compared to the deeply focused and renouncing monk in early European Christianity who secluded himself and worked through specialized techniques to

submit to God, the American Pentecostal can hear God and ask for advice on hairstyles when visiting the hairdresser. Thus, not only has the 'individual-in-the-world' become able to listen, to hear and to talk to God but she can do this anywhere in the world and at any time. This, in short, is what the transformation from the outworldly individual to the individual-in-the-world is about. The individual is not only significant in his or her seclusion (and thereby in a sacred context). Rather, the individual has become the only possible way to be, and this has also transformed the idea of the religious and the sacred in itself. It can be found in the person, not in the context (of seclusion).

This focus on context, on the secluded and holy space versus what the individual is, is also key for Kristeva's reading of the Bible. As a literary theorist reading it from a psychoanalytic perspective, she has highlighted this change from the external or outside context to inner states of mind as a significant change from the Old Testament to the New Testament. Such a change fundamentally shapes religious subjectivity and the social subject. In many ways Kristeva echoes Dumont (and, as an interesting aside, they worked around the same time in the same city but perhaps in very different circles). An understanding of what the contemporary subject is must be based on how Christianity has turned an outworldly individual into an individual-in-the-world. Although she does not use these concepts, it is in many ways the same phenomena she points to: the move from an external to an internal focus on the subject – in other words, a move from an outer to an inner context. However, Kristeva is very elaborate on the social and psychological effects of this change and how it affects the process of becoming an individual for the modern subject. Borders are the key here. Let us start by giving a short summary of her analyses.

On Abjection as 'Borderwork'

In Chapter 4 of her *Power of Horror* (1982), Kristeva performs a psychoanalytic reading of the Old Testament, primarily on the topic of purity/impurity in Leviticus. She starts out by referring to Mary Douglas' work on the same topic, crediting her for the fundamental insight that impurity is always that which departs from the symbolic order. As a new symbolic order was established with Judaism; it was primarily the maternal cults of the existing paganism that had to be combatted. The new symbolic order reflected the patriarchal order of the temple. Kristeva outlines three categories of the impure (or what she calls 'abominations'): food taboos, corporal alterations (with its culmination in death)

and the feminine body and incest. The elaborate rules and regulations established clear borders between the acceptable and the unacceptable, between the masculine and the feminine, but also, and perhaps most significantly, between the pure and the sinful individual – especially the taboos related to corporeal alterations, reflecting the significance of that which threatens individual identity and boundedness.

Kristeva points to Leviticus chapters 13 and 14 and the abomination of leprosy as a clear example of how bodily alterations threaten the individual. With leprosy, it is exactly the boundary of the person that is being attacked. In Kristeva's psychoanalytic reading, the obsession with leprosy in Leviticus is 'a fantasy of a self-birth on the part of the subject who has not rejected his mother but has incorporated a devouring Mother' (1982: 102). In other words, the obsession with leprosy signals an obsession with separations, boundaries and individual identity. Also, bodily fluids and secretions are threatening and must be tabooed, especially those leaking from the feminine body. Containment and maintenance of clear borders are essential. The key logic in the symbolic order of the Old Testament, according to Kristeva, is separation, first from the mother and then from the feminine in general (and thereby through rules that regulate the movement of women, for instance). This is echoed in taboos against everything that threatens the individual borders or symbolically reflects such a threat, mainly through food taboos. In Leviticus a clear and total symbolic order is outlined, one that will prevent the individual body from becoming impure.

The counterbalance is sacrifice. When the symbolic order is violated, sacrifice can re-establish order. Sacrifices 'abject' (cast out) the impure object. Kristeva accentuates the importance of sacrifice in the Old Testament. Almost any violation can be undone and un-differentiation (between pure/impure, men/women) avoided by casting out the object that threatens subjection to the system. In many ways we can see Leviticus as a guide to maintenance of the symbolic order through an elaborate sacrificial activity.

Let us for a minute pause the outline of Kristeva's reading of the Old Testament, and the establishment of separations and borders around the individual, and look at how this theory of the individual relates to anthropological discussion on the topic, as a side note. As mentioned briefly above, Robbins' analysis of Urapmin conversion made the argument that radical change and the significance of Christianity pushed the emergence of a concept of the individual. This generated a lot of controversy in anthropology, in particular in the anthropology of Melanesia. One of Robbins' main critics was Mosko in his 2010 prizewinning article on the individualism and 'partability' in Christianity. Here Mosko argues

that it is possible to read the Bible in a dividualist light. The Christian person is a divisible personhood – not necessarily individualist and indivisible. Rather, with reference to, among others, Dumont, he argues that the individual character of Christian personhood is a modern development. A Christian personhood is a composite personhood, he argues. The sharing of substance – the Holy Spirit as a non-contained force – establishes the point. According to Kristeva's reading of the Old Testament, however, and her focus on the abominations, it is exactly the separations and the establishment of individual identity that is the key to the symbolic order. It is avoidance of that which threatens the individual that is emphasized. Sacrificial activity, which might seem like the sharing of substance, is in effect the re-erection of borders and separations. Sacrificial activity is the negative manifestation of separation and individual identity and not a positive establishment of exchanges and sharing. Abjection practices point to the necessity of borders for Christian personhood and not of exchange and sharing. It is the *casting out* that is key and not the composition.

In her next essay, in Chapter 5 (called 'Qui Tollis Peccata Mundi'), she moves on to the New Testament and identifies a key shift in balance between taboos and sacrifice. With Christ, dietary taboos and taboos around verbal and gestural contact with lepers are abolished. The radical move of Christ is to approach and become intimate with lepers, prostitutes, the poor and the filthy. The symbolic order remains unchanged, but the manifestation of it is radically shifted. Kristeva writes: 'A new arrangement of differences is being set up, an arrangement whose economy will regulate a wholly different system of meaning hence a wholly different speaking subject' (ibid.: 113). The key is still the establishment of differentiation processes creating the individual identity. But this individual is created in a totally new way. Why is it that the figure of Jesus approaches lepers and breaks with the established system of taboos? Because abjection is no longer exterior, according to Kristeva. The objects of avoidance or abomination are moved within the body. The pure/impure distinction of the Old Testament is transformed into an inside/outside distinction in the New Testament. Kristeva underlines the following example from Mark 15: 'There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him; but things which come out of him, those are that which defile him.' The threat from the non-holy is no longer from the outside, according to Kristeva's reading. It is exactly this break with the idea that one can cast out the impure that creates the new subject and the new type of individual. The impure is now placed into the subject 'as a polluting and defiling substance' (1982: 114). Kristeva cites Matthew 23:27–28:

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

There is a new kind of permanence to this turn to the inside. The unclean substance is internalized without the possibility of eradication. The technology of casting out, of abjection and sacrifice, which was so elaborate in Leviticus, is no longer applicable. Impurity comes from within and cannot be counterbalanced in sacrificial acts. The category of sin is thus established as a permanent, interior state. The unclean is now permanently on the inside. In many ways this is the first move towards the 'individual-in-the-world' logic, which, according to Dumont, culminated with Luther and Calvin. The turn towards the 'inside' implies the lesser significance of the external landscape of separations, seclusions and regulations. It also implies that the ritual activity is of lesser significance. It is almost as if the Vineyard Pentecostals (described by Luhrmann 2012) are already visible here; it is the everyday act, the inner thoughts, that are crucial.

Attention should be drawn to two points from Kristeva's analysis. Firstly, the new inside/outside dichotomy replacing the purity/impurity dichotomy is a spiritual one. It is no longer acts of eating or movements beyond boundaries that are problematic. Rather, it is thoughts, or lack of thoughts, that are problematic. Secondly, as is underlined in the following quote from Mark 7:21, the problematic comes from within:

For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness.

Thus, it is there already. Inner impurity is permanent. Only momentary relief is given, in what Kristeva calls the 'fantasy of devouring', in the Holy Communion. By internalizing the Spirit of Jesus in the act of eating bread, the cleanliness is momentarily achieved but only as a spiritual state. Only Jesus is pure in spirit and can transcend the bodily state. The sinful body of man (but primarily, woman) is permanent. It is this analysis of the transition from the Old Testament logic to the New Testament logic that we find of comparative interest for our 'theory from Pentecost'. It is not the theological argument that men are born sinful that in itself interests us here but the rather dramatic turn in regards to where the sinful emanates from and the effect of ritual activity on it.

The New Testament individual is a permanently split individual, between spirit and matter, body and mind. For Kristeva, this is

interesting in relation to psychological disorders. She connects eating disorders among women with this turn towards the inside. The feminine, which was defined as impure in Leviticus, can no longer be controlled in an external landscape through seclusion practices. Rather, the impure is a permanent part of the body. For women this is especially problematic. Anorexia is a disease that plays on this logic. According to Kristeva, the effects of the disease (the threat to the menstrual cycle, the loss of fertility, the loss of feminine forms etc.) signal exactly the need to combat 'impurity' from the inside. It is as if lack of abjective technologies turns the 'purity-machine' towards the body, leaving everything to the individual (subconscious) mind.

When we now turn to 'Pentecost', we can immediately identify one obvious contrast. The individual is not closed off in the way Kristeva describes. The theory on borders from 'Pentecost' involves an intense ritual activity to abject the impure, the evil, from the bodies. It thus reflects a specific form of boundary-making and, consequently, a specific form of individualism. Let us take a closer look at this comparison.

Comparing Theories on Borders

In our reading of Kristeva, there are three main points to stress: the turn towards separation, borders and individual identity in Leviticus; the transformation from an external landscape to an internal landscape in the New Testament, thus creating a specific kind of individualism; and the effect of the latter as a loss of ritual activity. This is a theory of how the operation of boundaries has created very different kinds of individuals.

When looking at the ways in which healers presented in Chapter 1 articulate the significance of border and boundaries, there are two striking contrasts. Firstly, Kristeva describes the contemporary Christian as locked within a system of meaning where the impure and evil resides in the body of the individual without any permanent possibility of abjection. This is exactly the opposite of what the healers articulate; the process of casting out is not only possible but necessary, and constant. Secondly, in Kristeva's reading of the New Testament, evil emanates from the inside, as outlined in the presentation of the theory about borders above. For the healers and their patients, evil comes from the outside but can take root on the inside. Furthermore, the pure can only be confirmed as present when identified from the outside. The rhetorical question is, of course, how can the reading of these Christian boundaries be so different? An easy answer, but one that is clearly insufficient, is that

Christianity in 'Pentecost' is 'unmodern' and therefore more related to the Old Testament than to the New.

Although there is clearly a great interest in the Old Testament in the places we have visited ethnographically in this book, we have each also experienced the effect of a 'Jesus-centred theology'. In Port Vila pastors, healers and general prayer meetings often focus on Jesus. The healers also see themselves as working *as* Jesus – seeking the poor, the sick, the dangerous, unprivileged and marginalized. The healers frequently mention that their work is dangerous, that they get intimate with that which others find repulsive. Thus, it is not as if the healers work with an 'Old Testament logic'. It is in many ways the New Testament that is interesting for the healers and their patients (and when we say patients, we are referring to most people, since nearly everyone in the areas we have visited ethnographically will visit the healers at some point). In all of the contexts described in this book (in all of 'Pentecost', if you will), Christianity has been present for at least a century. These are places where sincere individuals (Keane 2002) and true believers have been moulded over generations. The first missionaries to Vanuatu, for instance, were obsessed with banning any kind of ritual activity that they saw as a survival of heathendom (see Eriksen 2008). Thus, instead of seeing abjective and ritual activity in 'Pentecost' as a reflection of an older form of Christianity, a more 'tradition-mixed' form perhaps, we suggest seeing it as an explicit turn to a new form of individualism, one that brings back certain elements of the Old Testament logic. We need to understand the expressions of borders and 'border work' as an articulation of a new theory of the individual. This articulation is a dialogue with the contemporary world. A re-ritualization of the impure and a new understanding of the significance of boundaries reflect exactly this. Let us explain.

As we pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, the significance of borders must be understood against the background of a deeply insecure world. Danger, in the form of evil, the devil, demons and sorcerers, is potentially everywhere, according to our interlocutors. Boundaries, therefore, protect from the outside, and, as we pointed out, healing takes place on the outside. It never emanates from the inside. This, of course, is in stark contrast to the points referred to above in the citations from the New Testament, where impurity (which is, in NT context 'sin') is permanently locked on the inside. The confession rituals in Kiriwina and the discernments of the healers in Port Vila reflect rituals of separation – the separation of evil from the body. These become new avenues for casting out evil, for ritual abjection. Furthermore, we can see the technologies of analogy, described above, as technologies for

managing abjection – it involves a turn to the exterior landscape – and as a turn to external regulatory practices. In addition, we can see how the transformative space of the borders, which we outlined as a key aspect of what we called ‘the phenomenology of the borders’, reflects an opening of the border, a way into the inner space from the outside, and not an order that permanently closes off.

Thus, the theory of the borders reflects a specific form of individualism where the presence of evil and danger is foundational. What the comparison above highlights, as we see it, is primarily two different forms of individualism that are reflections of very different social conditions. We might compare the ‘closed’ New Testament individual Kristeva identifies and the ‘abjective’ individual of ‘Pentecost’ to the kinds of individuals that are produced in what Foucault (1979) calls the discipline society and what Deleuze (1992) calls the control society. The discipline society produces an individual who is constantly self-aware, self-monitoring and self-disciplining. This is in many ways the New Testament individual who is no longer just being watched by God but also watching him/herself. Although there is an external, watching gaze in the background (the illusion of the panopticon), the effect of the internalization is an individual who does not need external ‘modification’.

There are, of course, differences between the ‘docile body’ in the context of the ‘bio-power’ Foucault describes and the ‘closed’ individual Kristeva describes, but they are both self-governing’ and self-monitoring. This is an individual who in confession practices, for instance, starts with the ‘I’. The focus of sinfulness, the target of the (self-)surveilling gaze, is the ‘I’. One might say that the closed individual Kristeva describes is a perfect fit for the disciplinary societies of institutional containment. There is ‘no way out’, so to speak. There is no abjection from the autonomous individual. In ‘Pentecost’, however, the ‘I’ is of another kind. This is an ‘I’ that is controlled in a very different way. It is not disciplined in order to repress sinful tendencies. Rather, in the theory on borders that the healers articulate, sinfulness can be dealt with through abjections and transferred to an external landscape. When looking at what we with Kristeva’s gaze can call the abjection practices in ‘Pentecost’, it seems obvious that it is not the ‘closed’, disciplined and autonomous individual of Foucault’s disciplinary society that is produced. The very focus on borders, on protection and abjection, creates another kind of personhood. It creates a personhood that can get beyond his or her internal impurity, over and over again. It also reflects a personhood that must be protected from the *outside*.

The theory on borders, and in particular the theory of the abjective ‘I’ in ‘Pentecost’, can perhaps be compared to specific theories on

subject formation in theories of control (Deleuze 1992). There are two reasons why this is an interesting comparison. Firstly, the social processes described as inherent in the new forms of control, on the surface at least, might look like a similar turn to an 'open' individual, and the borders inherent in new forms of control seem, to some extent, to parallel the borders erected in prayer wars, healing of neighbourhoods etc. However, as we will show, major differences are also easily found. Secondly, when we describe 'Pentecost', we detail phenomena that are part of a more general trend; 'Pentecost' is global and is reflected in different spheres of life. As others have pointed out (Guyer 2007), the key ideas of 'Pentecost' are reflected, for instance, in financial markets, in stock exchange logics etc. This is part of the reason why we need to 'go to Pentecost': to get the key social processes in focus, to 'zoom out' in order, as we pointed out in the introduction, not to 'only' focus on self-conscious religious life. In other words, if the ethnography from 'Pentecost' aims to capture some key globalizing processes, descriptions of forms of control also seek to describe these global processes. To what extent do these overlap?

The person in the Deleuzian control society is fundamentally different from the person in the discipline society. First and foremost, the person in the control society is no longer autonomous, no longer closed, but rather (in Deleuze's term) a 'dividual' (Deleuze 1992: 5). In control societies it is no longer the individual who is the key agent but multiple representations of the individual, the so-called 'data-double' (see Galič, Timan and Koops 2016). The new goal is access, not discipline. As Galič, Timan and Koops phrase it, this is a shift from 'soul-training' to managing user profiles and consumer practices. The representation of the self is more important than the self. Corporations do not need docile bodies. They want to monitor consumer practices and mould their products accordingly.

The usernames, online profiles, passwords and personal codes link a person to multiple representations. This shift, from discipline to control, maps a move from nation state-driven societies to corporation-run networks. The individual of the discipline society was watched by the gaze of the sovereign and thereby internalized this gaze. The new dividual is no longer contained in a body but can take on multiple identities. The idea of liberation from containment is crucial in the society of control, not only at the level of the individual. In many ways, in societies of control, borders are always challenged. Containment is not necessary for control. Control is achieved by giving direction, by steering movement in (virtual) landscapes where borders are invisible. More than this, borders are denied. For instance, the highway does not contain; rather, it creates

'freedom' for the driver while controlling movement. Google opens the possibility to search for anything, but the algorithm controlling and limiting the search is not obvious and visible. The places where one *cannot* go are not in focus. The borders are created by what you cannot do (on the highway, inside buildings etc.), the search results you do not get on the internet. But whereas in the theory from 'Pentecost' the healers can see the invisible – where the evil emanates from and where the protection of the good must be effected – in the theory of control, borders are invisible; they are created by forms of control that are unapproachable. In other words, in the theory from 'Pentecost', the articulations of evil create a visibility of the border. In the theory of control, control itself (and thus the border) is invisible. The 'data-double', the person who can become anything/anyone through access codes, usernames and online profiles, seems unlimited. Whereas a healer in 'Pentecost' needs to manifest the border – after a ritual abjection, for instance, to protect and keep the person secure – there is no articulation of the limit for the dividual in control societies.

Furthermore, the casting out of evil, which is the specialized capacity of the healers, reflects a process of controlled externalization, of creating new individuals with new capacities. This might, to some extent, be similar to the ongoing creation of new user profiles in the digital control sociality. However, there is one major difference. In 'Pentecost' this 'flow' is structured on a binary opposition of major importance: the good versus the evil. In the digital control society, only one logic structures the flow: that of capital. When the healers work through analogies, for instance, this might reflect the creation of external representations, but the context is one of protection and not of 'global flow'. Online user profiles and multiple social media identities are not created for protection, of course, but in order to consume. In contrast to the global flow of the 'network society', the structuration of 'flow' in 'Pentecost' is a deeply moralized one, distinguishing fundamentally between the good and the evil. The specific kind of 'abjective individualism' articulated in 'Pentecost' reflects a specific social context, one that emphasizes 'the roaming danger' and 'the omnipresence of evil'.

Thus, the abjective individual of Pentecost is very different from the partible personhood of the dividual in the free-floating control society. The logic of the control society is primarily formed by the stock market and exchange rates. Limitless but directed flow is the goal. In contrast, the processes of externalization in 'Pentecost' are fundamentally structured on a good versus evil logic. Understanding what this idea of evil represents is crucial, we argue, for an understanding of the specific theory of borders and the specific theory of individualism that is being

developed in 'Pentecost'. Evil is (no longer) something that stems from the inside, as it is in Kristeva's reading of the New Testament. Rather, evil is potentially everywhere and attacks the body from the outside. It reflects a deeply insecure world, a world where only one thing is established beyond doubt: there is evil and there is good, and distinguishing correctly between them is a matter of life or death.

Concluding Reflections

If borders as forms of control are hard to articulate, pinpoint and define, they are constantly worked on in 'Pentecost'. 'Pentecost' opens a space for thinking about the borders that might remain unarticulated elsewhere. On the one hand, this means that a person's borders are challenged, thus creating a new abjective individual, perhaps in response to the new form of dividualism outlined by Deleuze or perhaps independently of it. On the other hand, it means that other borders, such as, for instance, those around the nation and the neighbourhood, are given prominence, especially in prayer wars, prayer campaigns etc. Still, it is not as if the articulation of the borders in Pentecost is a reflection of a control society. The new abjective individual in 'Pentecost', along with the work to secure borders, seems almost to be as different from the individual in the control society as the individual in the disciplinary society. Perhaps we can see the articulations of borders and the abjective individual as a different form of global discourse (or theory), one emanating from a very different kind of reality in which danger is omnipresent and protection is fundamental. This is a world where the spiritual is primary and the material is secondary, in contrast to the social conditions of forms of control, where this order is reversed (i.e. the capital is only logic; see Galič, Timan and Koops 2016). In this sense, perhaps we can see the theory from 'Pentecost' as a 'critical theory'.

To sum up, we see the focus on borders in 'Pentecost' as an articulation of the problems of closing and opening the individual, and we see healing practices as a turn to abjective technology. On the one hand, this echoes the externalization processes described by Deleuze in control societies, and it reflects, we argue, a move away from institutional discipline. On the other hand, the abjection practices are also crucially different from the dividual of the network society. The form of individualism developed in 'Pentecost' is setting up clear boundaries and in this way structuring how and where the (global) flow should be limited. In many of the prayer wars and prayer campaigns Annelin witnessed in Port Vila, for instance, symbolic sites for desired global flow

were targeted: the harbour, airport, roads etc. In a specific prayer group called 'The Mothers of the Nation' that Annelin attended frequently in 2010, the theme of global flow was often on the agenda in different ways. Trade agreements, international political problems and electricity prices were just a few of the many topics on which the women would focus. In many ways those women were seeking with their prayers to erect borders and structures in similar ways to that which the healers did (although more abstractly) – creating divisions between good and evil by structuring the flow. One example is a prayer this group performed petitioning for the failure of a new trade agreement with China. China was regarded, explicitly in the prayers, as the most unchristian and evil country.

The major difference between 'Pentecost' and societies of control is that in 'Pentecost' healers and prayer warriors can see and work with the borders, whereas in digital control societies the illusion of free access and unbounded sociality is hard to challenge. Perhaps 'border work' becomes particularly pressing for the witches in Kiriwina, for the Tokoists and EKWESA prayer circles in Luanda and in healing sessions in Port Vila in a context where anything can be 'accessed', including selves, minds and bodies.

Note

Parts of this chapter have previously been published in Eriksen 2018.

References

- Barth, F. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*.
- Bialecki, J. and G. Daswani. 2015. 'Introduction: What is an Individual? The View from Christianity', *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5(1): 271–94.
- Deleuze, G. 1992. 'Postscript on the Societies of Control', *October* 59: 3–7.
- Dumont, L. 1980. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and its Implications*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Engelke, M. 2010. 'Past Pentecostalism: Notes on Rupture, Realignment, and Everyday Life in Pentecostal and African Independent Churches', *Africa* 80(2): 177–99.
- Eriksen, A. 2008. *Gender, Christianity and Change: An Analysis of Social Movements in North Ambrym*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- . 2009. 'New Life: Pentecostalism as Social Critique in Vanuatu', *Ethnos* 74(2): 175–98.

- _____. 2018. 'Going to "Pentecost": How to Study Pentecostalism – in Melanesia, for Example'. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 24(1), 164–180.
- Eriksen, A. and M. MacCarthy. 2016. 'Introduction', *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 27(2): 139–48.
- Foucault, M. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage.
- Galič, M., T. Timan and B.J. Koops. 2017. 'Bentham, Deleuze and Beyond: An Overview of Surveillance Theories from the Panopticon to Participation'. *Philosophy & Technology* 30(1): 9–37.
- Guyer, J.I. 2007. 'Prophecy and the Near Future: Thoughts on Macroeconomic, Evangelical, and Punctuated Time', *American Ethnologist* 34(3): 409–21.
- Hackman, M. 2015. 'A Sinful landscape: Moral and Sexual Geographies in Cape Town, South Africa'. *Social Analysis* 59(3): 105–125.
- Jorgensen, D. 2005. 'Third Wave Evangelism and the Politics of the Global in Papua New Guinea: Spiritual Warfare and the Recreation of Place in Telefolmin', *Oceania* 75(4): 44–461.
- Keane, W. 2002. 'Sincerity, "Modernity", and the Protestants', *Cultural Anthropology* 17(1): 65–92.
- Kristeva, J. 1982. *Powers of Horror*. University Presses of California, Columbia and Princeton.
- Lacan, J. 1968. 'The Mirror-Phase as Formative of the Function of the I', *New Left Review* (51): 71.
- Luhrmann, T.M. 2012. *When God Talks Back*. New York: Vintage.
- Macpherson, C.B. 1962. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, B. 2004. 'Christianity in Africa: From African Independent to Pentecostal-Charismatic Churches'. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33: 447–474.
- Mosko, M. 2010. 'Partible Penitents: Dividual Personhood and Christian Practice in Melanesia and the West', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 16(2): 215–40.
- O'Neill, K.L and K. Thomas (eds). 2015. *Securing the City: Neoliberalism, Space, and Insecurity in Postwar Guatemala*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Robbins, J. 2004. *Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Moral Torment in a Papua New Guinea Society*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Strathern, M. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Sykes, K. 2007. 'November Interrogating Individuals: The Theory of Possessive Individualism in the Western Pacific', *Anthropological Forum* 17(3): 213–24.