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Abstract: Pentecostal Christianity has in the last several decades demonstrated an ability to globalize with great speed and to flourish in social contexts of poverty and disorganization in which other social institutions have been unable to sustain themselves. This article asks why Pentecostalism should be so successful at institution building in harsh environments. I argue that this question is more fundamental than those scholars more often ask about the kinds of compensations that Pentecostalism provides for its adherents. I then draw on Collins’s theory of interaction ritual chains to suggest that it is Pentecostalism’s promotion of ritual to the center of social life that grounds its unusual institution-building capacity.
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The neo-liberal global order has proven to be a harsh environment for a wide range of social, economic, and political institutions. Many of those local and more globally diffused institutions that once in various ways buffered people from the depredations of the market economy have been so starved for human and material resources in the current climate that they have retreated or simply disappeared. In the face of the ‘institutional deficit’ that has resulted, people have had fewer and fewer ways to sustain spaces in which social relations can be organized by non-market logics to meet non-market goals (Martin 1998: 117–118). Yet, looking out at the desiccated social landscape that neo-liberal restructuring so often leaves in its wake, one exception to the rule of institutional die-back stands out clearly: the current neo-liberal regime has in many places been very good for religious institutions, particularly for Pentecostal and charismatic churches. According to the tenets of Pentecostal and charismatic Christianity, gifts of the Holy Spirit such as healing and prophecy are understood
to be available to all believers. These faiths are widely recognized as among the worlds fastest growing religions, and taken together they may well be the single fastest growing type of religion in the global South (Jenkins 2002). They are also one of the great institution-propagating success stories of the neo-liberal era. Pentecostal and charismatic churches appear to thrive in the very kinds of environments in which so many other institutions struggle and fade. My fundamental question in this article is why this should be so.

To be sure, there are a number of possible answers to this question that are readily available in the literature on global Pentecostalism.¹ Most of these have a more or less functionalist tinge, suggesting that Pentecostal churches thrive because in one way or another they help people cope with the global orders in which they now live and, in doing so, help those orders to sustain themselves. Pentecostal churches do this, many have argued, by providing some form of community for people who have left rural worlds and kinship structures to fulfill their dreams of individualist, urban lives, or by offering healing to those who lack access to health care. In their prosperity guise, as another argument has it, they enchant the market in ways that allow people to construe it as a context for meaningful living, even in the absence of the resources that are needed to make it so. By other accounts, they provide people recipes for self-discipline that make it possible for them to cope with poverty and adapt themselves to whatever opportunities for work they can find.²

I could go on in this vein, detailing the numerous ways that scholars have attributed the popularity of Pentecostalism to its ability to compensate for losses and deprivations that people have experienced at the hands of the global order. And if I choose not to go on in this way here, it is not because I think such answers are entirely wrong. There is some truth to each of them, and taken together they represent a style of thinking about Pentecostal growth that cannot be discounted.

I choose, then, to step back from compensation and deprivation arguments, not because they are flawed, but because I think they tend to beg a fundamental question—the question of how Pentecostal churches can succeed as institutions at all in the kind of resource-poor conditions in which they so regularly take root these days. It is only once they succeed as institutions that they can compensate for anything. This is why I take the question of the means of their institution-building success to be fundamental, even to the deprivation arguments I have laid out above. As this article develops, I will try to answer this question about Pentecostal institution-building ability by examining the fundamental role of ritual in Pentecostal social life. Before doing so, however, I want to specify in more detail the kind of institution building that Pentecostals have proven so successful at undertaking and to review some reasons that scholars have given for their success.

### Pentecostal Institution Building

When I talk about the institutional success of Pentecostal churches, I am referring minimally to their ability to engage people’s time in the construction and maintenance of congregations that regularly come together to worship and whose
members work to evangelize those who do not belong. That Pentecostalism has this ability is well attested in the literature on its global spread. Members of these churches regularly attend Sunday services that last several hours or more, often attend at least one other service a week, and regularly participate in home worship and Bible study sessions and in evangelization efforts. Chesnut (1997: 141) collected quantitative data on participation among the urban Brazilian Pentecostals he studied and found that members participated on average in 4.7 church activities per week (see also Gill 1990; Willems 1967). Furthermore, along with giving their time in the form of participation in church services and activities, many members of Pentecostal churches also volunteer to fill church offices, serving as deacons, elders, heads of women’s and youth ministries, and so forth. Chesnut (1997: 135) again provides enlightening quantitative evidence, finding that among those he interviewed, 79.5 percent held such offices. Making a similar point, Blacking (1981: 45) writes of the South African Zionist church that “the general principle seemed to be that as many members as possible should have an opportunity of holding positions.” These positions draw members into making regular contributions of their time to supporting the institution of the church and its many institutionalized sub-groups. As a final index of institutional commitment, it is worth noting that people often give materially to their churches as well, finding ways to tithe, even in conditions of great poverty, or giving in kind or in labor when they cannot pledge income.

It is by soliciting such intense involvement on the part of its members that Pentecostal churches have been able to thrive as institutions. My original question about the reasons for the institutional success of Pentecostal churches during a period that has been hard on many other institutions can thus be reframed as a question about how they solicit this kind of involvement.

One could imagine that they succeed in commanding people’s attention by giving away a lot of material resources or by providing services that people cannot furnish for themselves. For a long time, social scientists have used this explanation to account for the success of mission Christianity: people come for the food or the medical care or the access to schooling that the mission provides. But these kinds of ‘rice Christian’ arguments tend not to explain the institution-building success of Pentecostal mission efforts. For one thing, people’s involvement in Pentecostal church life tends to be much more intense than it is in the mission churches that have made material inducements and the provision of social and economic programs more central to their outreach efforts. And, more pointedly, one of the most noteworthy characteristics of Pentecostal church ‘planting’ is that it tends to be done on a shoestring. From the outset of the movement, Pentecostal missionaries have tended to ‘go out on faith’, as they put it. Heading out to the mission field with very few resources—often with no more than the cost of a one-way ticket to their destination—they trust that if they have been anointed by the Holy Spirit for mission work, their needs will be supplied by those to whom they bring the Word (Synan 1997: 133). If sustenance is not forthcoming, they know that their missionary efforts are not in accord with God’s plan for them. For those who have been mission-ized, this Pentecostal practice of going out on faith means that they are often
asked to join a missionary in starting a church for which they are to provide all of the resources. This has been particularly true in the global South, where missionaries tend to be people from neighboring groups rather than the well-appointed Westerners who are often viewed as paradigmatic of the missionary enterprise in arguments about the material factors driving conversion.

A second approach to explaining people’s willingness to make quick and strong commitments to Pentecostal institution building would take the belief system of Pentecostalism as its explanatory variable. In one way or another, such arguments have it, Pentecostalism is a perfect tract for the times: it preaches precisely the kind of self-reliance and self-discipline that the neoliberal order demands; it promises a better life to come for those whose current lives are marked by misery; it heals those who lack access to modern medicine and often to traditional healing as well; it empowers women who seek to escape traditional patriarchies and provides them with safe spaces for congregation. In many ways, this list overlaps with the one of compensatory or deprivation theories I presented above. And, reiterating what I said there, it is beyond doubt that many of these arguments are true. But again I would suggest that the compensatory promises made by Pentecostalism—promises on which many other religious and, for that matter, developmentalist and good governance doctrines also claim to be able to deliver—would not be so attractive if Pentecostalism was not better than its competitors at setting up thriving institutions in which people can participate in a world shaped around those promises. It is Pentecostalism’s social productivity that makes its promises credible, not the credibility of those promises that makes Pentecostalism socially productive. We are once again left, then, with the need to explain the reasons for this social productivity.

Ritual and Pentecostal Social Productivity

What I want to suggest in the remainder of this article is that Pentecostal social productivity is rooted in its model of social life. The key to that model is, in my opinion, that it defines ritual as fundamental to social interaction and asserts that ritual should be practiced regularly in all kinds of settings. In making this assertion, I recognize that some might question whether an emphasis on ritual should in fact count as a feature of the Pentecostal tradition at all, much less as the key to its conception of social life. As Daniel Albrecht (1999: 21), a Pentecostal theologian trained in the social sciences, has noted: “Pentecostals themselves have often objected to or reject[ed] the term ‘ritual’ and its implied conceptualization.” Placing a high value on spontaneity and authenticity, Pentecostals condemn ritual as too routine, mechanical, or, as Albrecht has it, “unspiritual.” Furthermore, the Pentecostal tendency to introduce ritual into almost all domains of social interaction tends to rob believers’ ritualized productions of that sense of ‘set-apartness’ that scholars often see as central to the definition of ritual (Bell 1992). Largely for these reasons, when it comes to Pentecostalism, the study of ritual has lagged behind work in other areas. With a few notable
exceptions, such as the work of Csordas (1997; see also Robbins 2004a), this is true even among anthropologists, despite the support that their discipline provides for arguing that ritual is crucial to people’s lives (Robbins 2004b: 126).

Yet despite both the lowly status of ritual in Pentecostal self-understandings and the extent to which Pentecostal ritual fails to announce itself as such in ways that scholars can easily recognize, it is not difficult to make the argument that a very frequent recourse to ritual is an important aspect of Pentecostal social life. To begin with, if we look carefully, we will see that Pentecostal antiritualism is, as Pfeil (n.d.) has noted, itself ritualized. Moreover, to an observer with an eye trained only on Pentecostalism’s social aspects, rather than on the fine points of its folk theology, it is hard to miss how much of what Pentecostals do with each other easily counts as ritual in terms of its formulaic quality and its directness toward divinity—and this is true even if the forms in question allow for a good deal of spontaneous elaboration of personal content in approaching the divine. Given this, it is easy to concur with Albrecht (1999: 21–22) when he goes on to say that despite their protestations to the contrary, “Pentecostals do in fact, engage in rituals, though they often call them by other names: ‘worship services’, ‘spiritual practices’, [and] ‘Pentecostal distinctives’, for example.” On the basis of such arguments, I think it is fair to say that it makes sense to talk about Pentecostals as people who have a vigorous ritual life.

Returning to my argument about the centrality of ritual to Pentecostal social life, I suggest that to relate to one another as Pentecostals is to carry out rituals together. These rituals can be the act of praying together almost as a form of greeting or as a way to define the kind of interaction about to transpire: “God, we have come together today to [eat/hold a conference/plant a garden/make a business plan/study for a test, etc.].” They can be rites of ministration, where one prays for the needs or health of others. They can be celebratory rites of praise in word or song. And, of course, they can be the major Sunday service rites that constitute the sacred high point of the week in most churches (Nelson 2005). These rites can also involve a wide range of personnel. They can be carried out by two people or in small groups (a fast-diffusing social form in many of these churches) or by whole congregations, with some people acting as ritual specialists. One could go on in this manner, pointing to the variety of ritual forms and personnel configurations that Pentecostals can draw on in relating to one another, but perhaps enough has been said to carry my main point that Pentecostal sociality in a wide range of contexts is marked by a high degree of mutual ritual performance.

A number of aspects of Pentecostal doctrine support this high frequency of ritual interaction. The conviction that God cares about the faithful and intervenes in their mundane lives and that a sharp sacred-profane distinction is untenable is important here, for it allows ritual to suffuse all domains of social interaction (Csordas 1997: 109), as illustrated by Pentecostal uses of the ritual of praying together in all manner of contexts. Also important are key design features of Pentecostal rites that make their ritual forms easily identifiable to participants while still allowing for improvisation in their content, thus making it possible for people to perform rites in almost any setting and to use them to
address almost any circumstance. Thus, one can pray about almost anything or can use healing rites that are similar in form to treat almost any kind of physical or mental ailment.

Yet as important as the refusal of the sacred-profane distinction and the openness on matters of ritual content are to the place of ritual in Pentecostal social life, probably the most important feature of Pentecostal doctrine in this regard is the idea that all church members are qualified to initiate and participate in ritual performances. The clergy has no monopoly on ritual. Everyone participates, and whoever is moved by the Spirit can initiate rituals in most settings. There is no need for those who initiate rituals to have formal training or possess church office. The literature has already made much of this lack of formal credentialing of the clergy in accounting for the rapid spread of Pentecostalism, with scholars pointing out that new converts quickly become missionaries to their friends and neighbors and then often set themselves up as pastors of their own churches. Here my point is the slightly different one that the intensity of ritual interaction that defines Pentecostal sociality is rooted in the Pentecostal belief that everyone, regardless of training or church office, can initiate and participate in ritual. This means that whenever any two or more Pentecostals are co-present, they have everything they need to engage in ritual together.

So far I have made an empirical claim—that Pentecostal models of social life are distinctive in the amount of space they give over to ritual performance—and I have rooted this claim in a quick sketch of the basic features of Pentecostal doctrine that support it. What I want to do now is to connect this empirical fact with what I have called Pentecostalism’s social productivity, that is, its impressive institution-building capacity.

In arguing for a connection between Pentecostalism’s emphasis on ritual and its social productivity, I draw on Randall Collins’s recent work, Interaction Ritual Chains (2004). The notion of interaction ritual comes from Erving Goffman (1967), and Collins takes from Goffman a focus on face-to-face interaction. But to construct the heart of his theory, Collins returns to Goffman’s Durkheimian roots. He starts with Durkheim’s (1995) argument that major collective rituals produce a kind of effervescence that energizes people and leads them to feel empowered—to feel larger than themselves. He then generalizes this familiar point to suggest that all successful interactions—interactions that are sufficiently ritualized in a way that I will lay out in a moment—produce some of this effervescence, which he calls “emotional energy.” In a final twist, one not associated from Durkheim or Goffman, Collins (2004: 44) claims that human beings are, at bottom, seekers of such emotional energy; they are creatures who go through life trying to participate in as many successful interaction rituals as they can, drawing on the energy generated in each such interaction ritual to support the next one. It is the tendency for people to endeavor to move from one successful interaction ritual to another, increasing their store of emotional energy as they go, that generates the chains of interaction rituals that provide Collins with his titular image. And it is these chains, he argues, that give society its shape.

If Collins is right to suggest that people seek successful ritual experience and tend to invest in those situations and institutions that most regularly provide it,
then it becomes crucial in studying social life to understand what constitutes a successful interaction ritual and how it is produced. For Collins (2004: 47–101), interaction rituals involve two components. The first is “mutual focus of attention”—a sense on the part of participants that they intersubjectively share a common definition of what they are doing together. The second is what Collins calls a “high degree of emotional entrainment.” This refers to people’s developing sense that they are coordinating their actions together, a sense built up particularly through the rhythmic synchronization of bodily action so that the interaction flows smoothly. Such bodily synchronization can happen as fully in conversation or any other kind of interaction as it does in those social practices, like dancing, that explicitly aim to produce it. When it does happen and is combined with a strong sense of mutual focus, successful interaction ritual occurs.

In this article, there is little reason to further unpack Collins’s discussion of the way successful interaction rituals are constructed. A moment’s consultation of one’s own experience of what is colloquially called a ‘good conversation’ or ‘a productive meeting’ or even ‘a smooth transaction’ is probably enough to grasp the outlines of Collins’s argument. In any case, for the purposes of my argument about the role of ritual in the social productivity of Pentecostalism, it is enough to know that mutual focus and emotional entrainment through bodily synchronization are, for Collins, what turns mundane social encounters into successful interaction rituals.4

It is enough for current purposes to know that these two features are at the heart of interaction ritual because, on inspection, it is clear that Pentecostalism is ideally suited to allowing people to put them in play when they come together. Mutual focus in ensured by the shared knowledge of the basic ritual frames that orient Pentecostals in so much of their interaction—frames such as prayer, praise, worship, healing. As I have noted, these frames are open enough to allow all kinds of content to arise within them, but their purposes and basic organization are fixed enough that, as soon as the frame is in place, people possess an immediate mutual awareness of their shared purpose and interactional focus: they know that they are praying, praising, worshipping, healing, or performing some other ritual together. And once Pentecostals are in an interactional frame together, they are well prepared to generate emotional entrainment through bodily synchronization, the second constituent of a successful interaction ritual. For if there is one thing even those who know little about Pentecostals tend to recognize, it is the extent to which members of the faith everywhere share a set of bodily practices that look very much the same: arms lifted in praise, hands laid on in healing, tongues speaking in prayer, voices lifted in song. Because of these shared bodily practices, Pentecostals recognize each other’s physical presence even when they do not share a verbal language. Hence, Pentecostal bodies of all backgrounds are well trained to work together in ritual and well practiced in producing the physical synchronization that turns mutual attention into successful interaction ritual.

As a quick aside, I would point out that the wide diffusion of Pentecostal ritual frames and bodily styles must in part account for its success as a specifically global religious movement. Visiting pastors can immediately meld a
huge crowd into a ritually focused group, even working through interpreters, because everyone knows the frames and the rhythms and trusts that others do as well. And new converts learn these frames and styles quickly, for evangelists focus on them from the outset, often leaving all but the very basics of theology for later, when converts can generate theological reflection out of their own experience (Smith 2008). As Albrecht (1999: 2005) puts it, in the Pentecostal tradition it is ritual, rather than “structured verbal catechesis,” that teaches people “what it means to live and behave as Christians in a faith community.” Tanya Luhrmann’s (2004) and Thomas Csordas’s (1997) work also points out aspects of this process of evangelization through bodily training (see also Smith 2008). The evangelical focus on the global spread of a limited number of widely shared ritual forms thus provides an important foundation for Pentecostalism’s noteworthy ability to travel widely throughout the globe and produce recognizable versions of itself wherever it alights (Robbins 2004b).

The fact that Pentecostalism is learned through ritual brings me back to my main argument. In essence, what Albrecht and the others I have cited are suggesting, and what Albrecht in particular demonstrates very thoroughly in his fine book on Pentecostal ritual, is that “to live and behave as Christians” in a Pentecostal faith community is to participate in ritual together whenever one can, both in church and out. Drawing on their trained ability to fall into states of mutual attention and push such states forward through bodily synchronization, Pentecostals go through life producing an unusually high percentage of social occasions that qualify as successful interaction rituals. From Collins’s point of view, this would be precisely what makes them such good institution builders, even in situations where material resources are so scarce that few other institutions survive. The emotional energy that successful interaction rituals produce is, Collins would tell us, its own reward—or even what most people, whether they know it or not, take to be the one intrinsic good in the world.

Edith Blumhofer (1993: 210) captures well the sense of Collins’s argument when she writes of the “spiritual acquisitiveness” that drove early Pentecostals forward in the pursuit of what she views as spiritual experiences and what Collins would see as emotional energy produced out of ritual interaction. As Blumhofer (ibid.: 211) puts it: “[T]hese eager pioneers … pressed relentlessly on to the next experience, impelled by an insatiable longing for more rather than by determination to reach a specific goal.” It is the Pentecostal ability to produce this intrinsic good in such boundless quantity that keeps people highly involved in churches that meet in shabby storefronts, or that move from office park to office park in dreary, decayed urban locales around the world, or that congregate in churches made of whatever scraps are at hand in rural villages in an equally wide range of places. My argument here is that it is the Pentecostal mastery of the technology of ritual production that makes these churches work. All of the doctrinal features that make Pentecostalism appealing to so many of those who live on the margins of the market economy can only suture people to the faith after these robust, ritually driven institutions have already proven their ability to thrive.
Conclusions

In conclusion, I want to make three observations related to my argument that might in different ways help open up discussion on the role of ritual in contemporary religious movements. The first is to suggest a comparison case that might make my argument a bit more compelling. I often find that anthropologists and other scholars who do not study religion tend to lump fundamentalists and Pentecostals together. However, there are in fact major differences between fundamentalism and Pentecostalism, and as it happens, these differences bear very much on my argument. Pentecostals and fundamentalists share many, although not all, of the doctrinal stands that people sometimes refer to when explaining Pentecostalism’s globalizing success: both are strong on certainty, moral strictness, individualist models of salvation, and the conviction that the Second Coming is imminent. Where they differ is in their approach to ritual life. Fundamentalists largely banish it, and they do not provide the bodily training for it that Pentecostals do. Given what the two traditions share and what distinguishes them, it fits nicely with my argument that fundamentalism has not globalized with nearly the success that Pentecostalism has. It has planted far fewer churches around the world, and those it has planted rarely generate the kind of institution-building commitment so prevalent in Pentecostal churches. The Pentecostal promotion of ritual as a mode of sociality may not be the only explanation for this; there are some doctrinal differences I have not laid out here that may play a role as well. But with regard to the argument I am making, we would at least have to explore the possibility that the differences in the way the two traditions treat ritual is crucial to their differential global success.

The second concluding point I want to make relates to the main theme of this issue. Given its attested social productivity and the importance of ritual in producing it, what role might Pentecostalism play in shaping new socialities in the current period of global social disorganization? There is little agreement among scholars of Pentecostalism about the political trajectory its churches will follow in the future. For some, the churches are progressive, a force for democratization that in many cases cannot yet express itself in political situations that are not ready to go in the directions they point. For others, they are cradles of authoritarian attitudes and precursors to, or active promoters of, totalitarian tendencies. For yet others, they are simply new opiates of the masses, leading people to an otherworldly quietism and taking them out of battles that, if they knew what was good for them, they should be fighting. These kinds of claims tend to be made in the subjunctive mood: they are most often forecasts rather than analyses based on concrete cases. And I have to admit that I have trouble choosing between them. We do not yet know, I think, exactly what kind of political role Pentecostal churches will play around the world in the future.

But the experiment I have just conducted of examining Pentecostalism less as a set of beliefs and more as a kind of social life suggests what may be a useful way to reframe such questions about the potential contribution of Pentecostalism to emerging forms of sociality. Looked at from the point of view I
have developed in this article, what is distinctive about Pentecostal churches is that, as Levine (1995: 169) puts it, they give “the tools of association to everyone.” And those tools consist of the means of performing rituals with any other church member at any time and in any place. What these churches have proven, then, is the social productivity of this practice of widely dispersing ritual capabilities. They have shown that a social life dense with ritual provides fertile soil not for escape but for successful institution building. The ends to which Pentecostals will put the institutions that they build is not yet completely clear, but at least we can say that they have already demonstrated the value of the means by which they have built them. And in that point alone there is much to be learned about the kinds of social life that are likely to thrive in the foreseeable future.

This leads to my third concluding observation, which is aimed more squarely at social theory than at the study of religious movements per se. There is a great deal of interest at the moment in ways of thinking about social life that do not rely on notions such as society or culture. These theories do not assume that there is something outside of interactions themselves that endures through time and decisively shapes the directions that interactions take. Hence, there is a general move afoot to turn away from talk of social structures or cultural formations and toward that of ‘assemblages’, ‘networks’, ‘relations’, and other such notions that are presumably more concrete—or that direct us more to the concrete phenomena that we observe and in which we participate when we do our research (e.g., Collier and Ong 2005; DeLanda 2006; Latour 2005). I am not wholly convinced at present about the advantages of this move if it is conceived of as the wholesale replacement of the older notions by the newer ones. However, given the nature of the Pentecostal religious movement I study, I can appreciate that this move does bring new issues into focus. One such issue, which I have explored here, is how the dynamics of ritual interaction in its own right can help to generate novel social forms that can flourish in contexts where older social forms find it difficult to survive. Yet in light of my ambivalence with regard to this new theoretical trend, one advantage of Collins’s conception of interaction ritual chains is that it allows us to keep some of the force of Durkheim’s insights concerning religion without having to bring on board his model of society. This makes it a promising theoretical approach to carry forward in pursuit of theoretical frameworks suited to the analysis of the emergent socialities that are such an important focus of contemporary social research.
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Notes

1. From this point, I will use ‘Pentecostalism’ to refer to both Pentecostal and charismatic Christianity.
2. For a review of the kinds of arguments mentioned here, see Robbins (2004b).
3. See Robbins (2004b) for a review of the literature on these points.
4. In an essay focused on theories of ritual, it would be important to situate Collins’s theory of ritual interaction in relation to other work on this subject. I cannot take this on as a task here. But it is useful to note that, on the most general level, Collins’s theory, at least as I read it, should be counted among those that Handelman (1998: xxii; 2004) sees as examining “ritual in its own right.” Handelman’s important point in proposing this category is that most theories of ritual tend to focus on the relation of a ritual to the society that, in one way or another, it serves to represent and/or functions to perpetuate. While not denying that ritual does relate to society, Handelman asks that we develop theories that focus first on what ritual does in and of itself. Only after we have determined what this is should we then examine how ritual action connects with society more generally. Collins’s theory, with its emphasis on how interaction rituals produce emotional energy out of their own dynamics (as opposed to needing to draw on social dynamics outside of themselves for their effects), fits this bill nicely. The fact that it does so is crucial to the social productivity argument that I am making: it is because ritual can do things in and of itself that it is able to generate novel social dynamics. I will return to this point again briefly in my conclusion.
5. See, for example, the case described in Knauft (2002).
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