

FOR THE HEALING OF THE NATIONS: LUMBEE INDIAN COMMUNITY, CHRISTIAN
MISSIONS, AND THE TRANSFORMATIVE POWER OF INTERVENTION

David S. Lowry

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Anthropology.

Chapel Hill
2012

Approved by:

Dr. James Peacock

Dr. Robert Daniels

Dr. Glenn Hinson

Dr. Patricia Lerch

Dr. Patricia Sawin

ABSTRACT

DAVID S. LOWRY: For the Healing of the Nations: Lumbee Indian Community,
Christian Missions, and the Transformative Power of Intervention
(Under the direction of James L. Peacock)

What does it mean for Native Americans to practice intervention that takes them across the world? This dissertation analyzes this phenomenon through the lens of the Lumbee Indian community of North Carolina. The Lumbee Indian community, at this moment, is defined by their permanence within constant struggles to define themselves vis-à-vis U.S. Federal mandates to make Indian identity localized, traditional, and otherwise unchanging. However, as Christians and agents of change across the U.S. and world, Lumbee people do not concede to these frameworks as they utilize missionary identities to provide healing for traumatized people across the world and throughout the United States. This ability to heal, I argue, is based in the steady importance of division and exclusion in the Lumbee community. Exclusive identities and spaces have influenced and prepared Lumbee missionaries for their specific missions, even as Lumbee missionaries begin to find it necessary to acknowledge one another and common goals in mission. Given the academic and social rhetoric that frames Native America in locality and unity, this dissertation attempts to illuminate how Native America must be discussed in terms of the intersections between Native community breakages and the transcendent power that often comes out of and utilizes those breakages.

My research is based on two years of research in the Lumbee geographical center: Robeson County, North Carolina. In this time, I conducted oral histories, short semi-structured interviews, observation in missions and at religious meetings, and informal conversations with community members. In my research and writing, I practice an auto-ethnographic method of engaging the Lumbee community because I am a member of the community. Because this research attempts to pull together seemingly distant anthropological discourses (Native American Studies and globalization, in particular), I engage these discourses with a sense that I am creating space for individuals and communities whose voices, experiences, and practices are not recognized because of gaps within anthropological theory.

To Ali, my fellow anthropologist.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I often think about what my life would have been if I had not had chance encounters with particular people at particular times over the course of my life. In that light, these acknowledgements are my very humble effort to remember what has influenced me. I would need all the pages of this dissertation to properly thank everyone who has been gracious and generous.

Thank you to my mother and father for bringing me back home to North Carolina as a child. Thank you to Dale Maynor, my high school principal, who told me that the most precious knowledge is found close to home where we often don't want to ask very simple questions. I owe a sincere debt of gratitude to faculty members at Massachusetts Institute of Technology – especially Heather Paxson and Jean Jackson – who introduced me to the professional world of anthropology. Thank you to Dean Sandra Hoeflich, Dean Leslie Lerea, Dean Marcus Collins, and many other administrators at UNC who always offered unconditional support for my health, education, family life, and future. Special thanks to Mrs. Suphronia Cheek and other members of the UNC Anthropology Department office staff for your consistent concern for my progress in the PhD program. Your assistance in many areas has been priceless.

Thank you to my committee members – James Peacock, Glenn Hinson, Robert Daniels, Patricia Lerch, and Patricia Sawin – who took me under their wings in the

middle of my graduate education and guided me into my PhD. Glenn, you have continued to press me to speak and write clearly and precisely. Thank you for believing in my passion and ability. Robert, we shared one of the most important conversations of my graduate career back in 2009. Thank you for your confidence. Patricia Lerch, you have helped me establish my passion for Native American scholarship through your sincere interest in my work. I appreciate the time, resources, and energy you have placed in my project. Patricia Sawin, I would not have studied missionaries if it were not for “Moving Stories”. Thank you for being a careful listener and excellent mentor in scholarship. Jim, you have been as much a father figure as an advisor and chair. You have been sincerely interested in every aspect of my life. Along with taking me under your wing, you have allowed me to think broadly and differently. The warmth exuded by Florence and you during the last few years has guaranteed my abilities to complete my research, writing, and preparation for my future as an anthropologist. I am forever grateful.

Thank you to the National Science Foundation and the UNC Graduate School for supporting my work with tremendously generous fellowships.

I truly appreciate and thank my family and friends in Saddletree, High Point, Winston Salem, and many other places across the United States. I am blessed to have such fantastic, undeniably generous people in my life who have been willing to sacrifice money, prayers, kind words, hugs, and good meals. You all have asked me to do work that will explain the fullness of our human experiences. Thank you for helping me in my journey.

Thank you to the Lumbee missionaries who allowed me entrance into your

worlds. Our conversations were often in the midst of very busy days in your lives. You have inspired my ideas and my future anthropological research. Thank you many times over.

I save the best for last. Thank you to my lovely and tremendously supportive wife, Ali. It's been a long road that will soon end with both of us doing a tremendous amount of good for various communities and peoples. Thank you for taking this journey with me and for loving me during my movement from student to scholar. Words cannot explain what I owe you.

Any mistake in this dissertation is my own and no one else's.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Complicated Native America.....	10
Remembering revival.....	13
Chapter outline.....	25
A note about ethnographic approach.....	28
II. ROADS TO RECOGNITION.....	33
Bloody Robeson.....	33
Today's missionary road.....	39
Conclusion.....	48
III. MAKING VISIBLE.....	50
Taking care of our own.....	51
Who to cook for?.....	60
Conclusion.....	70
IV. WITNESSES TO APOCALYPSE.....	72
Selecting apocalypse.....	84
Humanitarianism, the art of exception.....	90
A daunting task.....	98

Multiple sovereignties.....	104
Conclusion.....	108
V. LEGACY OF CIVIL WAR.....	110
The contexts of civil war.....	117
The introduction of Brother Johnny	122
The illusion of 1958	127
Civil war's children.....	133
Conclusion.....	136
VI. THE WORLD'S A STAGE.....	138
Creating new stages.....	140
The power to create stages.....	147
Mission celebration.....	153
Getting people talking (outside the church).....	160
Conclusion.....	165
VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES.....	166
May the circle be broken.....	184
Seeing ourselves.....	191
VIII. WHAT'S AT STAKE: A CONCLUSION.....	194
REFERENCES.....	211

“And the leaves of the tree are for the healing of the nations...”
Revelation 22:2

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Perhaps the greatest paradox of life in the United States of America is the relationship between exclusion and inclusion. This has been especially problematic for Native American communities whose existences within the American imagination depend on mandates for Native Americans to stick together and exist romantically separate from the rest of the United States and the world. Previous scholarship on the Lumbee Indian community, whose members live mostly in North Carolina, have focused on aspects of division in Native American community. Most notable of these studies are Karen Blu’s ethnography *The Lumbee Problem* (2001) and historian Malinda Maynor Lowery’s historical study *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South* (2010). Each study utilizes the notion of “factionalism” as part of its argument. Blu points to the contradictions that factionalism brings to the Native American landscape, while Maynor Lowery discusses factionalism as a precursor and a testimony to Lumbee enactment of sovereignty. Enactment of Lumbee sovereignty, according to Maynor Lowery, is witnessed in today’s Lumbee Tribal

Government.

However, despite the importance of these studies, I do not view Lumbee factionalism as an aspect of oppressed Native people in the U.S. whose community divisions were an unfortunate component of colonial situations in the United States. Neither do I see factionalism as either dysfunctional or as the circumstances that preface an ideally unifying sense of Lumbee community (i.e. Lumbee tribal government). Rather, I see the good and global potential in Lumbee community division as indicated in the work of Lumbee people in a global and U.S. Christian missionary landscape. In my fieldwork, I developed a thesis that the Lumbee community has contained elements of exclusion that have defined many parts of the Lumbee community and that are tied into American senses of exclusion. Yet, I came to a conclusion that this exclusion propels Lumbee missionaries into projects of mission across the United States and across the world where they practice and find satisfaction through particular forms of inclusivity.

The idea of going somewhere in mission, to bring an inclusive Christian message to the starving, homeless, and otherwise traumatized in some other community, in many ways defines a conceptual line between exclusion and inclusion in U.S.-based missions. That is, missions, to follow the idea of the “Great Commission” that many Christians follow, must extend into the world and *away* from home. This sense of responsibility butted up against popular conceptualizations of being Native American. For example, the fight for federal recognition pushes Lumbee people to constantly attempt to make themselves into some unrealistic image of Native America, all the while dismissing or not seizing

opportunities to explain the Lumbee community with regard to the way Christian churches have served as the center of being Native American. Thus, Lumbee people aren't battling each other because of some dysfunction. Their worlds are in states of proving inclusion and exclusion; in states of being here and there for the sake of their Christian and Native American moral responsibilities.

The notion that Christians must mission to those elsewhere or unlike themselves becomes especially problematic when we consider that Lumbee people, as Native Americans, are socially and politically urged to see trauma at home, locally, and within senses of relationships between Indigenous people in the United States and colonial or governmental powers in the United States. As such, unlike many missionaries from within the United States, they cannot simply and conveniently cordon off a zone of inclusivity somewhere else where missionary healing can take place. It *must also take place* back home to some degree. In this tension, Lumbee missionaries are in conversation with the discontents that define life in the Lumbee community, historically and in the present, through a constantly revolving set of conversations about the significance of globally framed intervention as it manifests in missions and various other types of humanitarianism.

Thus, my research led me to ask some core questions regarding what the connection between Native American people and missions means for our anthropological analysis of Native America, and for the narrow ways that both Native and non-Native people evaluate the place of Native America in the United States and the world. My first question regarded global mandates to "give back." What is the importance of today's global mandates to move and connect within a

Native American community that is urged to define itself according to a very old and stigmatizing sense of globalization (i.e. colonization)? Secondly, what does it mean for the insularity of Native American communities to meet the demands of “global” phenomena as they are mediated and shared, and what are the responsibilities that emerge from this mediation and sharing? And lastly, what does it mean for contemporary globalization, and otherwise more extended fields of vision that encompass global intervention, to surface within long held divisions and tensions that have defined particular cultural worlds?

For me, answering these questions demanded that I start at the sites of tension and division. They demanded that I attempt to locate myself at the places where particular cultural worlds come into conversation with a global movement to give back. However, as I found out, in the Lumbee community, this conversation revealed itself in practices that were not so foreign to Lumbee community life. Actually, at times, they were very traditional.

I began to realize this one day in between interviews for my research. It was Tuesday and the heat from the summer would soon be fading away here in the Lumbee Indian community in Southeastern North Carolina. The barbershop that I visited on this particular day was one of many barbershops situated within the various veins of the Lumbee community’s swamps and forests. The windows of the barbershop were large panes of glass covered with a metal mesh. Everyone here was Lumbee. They chatted about sports, motorcycles, and upcoming events in the Lumbee community. As I was waiting for my haircut, a young man, maybe 20 years of age, talked about his future. He would soon start trade school in the midwestern

United States. "It'll be nice to get away," he asserted. I wondered if his "getting away" was inspired by hope from the inside or by the tensions of life that define Lumbee community every day. Maybe it was both, but in my research, which this visit to the barbershop allowed me to escape for an hour, I was more concerned with the latter. Exactly what he was getting away from was up for debate. No one of the seven people in the barbershop asked him exactly what he was escaping. However, everyone knew – they all felt – the burden of attempting to succeed in the Lumbee community.

The words of this young man became very enlightening as I continued to listen to conversations in the barbershop this day and in subsequent visits. The owner of the shop began talking about the church across the street. The barbershop was neighbor to a prominent church in the Lumbee community that is known for its "holiness" style of worship, preaching, and teaching. The owner described how the church started a church basketball league and how they had restrictions on who could play and on what types of clothes they could wear. "They tell us we can't wear shirts with our tattoos showing. They tell us that our shorts have to be a certain style. You would think they would be trying to get people in there and get them saved," he muttered. "But they can't even do basketball right." His notion of "not even doing basketball right" was something that hit home with me and made me reflect back on the subject of my research.

In fact, ironically, it was this same church that earlier posted a quite interesting message on the eight-foot sign in the church's front yard. The sign read "WELCOME HOME MISSIONARIES." Yet, as it was, this church didn't seem like a

welcoming place for this barber and many others who saw it as a space of division and exclusion, even as it continued to be a center for projects to aid, pray for, preach to, and possibly heal people throughout the world. In fact, on one my visits to another church in the Lumbee community, about 20 miles away, a pastor referred to a three week long revival that had taken place at this church across from the barber shop: “They had revival there. It went on for three weeks or so. They had great worship . . . but it didn’t change the community.” In his view, the fact that “people drive past one another to different churches” means that churches are defined “not by God, but by division and the devil.” His preaching about this church and about what it was not doing is quite normal discourse within Lumbee churches and, more generally, in the Lumbee community.

By definition, in the Lumbee community, the church across from the barbershop and many other churches in the Lumbee community are defined by intense separation. This separation does not amount to the church’s separation only from “the world” as many Christians articulate it, but also from various parts of the Lumbee community. This separation now exists in the shadow of great movements by people in these exclusive religious spaces to participate in the art of Christian mission work encompassing many parts of the world.

But as the future trade school student in the Lumbee barbershop made me consider, leaving or moving into missions may not only be a mechanism to heal an “other,” but also a mechanism for getting away from, assessing, and ultimately addressing the discontents that Lumbee missionaries see in the world of Robeson County, where most Lumbee people live. In the shadow of the rhetorical

announcements of tribal unity for the sake of federal recognition that inundate the lives of Native American people and research on Native America, Lumbee people fully acknowledge and sometimes appreciate the heritage of division that has made the eclectic world of Lumbee missions possible.

Before arriving at the barbershop on the day I listened to the future trade school student, I was in a meeting with a Southern Baptist Lumbee, Pastor H, who would serve as one of the guiding voices in my research. He told me about a coalition of Native American Southern Baptists, a group made up of over 20 Native tribes. The people in this coalition plan to travel to Mexico and work in missions with the Mayan community. I had recently met with Pastor S, another Southern Baptist minister, and was part of a meeting where he discussed the process of gathering old pharmaceuticals for use during his mission to the Philippines. Their work is defined by loyalty to the Southern Baptist tradition and their simultaneous responsibilities and loyalties as pastors in the Lumbee community. While they, like all Lumbee missionaries, proclaim inclusivity or willingness to help anyone in any way, their work exemplifies the way that Christian charity is defined by decisions to place missionary intervention in particular places. In that light, the need to choose where to intervene undergirds this dissertation.

This lead me to consider what Revelation 22:2 (cited as the epigraph), in combination with the “Great Commission” that Christ articulated in the New Testament, means as it is performed by people who obviously have much to lose and gain by transcending the normal discourses of tradition, heritage, and localized identity. How do those “leaves”, in Revelation 22:2, manifest themselves in the social

worlds of people who seemingly have much to lose politically and socially? As I discuss in later chapters, Native America is socially and politically ensnared in senses of home. In that respect, for Native America to define home then leave it in the current global flows of missions may easily be conceptualized as the antithesis to the home roots that they have been completely invested in because of their social and political need within the U.S. to emphasize their heritage and power as Native Americans.

Numbering 55,000-60,000, the Lumbee community is mostly located in Southeastern North Carolina. We (I am Lumbee) call Robeson County, the largest county in this region, our homeland. While crude estimates of numbers of churches can be made, divisions are flexible, and numbers of churches and within churches change. However, the contours of Lumbee religious life remain the same. At this moment, the organization of Lumbee Southern Baptist Churches includes around 60 congregations. This number fluctuates from year to year as new churches start up and others become non-operational. The Lumbee United Methodists, likewise, consist of around fifteen churches. Many Lumbee people attend Presbyterian churches that are cross-racial congregations. There is the Lumbee-specific Holiness Methodist Church that consists of about 8 churches. Finally, many Lumbee people have formed independent “holiness”, “Pentecostal”, and “Baptist” churches that collectively number one to two hundred, especially if you consider the Lumbee churches that spread into the neighboring Hoke, Scotland, Moore, and Cumberland counties.

While Lumbee people are overwhelmingly parts of Pentecostal, Baptist, and Methodist traditions, with no relationship locally with the Catholic Church and very few relationships with such religious organizations as the Latter Day Saints or the Jehovah's Witnesses, their existences within and between the main Christian denominations in the Lumbee community maintain fluidity. By "fluidity", I mean that Lumbee church leaders often define themselves in particular religious organizations, yet the tearing apart and juxtaposition of religious traditions, which exists as a constant negotiation of religious life at the center of the Lumbee community, helps the Lumbee community maintain communication between Native social ways and the rigidity of religious life that defines denominationalism.

There is no origin story to Lumbee Christianity. As much as Lumbee people attempt to describe our community in terms of the Native American metanarrative that makes missions into Native America the defining moment of Native American Christian conversion, Lumbee people do not have that moment. Rather, Christianity is a definite part of the Lumbee community that has an indefinite beginning. It sits in the center of Lumbee community tradition as a strange concoction of difference and unity. The church, in the Lumbee community, is the place where division and unity mingle. It is the place where inclusion and exclusion find voice.

Thus, there was no period of Christian implantation or fertilization. Lumbee people do not articulate a period in the past when their community was "converted" to Christianity. Neither are there historical documents that indicate a period of mission activity that subjected non-Christian Native American people in this region of North Carolina with mission efforts of White Christian missionaries. If anything,

there were periods when Lumbee people became part of religious organizations. What they were coming from – what type of Christian organization they practiced before introduction into the Southern Baptist, Methodists, and other Christian organizations – is largely unknown. Nevertheless, in this dissertation, Lumbee Christian origin *within* particular religious organizations, and not the origination of Christianity itself within Native America, is quite critical.

Complicated Native America:

Perhaps the most complicated existence in America is Native American existence. Tucked conveniently in history, away from the eyes of contemporary battles over meaning, Native American remains a proto-America. Its containment of “heritage” and “culture” were not only what early anthropology was built upon, it was also what America was built upon. To make room for Manifest Destiny, which was the inevitability of American consciousness that demanded its immigrant children in the 19th and 20th Century be protected and provided for, Native America became the metaphorical shoulders upon which these immigrants stood. To this day, Native American communities suffer disproportionately in terms of health, wealth, and general senses of equity. However, as confusing as it may seem to some readers, we must return to them and continue to ask how their community members negotiate changing senses of ability to influence health, wealth, and equity. We must understand why they apportion their resources and imaginations of their futures in particular ways despite a very sordid and traumatic past that continues to speak in the present.

There are many anthropological studies of Native America already written. Over the last twenty years, however, many of them have focused on renewed senses of agency within Native American communities. Jessica Cattelino (2008), Circe Sturm (2002), Valerie Lambert (2007) are examples of anthropologists that ask us to consider the contemporary empowerment of Native communities and its discontents that are often, as these authors suggest, caused by a consistent presence of the “settler state” or “colonialism” in conversations about Native American empowerment. As all of these anthropologists note in their particular ways, empowerment is limited as long as “the state” and Indian tribes are paternally linked.

However, it must be noted here that recent anthropological dissertations have attempted to tackle the relationships between Native American communities and Christianity in a way that challenges the colonial contexts of Native America and the Christian church. Jessica Blanchard (2010) and Kimberly Marshall (2011), in particular, have written dissertations on Christian movements within the Absentee Shawnee and Navajo (respectively) communities. Their desires to make Christianity something that is not the antithesis of *being* Native American serve as the beginning of a quite new conversation that purposely situates Native American religious practices and experiences in much larger and profound spheres of responsibility and affinity.

In fact, Blanchard observes the critical battle between people and their “culture” among the Absentee Shawnee, where she describes one man’s discussion of his role in a particular “non-traditional” Christian religious church. In the context

of the “exclusive” nature of traditional Absentee Shawnee ceremonial grounds, he states that he will “not chase after something that doesn’t want” him (2010:7). What Blanchard describes in her dissertation is the “planting” of Native American led churches that “forge meaningful attachments within and against” the Native communities where they set up Christian churches (2010: 7)

However, my desire to continue this conversation does not depend on notions of Native culture as the centerpiece of analysis. Lumbee people who participate in missions do not focus on defending or reacting to the preservation of Native American culture. As Native people who are influenced by and carry with them a sense of historical and emotional attachment to land and social relationships that form their identities as Native Americans, they also participate whole heartedly in the institutions, conversations, and experimentations that define today’s Christian world. Lumbee Christian practice exists squarely in the changing contours of the institutions that house religious identities (e.g. Christian denominations), the ebbs and flows of information, and the changing tides of influence that place pressure on religious institutions from the global to the very local.

Thus, my analysis depends on two theoretical realms that have until now been deemed simply handmaidens of Native American colonization: contemporary globalization and Christianity. Introduction of these two realms of human experience and practice into conversations about Native America will not only broaden and magnify the complexities of Native American identity, but will also help reveal facets of Native American identity that have until now been hidden under the Native-colonizer dichotomy of Native American studies. While globalization and

Christianity have been used as historical catapults into today's discussions of Native American experiences and socio-political practices, we have not asked how these two realms have informed efforts of Native people to make sense of and transform their worlds in the 21st Century.

This analytical division between globalization and other communities is not as prevalent. I think about this in terms of other American minority groups. Black Americans, for example, were overwhelmingly forced to America through the global slave trade. They were forced to worship under the eye of the colonial slave master. The legacy of American slavery's Christianity still speaks today in terms of a radical Christ that never left the Black slave community in the 19th Century and is still observed as an empowering figure today in the Black American community.

I remember hearing Billy Graham talk about his revivals during the Civil Rights movement. He stated that his revivals were oftentimes the only non-segregated space in many American towns. The picture I always took from his description was of a Black and White America, and I often asked where my community, the Lumbee Indian community, or any Native American community for that matter, was located during these revivals.

Remembering revival:

This conceptualization weighed heavily on me during my fieldwork. During my interaction with Southern Baptist Native American missionaries from the Lumbee community and other communities, I was reminded of an argument from well-known Southern Baptist Leader Henry Blackaby that if revival starts in

America it must and will start in Native America. He has inspired many Native American Christian missionaries as they go back to their home communities to preach to their people during annual powwows and other community gatherings.

I knew, from a child, that revival had started long ago in Native America, well before Billy Graham or Henry Blackaby, and that it was guaranteed to not end soon. I was witness to Native American revival growing up in the Lumbee community, and it was the context of Lumbee revival that allowed me to form my understanding of Christian practice and experience today, especially within the context of the Lumbee community where revival, long ago, was not retained within community borders. Lumbee people, for long, have borrowed from the revivals that created and sustained their largely separate churches to reach across into communities where their revival could be utilized not just to convert but to help practice an inter-community healing process.

However, seeing this particular character within Lumbee religious life is difficult when confronted with the strong and complicated denominational faces that frame Lumbee religious life. While Lumbee churches began in revival, they often took on the status-quo symbols of American and Southern religious life. They became Methodists, and then United Methodists. They were Baptists, and then were eventually allowed to be Southern Baptists. The Lumbee Southern Baptists claim 1877 as their origination date. On this date they formed a conference called the Burnt Swamp Association, which exists quite vibrantly today. They, however, weren't fully allowed into the Southern Baptist circle until the mid-20th Century. The United Methodists claim a different origin year in the Lumbee community. 1888 is

the year that the Northern Methodists (to be distinguished from the Southern Methodists after the U.S. Civil War) began missions in the Lumbee community. All the while, Lumbee Methodists have been largely invisible under the constant shifting and re-shifting of organization that defines Methodism in the United States.

When I approached Lumbee church leaders during my research, they were usually eager to make sure I knew about their particular church histories. In the book titled *The Lumbee Methodists: Getting to know them*, Joseph Smith, a white UMC member, writes that some Lumbee people preferred the “methods and means” of Methodism.¹ Similarly, some Lumbee people preferred the “method and means” (if I can continue this word use) of the Southern Baptist and other denominations. However, importantly, the Southern Baptist and United Methodists have had particularly different relationships with missions, and these differences have distinguished the presence of their church organizations in the Lumbee community and beyond.

Mike Cummings, the leader of the Burnt Swamp organization of Lumbee Southern Baptists, actively reminded me that Lumbee Baptists did not want to be looked at as “missionized” people. Thus, according to Cummings, they set out to be and to do their own missions. Alternatively, because United Methodists see their churches as born in missions, something they do not attempt to distance themselves from, they have taken their places in national and global missions of today. For Cummings, there has been a pull from within the mostly White Christian missionary infrastructure in the United States to identify Native people and convert them.

¹ I use “UMC” as a shorthand for United Methodist Church

However, for Cummings, the missions that he has witnessed and been a part of are more than conversion. They are about community building and maintenance.

But other Christian denominations in the Lumbee community have not been as involved in missions. Some, such as the Assemblies of God (a Pentecostal denomination), have members who pursued missions on a much smaller scale than their UMC and SBC counterparts.² This is why I was surprised when I saw the “Welcome home missionaries” sign across from the barbershop. I had visited this and many other churches in the Church of God many times as a child, but I had never heard about missionaries. The sign shocked me. If anything, coming into my research, I thought the missionaries who I heard about in the Lumbee community were operating in some very different religious realm. As a child, I always heard children debating about how different their churches were. My wife, to this day, still jokes about a woman at her aunt’s church who sang like an “opera star.” “You would have never done that at our church,” my wife expresses. The “opera” singing of the Methodist tradition, in her mind, and probably the minds of many others, was starkly different than the less strained, more engaging style with which she grew up in the Baptist church. This difference, invariably, helped marked the separation between religious spaces in the Lumbee community.

As indicated earlier in this dissertation, the Lumbee community is divided into various religious organizations, including those previously mentioned and the Holiness Methodists, a church organization specific to Lumbee community. To help define the subject of my analysis, I chose to spend time with Southern Baptists,

² I use “SBC” as a shorthand for Southern Baptist Convention, otherwise known as the Southern Baptist Church

United Methodists, and Holiness Methodists because these were the groups whose members were actively pursuing “missions.” To begin to understand missionary expertise and the way the ways mission projects are selected within the Lumbee community, understanding how missions bridges the local Lumbee church and the rest of the world is critical.

The Southern Baptist Churches and United Methodist churches that Lumbee people have established are formidable religious and social centers in Robeson County. Both groups spread from Robson County into South Carolina and other parts of North Carolina. The Southern Baptists even maintain influence over a church in Baltimore, Maryland, where a diasporic community of Lumbee people exists.

It is important to note the way that a church sits in the Lumbee community. The Lumbee church is a living space, full of vibrancy and importance. For example, I often referred to Mike Cummings in terms that were similar to a tribal chief. He and other pastors and church leaders are holders of community confidence that is based not only in community history, where preachers were the orators of tradition, but also in a vision of the future that demands that church takes control in making the world sensible to Lumbee people.

In fact, in looking over the Lumbee community, there was a sense that even in the shadow of the strange political and social formations that are occurring around the relatively new Lumbee Tribal Government, the church was the place where people made sense of their world. It was the place where truth, reconciliation, and change in how the world is viewed took root. In many ways,

whether a Lumbee person is “saved” or “unsaved” – “in the church” or not, as many Lumbee people articulate their identities – their existence in the Lumbee community is based on implicit relationships to the church. Likewise, as I point out in Chapter 2, “Roads to Recognition”, because the Lumbee tribal government and Lumbee missions come out of the community-situated churches, you must see how the churches function within the community. Statistics do not work here. To say that a certain number of people attended church on particular Sundays may make sense to denominational leaders, but within the Lumbee community the church serves as an open door where individuals in the Lumbee community orient their worlds. This, as a matter of fact, is a point of emphasis for many of the Lumbee missionaries I worked with. Many of their projects, implicitly and explicitly, were designed around bringing the Lumbee community back into some type of harmony where the church, education, and family life worked together like in past decades.

In this research, even as I studied the breakages in Lumbee community, I was always cognizant that my observations and how I would write about them would help fill in the gaps that statistics could not. Whereas the Lumbee churches reported attendance to their respective denominations (e.g. the Southern Baptist Conference or the United Methodist Church), their conversation about what *comes out of* and *in relationship to* the Lumbee church cannot be illustrated in these numbers. In a U.S. landscape where Native Americans either do not exist or exist in spaces far away, the Lumbee people appear in their religious worlds in strong statements of Christian conviction or Christian orientation that have both carved meaningful antagonism within Lumbee social worlds and provided the strength and expertise to

influence, create and maintain healing from a community otherwise unaccounted for.

I realized this in death. Two of my uncles died before the end of my research. One of them, the first one who died, was a well-received evangelist in the eastern United States. He preached in many churches in the Church of God and I was often told that he had a desire to come back “home” and preach. The second uncle who died was the pastor of a Church of God in the Lumbee community. I was often told that he wouldn’t allow the first uncle to preach revivals in his church.

The family of my evangelist uncle invited me to a late night meal after the wake. As we gathered over waffles and hash browns, we began reciting our memories of our parents’ lives in the church. They were all dedicated to their existences in the Church of God, yet the domain of the church had changed so much. “Before, it was about long revivals, week long revivals...and the church was soaking in sweat from the heat of the place,” my cousin remembers. He is now a pastor of a mostly white Church of God in an adjoining county and talks about how his experiences attempting to go across county lines to join Lumbee churches for revival are sometimes difficult, even today.

We began talking about the separation between my two uncles. We talked about the politics of Lumbee church life. I shared some observations from my fieldwork. I told him about Mr. D, a 91year old Lumbee missionary who still travels to Belize and other Central American mission locations. I told him about how I began to interview Mr. D about his immersion in missions and how the beginning of Mr. D’s missions conveniently coincided with his exit out of the center of the

Lumbee religious world as a revivalist. I told him how Mr. D, recently, was celebrated at a “mission celebration” (which I discuss in a later chapter). However, as I told my cousin, he was not celebrated for his long history of establishing Lumbee churches through revival, but for his life in the national and international mission field. As I compared the separation of my uncles with the odd relationship between Mr. D and the Lumbee religious community, I began to see this thread of religious division that was not just a product of my family or a specific denomination. My cousin agreed that Mr. D’s acceptance “everywhere else” and not in churches in the Lumbee community mirrored his dad’s plight.

I had an epiphany in those hours after my uncle’s wake. The uncle who we mourned that night died as the pastor of a church that Mr. D helped establish through revival. Not only was it bitterly ironic that the Mr. D was not acknowledged for the revivals that he led for those many years, which happened to establish dozens and dozens of Lumbee churches in a few major Christian denominations, but his churches became the sites of influence and exclusion that his revivals were not.

Young Lumbee missionaries were in the process of bringing him back into the eyes of the Lumbee community in this era of major mission work in the Lumbee community. While many people looked at him as the forefather of missions and not of revival, his revivals spoke directly to what I had witnessed all my life. Out of his revivals came churches. These churches solidified Lumbee community. Through alienation that is part of Lumbee church life, Mr. D and my uncle were pushed away from the Lumbee community. Both of my uncles, both gone now, helped me realize this.

In this epiphany, I began to take account of the particular ways that missions, as a modality of religious experience that had become just as valuable as revival to Lumbee people, interfaced with Lumbee ways of interpreting the world. During my fieldwork, it was nothing to hear Lumbee missionaries, across denominations, talk about their missions as types of revival. For instance, Mrs. R, a UMC missionary who I worked with at her food pantry, told me about her experiences with missions after Hurricane Katrina:

We went down there to see the path of the storm. Then we went to the Houma Indian community. Do you know about the Houma? I didn't. What surprised me was that they never had revivals. They had church, but never revivals.

Mrs. R is a UMC member, but she has relatives in all three denominations that I spent significant time with during my research. Her uncle, in fact, was the leader of the Holiness Methodists. I met him one day during Lumbee Homecoming, an event in June and July that hearkens Lumbee people to come home to Robeson County for family reunions and various types of celebration. After I told him about the joint missions that Pastor S was attempting across the community, he replied in zeal: "It's about time we end the infighting!"

My conversations with Lumbee religious leaders and lay people from across the community generally centered on two ideas. The first idea is that Lumbee religious life defines separation in the Lumbee community. Whereas these churches may seem like they are led by people who simply want to be Southern Baptist or some other denomination, these particular religious contexts sit as symbols of particular potent and indefinite divides within the Lumbee community. These

divides may be historical, racial, economic, et cetera. Particular families who were ostracized in the community because of some facet of their identities often set up their own churches sixty years ago. Today, these sixty-year-old churches are most likely among the many churches that make up that denomination's association of Lumbee churches. Lumbee churches sit juxtaposed to one another. In between them, poverty, trauma, and senses of insecurity have taken root. The challenge Lumbee missions, in that light, is to have conversations across denominational divisions that allow everyone to view the commonality of poverty, trauma, and insecurity in the Lumbee community, which until fairly recently has not been directly addressed by religious leaders in the Lumbee community.

The second idea that we agreed on is that even as these churches have been separate, and even as they have been powerful and exclusive in this separation, this new era of missions, much like the old era of revivals that Mr. D helped lead, offers a steady critique of religious and social circumstances in the Lumbee community. As Mrs. R's uncle noted, the "infighting" must stop for Lumbee people to be able to address common areas of concern. But how far can this infighting go? That is, where does community division begin to not make sense for the sake of addressing community suffering both at home and outside the Lumbee community? In my observations, Lumbee community divisions can occur to great degrees because, as indicated in the formation of different forms of community institutions in the Lumbee community in the last century, establishment and maintenance of alternative community institutions from within the Lumbee churches has been critically important. The Lumbee tribal government was one of these. Missionary

work is also an example. Lumbee tribal government started when those wanting to formulate a tribal government attended revivals and impromptu meetings in the local churches. Likewise, attending a revival will often expose the attendee to some conversation about some aspect of missions, which are often followed by calls by religious leaders to extend one's actions beyond the typical activities of church life (e.g. attending revivals, participating in church activities that focus on the immediate church community, etc.).

That is why it is important to see revival and other activities that signal the prime importance of the local church as predecessors to today's plethora of Lumbee-led acts of intervention. It is important to see the churches that function through these revivals. In many ways, leading revival has long been an empowering tool of the local Lumbee church. Lumbee revivals reveal that change in the Lumbee community is tempered with old ideas, such as conceptualizations of who is accepted within the Lumbee community and who is not. However, missions, as a type of offspring of these revivals, take up what Mr. D and others attempted as they stirred up parts of the Lumbee community to eventually establish religious centers. In my fieldwork, I began to see how missions served to stir up the community once again. Only now, the messages of inspiration have turned into challenges to connect Christ with poverty, inequity, and invisibility. Whereas Mr. D and others once fueled the spectacles of tents filled with thousands of people, missions now makes the poor and disparate subjects of inquiry in a Lumbee religious landscape that for long existed in distinction from matters of social justice, poverty alleviation, and other

projects of helping heal human suffering that necessarily speaks across and beyond particular community spaces in the Lumbee community.

Whereas churches in the Lumbee community have long existed separated within denominations or in isolation because they were affiliated with a particular family or community, missions now place them in conversations that urge them to transcend church walls and social boundaries that have long defined the Lumbee community. Like the revivals of old that were inclusive, Christian missions in today's Lumbee community are redefining Lumbee moral worlds and attempting to break the exclusive and often alienating aspects of Lumbee religious life.

So it is important to consider how the organization and tradition of difference is being challenged under the weight of contemporary Lumbee missions. Lumbee missionary activity is fueled by growing national and global mandates, which push Lumbee religious leaders to reconceptualize Lumbee religious life and make it part of growing communities of shared sentiment. This is particularly important, especially when we consider that Lumbee people have maintained identities as Southerners, Native Americans, and parts of religious organizations, all of which have helped Lumbee community members maintain religious and social identities based in contention and separation. Missions is not only a modality through which Lumbee people attempt to make a difference to "the nations"; it also shows that religious life is a context through which Lumbee community is constantly critiquing and transforming itself.

But this story isn't simple, and it takes some getting used to. By that I mean that to understand Lumbee missionaries, you must excuse yourself from the repeated

mantras and themes that have sealed the current politics of Native American studies and the anthropology of Native America. You must, in effect, allow “being Christian” and “being Native American” to come together in ways that may greatly challenge paradigms in Native American studies where Native people, as “nations” or “the tribe”, exist in solitude or in long established relationships or political coalition with other tribes or the U.S. federal government. You must see that new spaces emerge for truth about our world and the conduits through which we intervene in it as morally charged intervention and Native America come together

Chapter Outline:

In the chapters that follow, I begin to outline the emergence of this realm of intervention as it sits simultaneously in the division and exclusiveness that have long defined circumstances in the Lumbee community, and in the necessary processes of unification that define activities of intervention that aim to be wide reaching and transformative.

In Chapter 2, titled “Roads to Recognition”, I begin to explain today’s Lumbee missionaries by juxtaposing the trauma in the Lumbee community as it has often been witnessed by outsiders with the necessity that Lumbee-specific addressing of these issues comes from the core essence of Lumbee community: the church. To that point, I explain how Lumbee community, as it comes out of the church, has been defined by two main roads: one defined by the coalescing of Lumbee community into the notion of a unified nation under a tribal government, and the other defined by missionaries who retain identities in particular Christian traditions. These paths,

I argue, were ideally formulated to address inequity and trauma in the Lumbee community. I argue that despite the plethora of strong voices that have identified trauma in the Lumbee community, these two paths – as spheres of identity and places where Lumbee suffering is recognized – remain the only two principal positions from where Lumbee people can hope to address major discontents within the Lumbee community.

Chapter 3, titled “Making Visible”, is the beginning of my conversations with Lumbee missionaries who have attempted to bridge their religiously based moral obligations to roads within the missionary path. Using examples from my fieldwork that express the continued fight between voices of intervention and institutions of power (in this case, the Lumbee church is among them), and moving into a conversation with missionaries in their sites at home in Robeson County, I argue that there is a slow but steady breaking with institutions that continue to deny or look past the devastating circumstances of people and communities that Lumbee missionaries feel express need to aid. It is their visions, born out of eclectic experiences and primed for sharing with the entire Lumbee community, that serve as the basis for Lumbee missions.

In Chapter 4, “Witnesses to Apocalypse” I continue a conversation about community breakages by returning to missions as a form of debate and transition. As witnesses to apocalypse – “apocalypse” meaning trauma and enlightenment – Lumbee missionaries articulate the daunting tasks of their works as missionaries (which often pull them far from home or place them in contention with the traditions of home) and new appreciations for Lumbee religious life. In utilization of

a concept of Lumbee churches as the center of Lumbee community empowerment, I argue that in its breakages it has created and continues to create spaces and opportunities for Lumbee missionaries to select particular humanitarian projects.

In Chapter 5, I return to the Lumbee church as offspring of civil war, generally, and of the U.S. Civil War, specifically. Within a discussion of Johnny Hunt, a Lumbee man, as the first non-white President of the Southern Baptist Convention, and a general discussion of the impact of civil war in Lumbee religious realms, I point out how divisions (as points of exclusion and alienation) in the Lumbee community have helped craft particular spaces for the creation of Lumbee missions. This points to the process of civil dispute – inside and outside the Lumbee community – as a cadre of voices and appeals that have ultimately pushed Lumbee community members to favor their specific religious realms (SBC and otherwise), which have continued to align themselves with larger national and global affinities for transformation that inevitably and importantly pull them back to their home community and its discontents.

In Chapter 6, “The World’s a Stage” I discuss the importance of resolving this civil war within the contexts of pervasive problems that are affecting the entire Lumbee community. Since I was often the witness to powerful people (on stages) who maintained a captive audience, I contextualize today’s era of Lumbee missions as one where the Lumbee church urges the Lumbee community to not remain stagnant in the shadow of massive human suffering from Robeson County to the rest of the world. By utilizing discussions of stages as places and situations that are crafted, such as the “mission celebration” where Mr. D was celebrated, I aim to

situate this period in Lumbee missions as it is heavily intertwined with Lumbee missionaries' growing dispositions toward finding particular niches for missions. In these niches, they can safely blend the contentious spaces of their home community with a world where they envision and articulate a plethora of subjects of healing.

In Chapter 7, titled "Implications for Native American Studies", I describe the implications of this research for Native American studies. While Native American studies attempts to delicately place a localizing rhetoric within most of its discussions, I return to Renya Ramirez's idea of "native hubs." I suggest that, as Lumbee religious institutions remain conflicted over tendencies to maintain "home" or work in missionary relationships that both take them away and challenge traditional aspects of home, the connection between home and places where Lumbee people remain in mission exhibits something even more dynamic than a "hub" relationship. In fact, the blending of Divine sovereignty and individual sovereignty, as I have suggested earlier, may be a quite sophisticated container of and vehicle for Native American empowerment that is not easily conceptualized within notions of land, government, or other social formations where Native American people ought to exist.

A note about ethnographic approach:

As anthropology remains the most human of the sciences, and the most scientific of the humanities, there are leanings toward retaining the objective field of observation and analysis that made anthropology so prominent in early 20th century American popular culture. At the center of that set of fields, Native Americans blew

in the wind, often unable to explain themselves without referring to anthropology's ideas of Native cultural purity.³ Partially because of that old notion of purity, as a Native American anthropologist today, I must retain a triple consciousness. I must hold important what mostly white anthropologists up to this point have said about Native America. I must retain an understanding of the counter discourses that evolve out of the Native community I study, which often and ironically entertain the frameworks of this old anthropology. Then I must assume the role of an agent of discovery whose insights are not what the white anthropological base or people within the Native community are expecting.

In many ways, writing what some scholars have described as “auto-ethnography” is a no-man’s land. Auto-ethnography, generally, is the writing of anthropological research that has “self” at the center. “Self” can be one’s experiences, one’s community, one’s cultural affinities, et cetera. As a Lumbee Indian, I will always observe through the contexts of my particular circumstances growing up in our community. The images of change in the Lumbee community, as I lived them and as they influenced my consciousness, remain sealed in my memory and in the language of my engagement with my community today. Like the story of my uncles, there are many stories of disagreement and contention that framed the everyday lives of people whom I lived around in my youth. In my writing today, this leads to a type of “confessional tale” (Van Maanen 1988), a conversation that I am having with my own community even while I write for many others to understand and appreciate the world that I study.

³ See Baker 2010 for a detailed examination of these notions of Native American purity in popular American culture

To begin to share this tale, I start with the sensibilities that lead me as a Lumbee Indian ethnographer. By “sensibilities”, I mean that my writing is meant to move past the mere conveyance of information. Not only am I there as the ethnographer, but the lives and ways of seeing the world that my consultants share often speak to me on a personal level. Though the notion of sensibility seems antithetical to the separation of everyday life from the analytical fields within the American ethnographic project (which is most easily approached by studying somewhere far away where sensibilities of a subject community are learned by the researcher), acknowledging my ethnographic familiarity and bias within my studied community served as the corner stone of my fieldwork. I knew that my studying Lumbee missionaries was predicated on how I perceived them or did not perceive them in my youth, and what their emergence meant today. This meant that I would have to share particular moments of influence from my youth to begin to explain why the missionary identity meant so much more today than I remembered. These examples are most prominent in my first chapter, “Roads to Recognition.” In this chapter, it is only through my situation as a partial insider, who invites many voices that witnessed a particular period that defined today’s catapulting of Lumbee people into missions, that I am able to begin to articulate how relationships of government and Native American “tribe” do not encompass the many ways that Lumbee people have discussed and reacted to subjects of healing.

Thus, my being a witness on several levels – as a trained anthropologist, as a member of community, as a member of a family full of preachers – insists that I sometimes present arguments that are antithetical to what some would argue *ought*

to be important in a Native American community (e.g. the primary importance of relationships between tribe and U.S. government). In many ways, I share the opinion of Renata Ferdinand, who shares her experiences as a writer of auto-ethnography within the context of Communication Studies. She writes:

As you can see, auto-ethnography forced me to come to grips with myself and to acknowledge the ways in which I occupy this world. If it could do that for me, it may work wonders for the communication discipline itself. It could transform relationships, strengthening understanding of ourselves and others. Or maybe it could diversify communication scholarship by widening the scope of research topics, ultimately changing the materials used in college courses and challenging the composition of the classrooms. It could even help break the monotony found with traditional research strategies by adding versatility to the methodological repertoire available and by opening up social science discourse to a larger and more varied audience, making social science discourse more useful. Auto-ethnography proves that there is much more to research than just experiments or surveys, in-depth interviews or participant observations, or statistical studies. Statistics are wonderful, yet they only reveal a small part of a larger story (2009:12).

The same, quite honestly, can be said of anthropology. While anthropology has continued a proclivity toward allowing stories to frame scientific articulations of human existence, instead of relying on numbers to provide perspective on particular social phenomena, its premise is that we are studying an “other.” However, as I have discovered in this research, going back to where we are from – or connecting to people who share sensibilities, affinities, and experiences with us – often means investigating how our home communities are in perpetual conversation with “others.” Whereas anthropology was once that discipline that brought the never-seen-before peoples to the homes of the average American, now the “average American” is in constant but often particular conversation with “others” in ways that insist that anthropologists reconsider who, what, and why we study what we do. While anthropologists such as Renato Resaldo and Audra Simpson (two among

many) have used auto-ethnography as a sometimes implicit means of challenging and broadening dialogue within anthropology, the new extension of anthropology as auto-ethnography may be ardent and expedient conversations by anthropologists within particular communities within which they belong. These conversations will not necessarily serve to defend or serve as token representatives of experiences within these communities. They will serve to make anthropology something very new; possibly a humanistic science of accountancy that reaches from the depths of particular communities to reveal lived realities that other social sciences can not.

In short, because where we are from is transforming under the weight of infinitely growing connections between people across the world, we might have a mandate to explain the contours of the communities that once merely served as our audiences. We might be forced to begin a constructive project to make anthropology exist perpetually within instead of on the edges of culture. In that light, introduction of auto-ethnography into the *standard* repertoire of anthropology is past due.

CHAPTER 2

ROADS TO RECOGNITION

Bloody Robeson:

Visions of blood and poverty help describe “bloody Robeson” in a chapter in Mab Segrest’s book *Memoir of a Race Traitor* (1994). She writes about her time spent in Robeson County during the 1980s leading up the taking over of the *Robesonian* by Eddie Hatcher and Timothy Chavis. In 1988, Eddie Hatcher, a local man who described himself as half Tuscarora and half white, decided that it was important to once and for all send a message about the political and police corruption in the roads of Robeson County. Segrest tells the stories of these roads. In reference to a series of murders, especially that of Joyce Sinclair in Robeson County, she writes:

Her murder, like many others in the county, remained unsolved. People were recalling her name because of another death, a year after Joyce’s body had been spotted behind the cinder block house...Joyce was killed the day before Halloween, and Jimmy Early Cummings died after being shot through the head by Deputy Kevin Stone, son of Sheriff Hubert Stone, on November 1, 1986, the night after Halloween. All Hallows Eve, so conquered Celtic culture says, is the night on which the passage thins between world of the living and of the dead, the evening on which that other world is caricatured in the little costumed ghosts and goblins tricking after candy. Joyce’s abductor, the man redundantly white, visits like a Klansman, like a ghost, like a deadly apparition flitting through the story (105).

Segrest continues to discuss, among other things, the reasoning behind Eddie Hatcher’s actions. After describing cryptic calls from some of her colleagues who she

worked with in Robeson County on social justice issues, she attempts to explain the evidence that Eddie Hatcher offered for the central role that the drug trade played within the culture of death and corruption in Robeson County.

According to Segrest, Hatcher thought that holding the staff of the *Robesonian* hostage was the only way to save his own life and to bring attention to injustice in Robeson County. She writes about how she took a break from her work in Robeson County to do a “gig” in California, about how she met her friend in San Francisco, and about how she tried to explain Robeson County:

I tried to tell her about Robeson County: cinderblock buildings, blood in sandy soil, asthma, jailhouses, twenty hostages...I felt incoherent (123).

Segrest did not immediately change anything, and 6 years later, in 1994, another “outsider” attempted to be coherent in describing Robeson County.

Scott Raab in his 1994 article “Reasonable Doubt”, which was published in GQ magazine, covered the murder of James Jordan, the father of famed basketball star Michael Jordan, who in 1993 died on the same roads in Robeson County. Raab attempts to depict the complex natures of Robeson County’s poverty, racial contexts, and social tapestry. The back-story was (and still is) captivating. Michael Jordan, a former player at UNC, retired for the first time after his father was brutally murdered at gas station off Interstate 95 in Robeson County. Fans of Michael Jordan called it the worst thing for the game of basketball because he left in his prime. Jordan’s father, James Jordan, was murdered in Robeson County, near the intersections of Highway 74 and Interstate 95. That year was a major turning point for my worldview. It was surreal because this was the height of the many

conversations in the U.S. about various forms of violence – associated with drugs, popular culture symbolized by “gangster rap”, etc. – that targeted mostly non-white, poor communities.

What many people don’t realize, still to this day, is the context of James Jordan’s death. His death, despite its seemingly random nature, was part of a developing web of transformation that was taking place in the middle of this region of North Carolina. Of the two individuals who were convicted of Jordan’s murder – one was Black (Daniel Green) and one was Lumbee Indian (Larry Demery). I remember how the news showed footage of the two; how they captured minutes of their night with a video camera, parading one of Michael Jordan’s championship rings. There were liberal and conservative reactions to these images in the Lumbee community. On the conservative side, many said that they are un-Christian youth, who are the product of a bad environment, who had run-ins with some form of authority before. On the liberal side, individuals blamed all sorts of things: the government, the bad educational system, and the treatment of people of color in general. Ironically, however, the conservative voices came from within Robeson County – even from Indian people who I passed daily. No one questioned the guilt of these boys, especially when “outside” voices attempted to shed light on the probability that these two were not guilty of the murder. Like Hatcher, they were caught in the context of a criminal story, while the real story (something that Raab sought to unfold) was covered in a community where Hubert Stone was still in power and where, like Eddie Hatcher before them, local people couldn’t recognize the probability that two poor, non-white Robesonians didn’t commit the murder.

In his article, Raab seems to toe the line between respect and outright horror at the fact that such political and judicial manipulation could take place:

I ask about the first news stories of Jordan's disappearance, which reported that his wife had spoken with him on July 26, three days after Stone says he was murdered. Deloris Jordan said she didn't know where her husband was calling from, but he seemed all right. Then, after Green and Demery had been arrested, a convenience-store clerk in Winnabow, eight miles south of Wilmington, North Carolina, and sixty-two miles east of where Stone says Jordan was killed, told police that on July 26 or 27, James Jordan, Larry Demery and Daniel Green had stopped in the store--she remembered the gold trim on the Lexus--and she and Jordan had a brief chat. A breadtruck driver, making a delivery to the store, also recalls the incident. Finally, I say I've heard that at least two people whose descriptions don't match those of Demery and Green were seen running from a red Lexus parked near the intersection of US 74 and I-95 early on the morning of July 23. In September, in fact, a Raleigh television station reported that police were looking for two additional suspects in Jordan's murder.

Hubert Stone smiles. Mrs. Jordan, the clerk and the breadtruck driver are simply mistaken. The sheriff has no other suspects, no doubt who killed James Jordan. Forty-one years and only one unsolved killing: Doubt is something outsiders bring with them. In Robeson County, every murder case seems to break and close like a well-oiled 12-gauge (Raab 1994).

But what seems most important to me was how local readers, Lumbee and non-Lumbee alike, appropriated his work. Journalists and readers of the *Robesonian*, who either didn't approve of what they considered a limited view of the article or the fact that this national magazine had the gall to write about a place it didn't know, wrote articles in the *Robesonian*. In an attempt to quell perceptions that what Raab was saying about Robeson County was true, they put their proverbial foot down.

The first of two articles that caught my attention was that of a *Robesonian* editor who, in drawing up an editorial, seemed to attempt to deride Raab while silencing the notions of violence, chaos, and blood that Raab points to. In an interesting twist of meaning-making, the editor brings up Eddie Hatcher, and what

seemed at first an editorial statement to address the effects of the GQ article making its way “into the public domain.” Eddie Hatcher, as someone who at the time in the early 1990s was still attempting to affect change and make anyone listen who would, was this journalist’s way of making Raab insignificant. To the locals, and to some who may have heard about the *Robesonian* takeover, Hatcher was most likely a villain. Making Raab a villain, in that same light, accomplished the goal of dismantling his credibility. However, what is also interesting here is this editor’s apparent inability to do this without pointing to the image of people in Robeson County as those who would “stick their head in the sand.” His appeal against this is an appeal to the *Robesonian* readers to: “vote”, “improve communities”, and “take care of our children” (Editor 1994:4A)

The first of these, “voting”, was very much on the consciousness of Robeson County’s Lumbee community. In fact, in the aftermath of the Jordan murder, and in what seemed to be an awakening within the Lumbee community from a sleep that had lasted throughout the last few decades, the county voted in its first Lumbee Native American Sheriff in 1994. His election, however, especially as it spiraled into corruption and chaos in the early 2000s, made me reconsider the tone of a second letter that was written after the Jordan murder in 1994.

This letter, written by Mr. Brett Locklear, points not only to the limitations of Raab’s article, but also to how the Lumbee community was, at least in a small way, distancing itself from Demery in hopes of correcting the image of Native Americans in Robeson County. He clearly resents the use of Hubert Stone’s voice in describing

Demery or any other aspect of Robeson County. At the conclusion of his “Reader’s View”, he writes:

The injustices and grievances I have borne, and all the rest of the Lumbee have encountered, have made us stronger in our attempts to reorganize the prejudices we have fought against for years. The perseverance of the Lumbee is in essence the mainstream of our existence. We are stereotyped to be corrupt, yet many of us are very moral [...] Therefore, I challenge you to come back to my home town, Pembroke, in Robeson County, and search for some positive influences that are evident within our community. I promise you that it will not be very difficult, as good deeds are evident within our society [...] We only want to be viewed as good and decent people that most of us are, not the malevolent individuals that we are portrayed to be (1994:4A).

Locklear’s voice speaks to the disdain that Lumbee people themselves had for the unsavory people that helped make up the Lumbee community. He should not be blamed because this was the climate. The Lumbee community was based on working hard, and if you are not working hard you are the one to blame.

What all these conversations –the GQ article and the editorials that followed – show, maybe most importantly, was that the multiple transformations that were taking place were part of a reassessment of the moral certainty that previously existed primarily in the centers of Lumbee community life. What Locklear called for in his letter to the editor was not a showcasing of particular institutions – not the tribe, the churches, or the Native American college (which, at that time, Native Americans operated) – but a pleading for people unable to appreciate the good within Robeson County (who are represented by Raab) to “come back.” He wanted them to follow those same roads back into Robeson County, to experience them again in the light of those who were related to the murderer. This was a request for

some type of clarity where previous writers – primarily Raab – supposedly saw no clarity at all.

What Raab described was the murkiness of the roads. Locklear saw and attempted to describe the clarity of the roads. He saw a definite division between those who were doing good (what the *Robesonian* editor suggests) and those who were not like the rest of Robeson County. However, what Segrest and Raab saw, which Lumbee and non-Lumbee alike in the *Robesonian* didn't know how or want to address, were the bloodied sand and the bodies that were appropriately staged, which as Raab suggests were used to frame Demery and Green. Robeson County was sealed with a legacy of corruption and dismissal, even from Lumbee people themselves.

Today's missionary road:

In my fieldwork, I was left with a question of how this general sense of good – which would, according to Locklear, be easily witnessed by coming back – spoke to the necessarily gruesome realities that lie in Lumbee community landscape. Whether murder, drugs, or a general sense of malevolence, there seemed to be no way to fix those things. For Raab and Segrest, it was quite important that they be fixed. For Locklear, as it seems during this time, the importance of protecting the image of the Lumbee community was just as vital. So where Raab and Segrest, to some extent, failed to realize the necessity for Lumbee-specific healing to take place within the guise of Lumbee social structure, individuals like Locklear were apt to suggest that nothing needed healing as long as “we” were not identified with people

like Demery. Raab and Segrest saw the critical need to take on inequity head-on, while Locklear wanted to show how he and most Lumbee people were different from a particular subset of the Lumbee.

In today's Lumbee community, this same tension remains but has shifted slightly. There is still a sense that dealing with poverty head-on cannot fully incorporate efforts that seek to recognize the general standing of the Lumbee community. For Lumbee missionaries, dealing with trauma, homelessness, and hunger means actually bucking the systems and traditions of recognition that place images of who we Lumbee people are before efforts to address human deprivation as it affects all people.

Here I am not arguing against the goal, pursued by the governmental wing of the Lumbee community, to seek federal recognition as Native Americans. One of the arguments for federal recognition is that it will mandate that the U.S. government help provide needed healthcare assistance to members of the Lumbee community (among many other needed benefits). The fight for federal recognition pushes Lumbee people to constantly attempt to make themselves into some unrealistic image of Native America, all the while dismissing or not seizing opportunities to explain the Lumbee community with regard to the way Christian churches have served as the center of being Native American.

I introduced my uncles in the introduction because of the way they helped maintain the importance of the Lumbee church. These were sites (and continue to be sites) of great influence and power. The story of my uncles is one example of how families and communities – within the Lumbee community – help create and

recreate community. The church is a place of bargaining and truth. Yet, what is important is not only what happens *in* the church, but also what happens *at its borders*. The churches are, among other things, the nucleus of a religious and moral cell that helps solidify Lumbee community and makes Lumbee people comfortable because they can attach themselves to certain spaces and activities that come out of the church. But the Lumbee church and Lumbee religious life, despite serving as a very important nucleus, has never been the whole cell. That is, the church has helped create secondary institutions that also seek to help the Lumbee people. In these secondary institutions – at the border of the Lumbee church – there is much to be said about what the Lumbee community has been and is becoming.

To begin to explain this more fully is to understand the paths that Lumbee people have placed themselves on via the centeredness of the Lumbee church. I have observed two paths to influence that have been born from within the Lumbee church: missions and tribal government. During my childhood, another one of my uncles was my pastor. I never heard him ever mention either missions or Lumbee government. As a child in the Church of God (the same church denomination that my two dead uncles were dedicated to) there were missions circulating all around the Lumbee community, but in *other* denominations. In like manner, the foundations of today's Lumbee tribal government were built within the Lumbee community in churches, but in *other* denominations. While Mr. D and others were traveling far and wide to work with people in India and other far away countries, people in my church seemed content to minister to people close to home. However, during my research this past year, that uncle who was my pastor ran for and was elected to

Lumbee tribal government. From the cordoned off religious space that he pastored, he now entered one of these paths.

Coming into my fieldwork, I didn't know how to explain the gap between that f separate, largely exclusive religious environment, the distinct realms of Lumbee tribal government, and the plethora of missions that led some Lumbee religious leaders to embrace the whole world. I wondered if my recently elected uncle wanted to address poverty, trauma, and inequity in a way that his pastoring a church could not. When I was young he preached fire and brimstone. Now, he seems to preach a form of social justice, which is born in the Lumbee church but exists far from its rules, regulation, and openness.

In looking at this elected uncle, I had to consider the distinct sphere of his new world in tribal politics in relationship to the missionary world. Two of my missionary friends, Mrs. R and Mrs. T, were at one time tribal administrators for the Lumbee tribal government. In the early 2000s, they were among a few individuals who tried out for this position, within which they were assigned the task of maintaining the tribe's financial affairs. Both of them, in their first one or two years of office, were ousted. In 2010, at the beginning of my research, I attempted to understand how they went from positions as major spokespeople of the Lumbee tribal government cause to their roles as organizers of mission hubs. I was interested in the disparity between their images as leaders of a new tribal government, which inevitably had to borrow from pan-Indian styles of community critique, to a very memorable interview where Mrs. T, in the contexts of growing

trends to teach Lumbee children “Indian heritage” through the window of powwow, made me aware of her distance from these pan-Indian elements:

This...this is what you need to study. Not the powwows. That is not our heritage. That is something that looks good, but we were born in the church. This here [she points at the walls of her mission] is where we help our people (T 2011).

She sat confidently as she attempted to separate herself from the other path that Lumbee religious leaders take within the guise of tribal unity. She distanced herself from the flags of heritage and tradition at sites like powwows and in buildings like “the turtle”, the main offices of the Lumbee tribal government.

“The turtle”, in fact, served as an interesting point of reflection during many of my conversations with Lumbee missionaries. For example, one of the UMC missionaries I worked with sat down at lunch with me one day. We were literally 5 miles from the Lumbee tribal government building in Pembroke. He began to reference what he learned in missions in Bolivia. I asked him what it taught him and what it meant for him to come back home with his mission experience:

Those people, in the turtle, don’t realize what they are doing. They are hurting our people. I understand missions as a place where you find out what the world is suffering from. When I came back, I saw suffering all around here. Sometimes, it seems a bit worse than Bolivia. But those people [he points down toward the tribal building], they take advantage of so much. They have led the people on. Do they love the people? I’m sure some of them do – but not all of them. (S 2011)

As both Mrs. T and this missionary explain, Lumbee missions fix explicit problems that battles over heritage maintenance and cultural preservation cannot. This missionary, who explains how the tribal government “takes advantage”, points to the disparity between resource allotment and the rhetoric that comes from Lumbee

tribal government about helping. For him, Lumbee missions do much more of a service and provide vision that the tribal government cannot.

Lumbee missions operate spaces that stand in juxtaposition to “the turtle.” They are, quite literally, alternative spaces for Lumbee people to gain assistance. Mrs. R, for instance, operates a mission in Lumberton, while Mrs. T operates a mission in Pembroke. In a short decade, they have come to represent the complexities of fixing the great inequity and trauma that have plagued Lumbee Indian people and their neighbors. At times confusing and at times full of shame, the tribulations that the entire Lumbee community has endured are visible in the long stares of these two women, as they stand ready to act in their particular mission sites.

I remembered them when they were part of the grand beginning of Lumbee tribal government in the early 2000s. Even though I didn’t know them then, I knew of them. Everyone knew of them. They were the faces of federal recognition and other hopes for the future of the Lumbee community. But they do not maintain those relationships anymore. To begin to share their worlds – and the worlds of Lumbee missionaries of all sorts – we must consider how I interpreted their lives as parts of a much larger landscape within which the two roads began to be carved.

I began to think about this during the first few months of my research. During one long night, within which I visited three churches where missionary related events were taking place, I was stopped at a railroad track in my effort to get to the third location on time. It was a desolate area, and for a moment I doubted my safety. Eventually I asked my brother-in-law about the area where I stopped, and he

conveniently but in late fashion told me that that was the same place where his friend's automobile was hijacked. "Really?!" I asked. "Hijackings in Robeson County?" This was only one of the stories of the sordidness of death and trauma that Lumbee people hear about in these roads. Another story came from a Lumbee bus driver who told me about a young boy who was riding from school with his fellow students and was reminded that his mother was the prostitute that was walking along the road.

Multiple murders were reported in the *Robesonian* each month before and during my research. Part of the everyday conversation during my days sitting with missionaries was centered on reports in the *Robesonian* about murders that took place. For many who are familiar with it, Robeson County remains a mysterious place. It captures all of the elements of uncertainty that seem to define an almost lawless place. Along with being one of the most violent counties according to statistics provided by the state of North Carolina (see Hixenbaugh 2011), Robeson County has been home to special events of meaning-making. By "special," I mean that, within the context of the United States media, they have garnered special attention and, for very brief moments, exposed the general senses of poverty and deprivation in Robeson County. Behind all of these stories, there has been this sense that Robeson County vanishes as soon as it appears. For example, Lumbee people claim its swamps as part of their heritage. It's where our ancestors supposedly hid for generations, and from whence they have suddenly appeared in recent history. However, I often think that the histories of hiding away and the more recent practices of political and legal corruption in Robeson County have been complicit in

mandating this social invisibility in times past. Together, they do the work of making the Lumbee community invisible and silent. When we speak now, we have limited historical presence, and today we speak without the rootedness that Native people are supposed to have in the past.

Perhaps this is best imagined through the stories of “salvation” that brought various “worldly” people into local Lumbee churches as leaders. For example, many people in Robeson County were bootleggers during and up through the middle of the 20th century. Robeson County remained one of the “dry” counties in North Carolina, and it was quite normal for Lumbee community members to enforce intolerance for alcohol consumption. The “black market” of alcohol abuse was, as my father often told me, found in either “Going to Dillon” or in “bootlegging.”

“Going to Dillon” referenced the motel/entertainment complex, South of the Border, and the community that eventually was created around it. In its online history, South of the Border states that it started out as an alcohol distributor because of the “dry” status of Robeson County. On back roads through Fairmont and Rowland, Dillon was but a hop, skip, and jump that was eminently convenient and which created great friction between local religious leaders and the many Lumbee people who found it necessary to “head to Dillon” for consumption of alcohol.

My wife’s cousin jokes that having grown up in the southern part of Robeson County, it was always the “Pembroke crowd” (Pembroke is the “Lumbee capital” in Robeson County) that went to Dillon. She states that she and her peers, in the 1990s, “laughed at them” when they would come faithfully trucking down through her community to get to Dillon. In many respects, access to Dillon –whether for alcohol

or partying – seemed like a conduit where individuals in the Lumbee community could access some type of freedom from the Lumbee institutions that bound them. The story goes that South of the Border was, in the mid-20th Century, part of an agreement between the White leadership of South Carolina and the White Sheriff of Robeson County to allow Indian people, for the most part, to purchase alcohol. In the context of enforcement, while the White governmental authority authored the alcohol and partying depot in Dillon, it was the Indian religious power structure at home that helped fuel the diaspora between there and Robeson County.

Dillon, after Prohibition, became a partying scene for Lumbee youth where they entertained themselves to the point of violence. There were fights that broke out between Lumbee youth in Dillon and skirmishes that followed the partiers back into Robeson County. Recently, during my research in fact, a young Lumbee man was murdered on his path from a nightclub in Dillon. The blood continues to flow.

In that sense, Dillon represents the way violence, drug abuse, alcoholism, and other tantalizingly harmful realities have been long ignored in Lumbee society despite their importance to outsiders looking inward at Robeson County. Lumbee missionaries were not ignorant to murder or other forms of trauma, but their stories of dealing with the ramifications of this scuffling point toward a much larger, historically long conversation about trauma in Robeson County. Mrs. T, in fact, tells the story of the origin of her mission in simple terms. Her son, who was a prize student, became addicted to the narcotic drugs that have flowed fluidly throughout Lumbee community since the 1980s. I met him in her mission one day and we chatted. Mrs. T interrupted me as she attempted to talk with him. It was a stressed

relationship. She told me later that her work with her mission, “Traditional Paths”, was born out of her needing to address the conditions that made her son a drug addict and helped him leave home without telling anyone in his family where he was. “I told God that if someone is taking care of my son, I would take care of other peoples’ children” (T 2011). Her voice was filled with tension, and she spoke to the presence of addiction and other types of social ills that can affect anyone, despite ethnic or racial background. However, her addressing of these ills was carefully crafted in the mechanisms of aid that had to fall within Lumbee community senses of self if they were to work in the Lumbee community.

Conclusion:

In fact, the movement of Mrs. R and Mrs. T from the emerging Lumbee government back into the charitable sector is critically important and sits in stark juxtaposition to other “outside” voices that have attempted in their own ways to shed light on the trauma of Robeson County. Thus, as these roads are where life and death often exists, Lumbee people can only contend with them through the prisms of Lumbee community, if they are to be dealt with in a way that Lumbee people accept. Perhaps that is why Raab, especially, received no appreciation for his piercing and often truthful words. Even though Lumbee missions often do take Lumbee people outside the community, the kernel of connectivity that they maintain in the Lumbee community is what eventually creates the circumstances for creating the particularly valuable sites of intervention that the Lumbee government

and Traditional Paths can become. In the next chapter, I begin to explain this through the framework of visibility as Lumbee missionaries make it possible.

CHAPTER 3

MAKING VISIBLE

Recently, in 2011 and 2012, there was a wave of news reports about child abuse at major national universities. In November of 2011, national news programs were filled conversations about the supposed decades' long history of sex abuse by Jerry Sandusky of Pennsylvania State University's football team. Shortly after the Penn State scandal broke, another child rape scandal broke at Syracuse University. Victim after victim, tied to one particular coach at each University, came forward to articulate their experiences at the hands of the accused pedophiles and rapists. Men who were part of grotesquely large and powerful sports programs were vulnerable to the accusations of less powerful individuals.

However, what caught my attention was that the news media captured this spectacle of Penn State by paying critical attention to the charity that Sandusky founded: Second Mile. In the two weeks after this story broke in national headlines, Second Mile was as important to news commentators as dealing with the fact that Sandusky had supposedly raped children. There were as many calls to neutralize or close his charity as there were to make amends with these victims. They wanted his "closet" exploits to speak to and warrant dismantling of his prize charity that was supposedly formed to aid children who were overwhelmingly impoverished and in need of family structure (see Althouse 2011).

Sandusky, despite his supposedly indecent acts, was part of an economy of intervention that seeks to fill the role of that strange neighbor who happens to show up at the door. Sandusky served in this capacity, but in his illicit actions toward children he violated this role. However, within this scandal, the importance of Second Mile as a charity of importance was reified.

In the U.S. we have come to understand the middleperson of intervention as normal: from Salvation Army bell ringers to Meals on Wheels. Human vulnerability meets the humanitarian side of wealth and spectacle. That's what makes Sandusky's story so gruesome but worthy of continual coverage. His obvious "evil", at least at first, contended with the "good" that he did via his charitable organization. When news reporters started digging into his long history of child abuse and rape accusations, they found out that a judge who had granted him bail was also, conveniently, a volunteer for Second Mile. Outside of law, there was a community – and a fellowship and communion – that defined the private lives of people all around Penn State.

Taking care of our own:

This story weighed heavily on me as I continued through the end of my research. Because Second Mile was a place where many people gave time, money, and resources – and because it resembled so many other charities – the news media and people in the public were ready and willing to question anything illicit within the organization. There were several themes in the Sandusky case that mirrored things I saw in my research: the less powerful were up against the powerful social

institutions, there was an important battle between the privacy of those in power and the public domain of need, and there were certain people who had social currency to effectively “call out” those who took advantage of their roles within powerful institutions in U.S. society.

While the Sandusky case unfolded (and continues to unfold, at the time of my writing) in the U.S. national media, the calls to action by members of the Lumbee community to protect social mechanisms for aiding the suffering within and around the Lumbee community were projected in much different fashion. Community meetings and local media, for example, raised questions about events in the Lumbee tribal government and in the Lumbee churches. While articles and editorials in the local newspaper were accusing the Lumbee tribal government of corruption or general disregard for Lumbee community wellbeing on a weekly basis, everyone knew of the trouble that the Lumbee tribal government was having in relationship to the federal government. In fact, during my fieldwork, Purnell Swett, a Lumbee man who was the first superintendent of Robeson County Public Schools, recently served as chairman and chief of the Lumbee tribal government during a U.S. Housing and Urban Development investigation of the Lumbee tribe’s use of federal funds. This led many community leaders, including Lawrence Locklear who helped lead a grass roots organization that titled itself the “Lumbee Sovereignty Coalition”, to publicly call out and question the ethics and legitimacy of actions within the Lumbee tribal government. In a local newspaper article from June 9, 2010, he stated what was needed within the Lumbee community:

It's now time for the tribe to heal. The tribe needs to heal its relationship with the people, rebuild credibility with the government, and continue pushing for federal recognition (Shiles 2010).

This analysis of why the Lumbee tribe acted in particular ways with U.S. Federal funding became a particularly potent point of conversation in Mrs. T's mission. One of her workers, Mrs. A, told me of several people, including one of her relatives, who knew that certain people had received special services from the tribe. "We were put at the top of the list," she said as she placed cans of food into a food box that Mrs. T provides to low-income families. "Yes, I know it's wrong, but it happened. Everyone there is corrupt, but what are we supposed to do?" (A 2011).

She speaks in terms of the juxtaposition between resources and need. She questions the ability for people to make sense of corruption in Native American government when it happens everywhere and when people really need help where there is no wealth. She was able, in a way, to separate the corruption of the tribal government realm of the Lumbee community (where her family received special benefits) from the realm of charity that she worked in every day. The local council of governments, an organization that often hired people to help out in non-profit organizations, employed her. In fact, this was not my first or only interaction with people employed with this local government agency. There was a sense that through the contexts of charity members of this agency could help take local churches and other major institutions to task for not doing their part to address inequity, poverty, and trauma as it existed past the realm of exclusive Lumbee organizations.

This is exemplified in an exchange between Lumbee people at a UMC meeting earlier in my research. I was invited by Mr. P to introduce my research to the

Lumbee UMC executives. I showed up at approximately 5 pm at a small UMC chapel in the southern section of Robeson County. Mr. P showed up, and we walked in together. Inside, I decided to take a look around, so I attempted to glance in the sanctuary and around the property. I then walked into the fellowship hall where several UMC pastors from the Lumbee conference were sitting and snacking on deli meats, chips, and cookies. We all greeted one another, and the meeting soon started. As the secretary read the notes from a previous meeting, and as a prayer was said, I quickly realized that I was one of several visitors who would take up some of this committee's time before they got to the private business of the church, which meant we visitors would be kicked out. I was asked to go first, and I gave a summary of what I was studying.

There were many long glances – as if people were attempting to wrap their head around my project. There were a couple of questions about why I was doing this research. These questions soon subsided. The visitor presenting after me was the representative from the local council of governments. She had been highly interested in what I was saying in my presentation, though at the time I didn't know that she was a visitor too. She began to present her information, which was an appeal for local churches to revamp efforts to care for the elderly people who often had no one to look after them or care for them. She told this group that she was visiting many church denominations around the Lumbee community and outside the Lumbee community (she was Lumbee herself), and she felt that our people were complacent when it came to reaching out to those unable to attend church. "We care for our own," the secretary blurted out not looking up at the presenter. "I know we

do,” she responded, “but I feel – the numbers show – that we really don’t take care of our own. I think we think we do.” “Hah!” the secretary responded. This back and forth between the two ended quickly, and after this presentation, the visitors were asked to gather their belongings and leave.

I met the other guest speaker outside the church facilities along with a gentleman who worked as a Vista representative through the UMC. I abruptly asked the other speaker if she gave many of these speeches:

I do. And you know, our people are the worst for thinking they make a difference. They think that just because we are tied to a church that we don’t have to be looked out for. That lady may take care of her own, but everyone isn’t taken care of. That’s the problem. (W 2011)

Her story was that she traveled frequently to meet with church committees, hoping to convince them to think outside their boxes of tradition; to understand that they may be blinded by how they do things and the success they think they have. She represents not only this particular council of governments, but a greater conglomerate of interventionist projects that, whether government, church, or otherwise funded, speak to one another in ways that defy the private/public divide that we see in our everyday lives. Private churches are obligated to exist in certain ways vis-à-vis the federal government and their larger, hierarchical institutions. The mission and outreach efforts of these institutions, which stand juxtaposed to the interventionist work of local state-situated, governmentally oriented efforts to help the poor, homeless, and hungry, happen to employ individuals who possess certain identities and challenge the institutions and powers that have been linked as the traditional elements of certain communities.

Whether it was this representative being a member of a UMC church and attending this meeting as primarily a representative of the council of governments, or her being Lumbee and challenging the way that things work as these Lumbee and UMC leaders saw it, she pushed the comfortable limits and was severely rejected by this particular leader in front of the entire group. In that context, the pitting of the exclusiveness of the Lumbee religious space against the apparent inclusiveness of a humanitarian conversation is easily dismissed. But it is precisely this tension – between the Lumbee religious space and humanitarianism – that defines the provocative spaces that Lumbee missionaries have helped create in their pursuit to make healing part of “the ordinary routines of everyday life.”

The normal routines of everyday life, for many Lumbee agents of intervention, including this employee of the Council of Governments, has been to help the entire community take account of insufficiencies in taking care of community members. This has often meant that the established mechanisms for intervention are greatly challenged through subtle cues to community members to step out of the routines of everyday life. Missionary intervention becomes an endeavor to recreate what is comfortable, or to bring the comfortable into what is comfortable into a world that is being recreated.

These endeavors – in the soup kitchens where old women are reminded of and try to implement the comforts of Lumbee community, for example – are indefinite. That is, as they search for ways to help, to fix, and to heal, the places and contexts where missionaries work are both liminal and, increasingly, core institutions of everyday life. This is noted in a statement of Mr. P as we traveled into

South Carolina with a group of missionaries whom he invited from Virginia to do building work for a three-day period. As we traveled from home to home, well outside the Lumbee community, but within the community that Mr. P and others had drawn up as areas of missionary service where Native Americans lived, we were constantly confronted with the perils of poverty. One lady, having just missed her transportation to rehabilitation, was sitting in her house. The boards of the house's infrastructure were rotting. The floors of the house were caving in. There was an indentation in the earth in the back where trash was burned. She was paralyzed, and she attempted to raise children. The car she wrecked in was sitting in the back. At another house, a manufactured home, Mr. P and another missionary talked about how they had attempted to replace the home's roof several times. I mentioned the two homes, asking how they were supposed to confront the inability to permanently fix the problems. "This is all patchwork. All of it."

As we carried on through the day, Mr. P reflected back on his role as someone who facilitates missions, and he spoke of the joy he had in helping. However, he realized that even as he provided patches, he confronted his being the center of a changing community. He spoke about Mr. L, a white man who has long worked alongside Lumbee UMC churches and who played a significant role in starting the LRDA (the immediate predecessor to the Lumbee Tribal Government): "He has been helping Indian people for a long time, especially down here (in South Carolina). But he can't do it much longer. Our people have to step up." We had discussed the Lumbee tribal government several times, the inequity in treatment of the poor and disabled, and how he was one of very few who were willing to journey into South

Carolina to pay attention to those who couldn't make it to the soup kitchens and the other missionary sites up in Robeson County. "I wish our people knew they were here. I wish we could extend the community boundaries." At the end of the day, Mr. P was talking with the missionaries about their coming back, and I wanted to know when I could follow another missionary team. There are only certain times of the year they come in, and this was the middle of a very hot summer that itself would keep some missionaries away.

As much as Mr. P's job was to fix, it was also to maintain a flexibility to facilitate and to help place the interventionist with those who needed intervention. He is only one of two Lumbee missionaries who the United Methodist Church allows to be home missionaries. The other lives in South Carolina. "If that doesn't tell you about the state of this region, I don't know what would," he exclaimed as we were driving out of South Carolina. This region, full of counties of "persistent poverty", contains an Indigenous community that attempts to bridge the gaps between the most decrepit of circumstances and the eyes of those (Lumbee and not Lumbee) who might be willing to help. It is a role he has taken to heart, and a role that is becoming more prominent within Robeson County. The suffering call on him while those who need outlets to help place their names on his calendar. Likewise, with Mrs. T and Mrs. R, their roles shuffling between mission sites and executive meetings – always bearing the burdens of their willingness to step in the gap – are positions of certainty because they are those directly responsible for the indefinite in this period of the Great Recession and great uncertainty.

But certainty comes with a cost – an economic cost –and even as they serve as actuators of intervention, these missionaries are subject to the reality of a collapsing and shifting system that slowly pulls resources from their closet of resources. In their roles as missionaries, in their roles as creative connectors between source and salvation, they seem convinced that their roles as interventionists are complete only with regard to their borrowing from the residue of society. These missionaries are becoming normal actors in the Lumbee community, having gotten churches on board to regularly donate food and other resources. However, nothing about the economy of intervention is law. Nothing is permanent. As long as part of society exists at the edges, the edges are held together by that force of stick-to-it-iveness that defines survival. To understand how intervention is not spectacle, take disaster as it is televised for an example. In the media, the larger narrative moves on in spite of charity. The action of destruction – whether fire or hurricane – is complemented by slowly fading stories of human goodness in the aftermath.

It is all the Mrs. T can do to hold her little missionary house together. She has faith in the Lumbee community to provide resources. Mrs. R, likewise, depends on the pleasant attitudes of local churches and grocery stores to spare the less fresh items. Perhaps, in that sense, missions – and humanistic intervention, more generally – is a category of human existence that subverts more direct narratives of trauma to place patches and create healing. Perhaps, in coming out of their proverbial closets – where one could argue that individuals once hunkered away from the trauma of our communities – those who intervene are made complete.

Who to cook for?:

Lumbee missions are defined by the whirlwind of activities that hold together missions as a productive part of the Lumbee community. Pastor H is busy traveling back and forth to the midwestern United States to meet with and help strengthen a coalition of Native Americans from across the U.S. who do missions internationally. Pastor S is continually invested in planning for his missions to the Philippines, where he takes expired drugs to help with medical treatments that he sets up for his people in mission. Mrs. R is always “on the go”, to use the words of her secretary. In all my days in her mission, she was there approximately 60% of them. Mrs. T has a little white house that serves as her mission, whose wall rattling with the train that passes just 40 yards away, symbolizing the movement of people, resources, and ideas in and out of its rooms.

I encountered several VISTA workers during my fieldwork, all of whom were Lumbee, all of whom hoped their funding would continue to be able to serve as agents to fight poverty in Robeson County. The AmeriCorps VISTA program, according to their government website, states that they play a key role by connecting places of poverty in the United States with workers who are willing and able to help:

Americorps VISTA is the national service program designed specifically to fight poverty. Authorized in 1964 and founded as Volunteers in Service to America in 1965, VISTA was incorporated into the Americorps network of programs in 1993. VISTA has been on the front lines in the fight against poverty in America for more than 45 years (Americorps 2012). [An unnecessary quotation—your point here doesn’t at all hinge on a history of VISTA]

Along with employees from the local “Council of Governments”, they make up the plethora of paid workers who facilitate interventionist activities across the Lumbee community. One of Mrs. T’s workers, whose pay came from the Robeson County Council of Governments, was the effective “lead cook” for Traditional Paths. Her meals spanned the gamut, from pork chops to turkey, and she created all the sides that Lumbee people (and most Southern people) would consider acceptable: cooked cabbage, lima beans, collard greens, cornbread, et cetera.

Each day I entered the small house, I was reminded of Lumbee cuisine, but I was not aware of the fact, early on, that this food was a labor of love that was in many ways limited. Every time I walked through the front door, I chuckled to myself, remembering her words concerning the former white owners: “They would turn over in their graves if they knew it was being used to help Indians.” But this house had become a very important site for bringing attention to need within the Lumbee community. For example, the VISTA workers, who were much younger than the employees of the Council of Governments, tended to speak for the cultural quality of the meals. They would look at the ingredients, taste the food, and often comment on its acceptability as a “Lumbee meal.”

I found that this conversation between the workers at Traditional Paths, which happened in preparation of the many poor Lumbee people who would eat the meals, was a major component in the creation of visibility around the Lumbee community’s poor. “If we don’t do it [cook], who will?” the cook asked me. “These people, a lot of their families have disowned them. They have fallen out. It’s only us - we are their family,” she continued. I came to tears one day when a woman brought

her three-year-old daughter to the mission. I knew there were many children like her, throughout Robeson County, who didn't have a mother who was willing to bring them. Knowing that these many children did not have food gripped me emotionally. "Don't let it bother you David," Mrs. T said in reply to my getting emotional. She seemed to have developed an ability to see these painful realities and tuck them away. For her, the starving child was unacceptable, but it was not abnormal. She was prepared to see what I was not.

While the cooks in Traditional Paths attempt to sustain the space of comfort within their mission by regular and acceptable meals for individuals who come to them on a weekly basis, they reply to concerns that they are not cooking a perfect "Lumbee" meal with the expression that everyone "should be thankful" who comes to Traditional Paths to eat. While I overheard many people in the Lumbee community ask how they could help keep these missions open and ready to serve the poor, they also wondered how cooking in a way that essentially borrowed unwanted food from around the community could make a good meal. However, the cooks, despite their not knowing what they would cook with from day to day, understood that the precious nature of a Lumbee meal was found in its creation more than its content. This house was a tender balance between those who "will be thankful" and the inability to determine how much food they will have to cook these Lumbee meals. I say they are "Lumbee" because as these women cook, they talk about their childhood, and about how the kitchen within this old house reminds them of their homes back in the 1940s and 1950s. They tell me stories about working for Converse or some other knitting factory before they began this job.

They tell me that it is sort of a blessing to be able to return to a point where they do a job that resembles the old community and kin kinships that defined most of the stories of the older generations of Lumbee people who cropped tobacco, picked cotton, and worked on farms of various sizes. Eventually, they realized the old ways were gone. In this house, however, they gain the old ways again – at least in a small way. I am waking up to the smell of apple pie. The garage – a component added to the back of the building – is opening up. They are almost all here, ready to pray over their food and to eat.

Lumbee missionaries have attempted to make the rhetoric of living Christ-like to task by making the traditionalized offices of Christian preachers and pastors into callings that transcend buildings, churches, and the very Lumbee community itself. This isn't just about traveling or going to another place to exist as Lumbee people, it has been about addressing those hidden things that make up what Richardson described as "loneliness" (1990:4). If you hear Lumbee people describe "being Lumbee", it often veers into conversations about who is doing whatever, and who is not doing whatever. To critique Keith Basso and Karen Blu (Basso 1996 and Blu 1996), instead of "wisdom sitting in places", it sits in *actions*. Even though Lumbee people may start to know someone by where they are from, they *really* want to know what they are doing. It's about morality that travels with a person.

This contrast between *place* and *action* helps to explain this new era of Lumbee missions because Lumbee missionaries often find themselves alienated from location. The people they serve are often homeless or, at best, living from home to home. Likewise, Lumbee people are always attempting to introduce the

hidden facets of the Lumbee community in the course of their describing their mission visions. Lumbee missionaries who attempt to change or challenge the status quo in the Lumbee community must also be ready and able to articulate what exactly they are doing and why it matters.

I discovered this readiness to describe missions with Pastor N. I sat with Pastor N for several days at the North Carolina Baptist Mission. He is one of two leaders. He is Lumbee and the other leader is White. Pastor N's description of the growing presence of the mission camp, which mostly operates as a triaging center for different types of relief and rebuilding projects in and around Robeson County, is that its giving young people in the Lumbee community a way to learn about hard work.

These young people, they are coming out here, and they are highly interested in what we do. You see them, and you know they haven't done hard physical labor. It's something new to them. But they enjoy giving back (N 2011).

When asking Pastor N if young people are asked to travel far away to do building and relief projects during this same conversation, he entered a space of discernment about what he does and why he does it:

This mission, it was started directly after Katrina. Now, you may not believe it, but Katrina changed this community – our churches. People began having a heart for people like they haven't before. All of this [he points out to a large old parking lot, which connects three buildings of an old knitting factory that was emptied after NAFTA was signed] is about God's work now. It's about helping the suffering. Now, some people can go to the Philippines or other places, but not me. There is enough work here.

Pastor N connects the Lumbee "community" with the Lumbee "church." Both, he indicates, are changing for the sake of "helping the suffering." The awakening that

Pastor N recognizes explains the moral intersections that many people in the Lumbee community stand at. Not only have Pastor N, Mrs. T, and other elder mission leaders shown an example of missions as a general sense of sentiment, they have also articulated an ability to discern where an individual should be located in their mission work. This location is tied into the act of achieving visibility for the subjects of missions. To define their roles as missionaries often depends on creating an argument that can be deployed in explanation of how one's work is discerned and chosen – almost a prescription for fulfilling moral obligation – but ultimately defined and guided by God's sovereignty and, within the contexts of Lumbee community that is defined by its poverty and trauma, which is only properly treated through actions of aid.

I had a few conversations with Mrs. T about foreign missions, which often lead to a declaration by Mrs. T that there is too much work here, at home. The walls of this small white house in many ways make up for the porous borders that define the Lumbee community in relationship to extra-Robeson County missions. This house in many ways symbolizes how *Lumbee people at home can house missions*. It is an example.

On one particular day, I drove to see Mrs. T. She wasn't supposed to be here and I caught her by surprise. She had given the staff the week off since they agreed to help her in her annual Thanksgiving project to provide a substantial Thanksgiving feast to the region's homeless and hungry. "This is a 40 hour a week job for them. For me, it's more than that. I guess they don't think I have a life." But she received a phone call. A woman wants to drop off some clothes. A second phone call; a second

batch of clothes. As we trade ideas concerning what is next for helping the Lumbee community, a man knocks on the front door of the old early 20th century house. "May I help you?" she asks. "I came to pick up a box. Are you open?" "No sir. You will have to pick it up the first Tuesday of the New Year." "Well, I can't do that, I'll be up the road." He mumbles a few more words. He becomes silent. He turns around and walks out. The door slams shut.

Mrs. T didn't move an inch. "Well, I'm glad I didn't start to move, with his attitude." I looked to her, "Is that reaction normal?" The train was passing, and the walls of the small house were shaking. I wait. She doesn't say anything. She rolls her eyes. Her eyes' movement was worth a thousand words. They spoke of the bind she is in: as the middle-woman between those who have and those who very often don't. I begin to share with her some of the topics from my research. She seemed to ponder my points. At one junction, we began discussing the local churches. Her eyes light up as she quotes Mike Cummings: "He told me 'sister, you are the only one doing missions.'"

Mike Cummings was one of her former students, and her focus on what he has said about her missions speaks to his prominence in the Lumbee community. "How about if I say you and Preacher Mike and other missionaries are more important than the tribal council?" I asked her one day. She smiled, and entered a long discussion her plan for healing the Lumbee community. That was her way of answering those types of questions about who actually leads the Lumbee community. She stated, quite often, that it was necessary to reconnect the church, the schools, and the family in the Lumbee community.

She is a firm believer in education, and she has taught many of the Lumbee community's leaders. She had a long career in public education. She is also a United Methodist, but she was raised Southern Baptist. She told me that her remarrying made it virtually impossible to be a Baptist. "Preachers, they used to preach. They used to make you sit up straight." We began talking about Mr. D. I asked her if she realized that he was at least somewhat alienated by the community. "That might have been his problem, his leaving all the time", she suggested. "No, he was kicked out. Rejected. I think he was pushed away", I replied. We were both silent. In our own particular ways we had witnessed trauma.

Mrs. T began talking about her divorce. She was remarried. That's when it became plausible for her to be a United Methodist because there was no other real option. The Southern Baptists wouldn't have her. I asked her: "So, because you were divorced, you had to give and take?" "Yes, a little." This giving and taking – a sense of flexibility in acceptance of certain Lumbee and Christian moral standards that Mrs. T acknowledges could not have been exercised in past decades – is a product of many things. Even as Lumbee churches have continued to be part of large national and global organizations, the community itself has crafted its religious identity often in spite of a disconnection between the types of social interactions that occur between Lumbee people and the religious structures that they have often framed Lumbee peoples' moral obligations to one another. In a way, the slamming of that door that we both witnessed was one of many that Mrs. T, despite her educational and professional success, has experienced because of the gradually shifting senses of expectancy that define Lumbee community interactions.

It is important to see how this moment that I am speaking from – where Mrs. T and I are waiting for 2012, for the continuation of the missionary cycle – is primed with a form of expectancy that borrows from long legacies of Lumbee moral commitments to one another, but which also contains elements that are fairly new. Mrs. T didn't have to say it, but that door wouldn't have been slammed 30 years ago. Her giving and taking isn't just in terms of choosing a church; it is also in terms of being this middle-woman – this facilitator of morality that makes her wait for clothes and specify when they can be picked up by those that, most of the time, are in need.

Her small house is the sanctuary of the decisions that she makes, and of the regulations she must enforce. Mrs. T is a symbol of a critical change in how Lumbee people exhibit their responsibility to one another. Even as Mrs. T and I talked, we sat within a particular habitation. This moment that I joined Mrs. T was a moment where she in many ways was the center of the moral trajectories of the community. Despite her being rejected by the old religious guard (i.e. with respect to her divorce and her need to choose the Methodist church as her home), she was the person to whom the new religious guard looked to when preparing their morally clad ventures. As much as she had been the non-ideal image of Christ in earlier times, her seat in the small living room – turned mission office – was her existence as the center of a world that religious leaders now realized they occupied.

Having worked with Mrs. T and Mrs. R, I was introduced to the mechanism of charitable work. As 501c3 organizations, Ms. T's an independent mission and Ms. R's mission sponsored by the United Methodist Church are bound by particular rules

and regulations that determine what they can take in for donations and what, when, and to whom they can distribute these items. The major item of distribution that is regulated is food, and both missions are part of the same network of resources, from which they collect the food and other items that they keep in their mission sites. “School can drives, grocery stores, and Second Harvest”, Mrs. T uttered as she walked with me to the front of the old white house. “I tell you right now, I don’t turn down any food.”

But these spaces are often more about the actual resources. These places often act in replacement of families that are either absent or are not able to provide resources for family members. I cried one day as a little girl walked into Mrs. T’s soup kitchen with her mother. It was a sad day for me because I knew her memories would be of love that Mrs. T and others showed, yet they would be sealed with the exhaustion of resources in particular lives. Mrs. T, as I came to understand her, was much more than the person who had lost her son for a little while. She was unable to accept the proposition that little girls and their families would have to accept hunger because there was no one to facilitate the connection of resources and poverty.

The calls that Mrs. T received came from large numbers of people, mostly Lumbee people, who want to clean out a child’s closet or give over some left-over baked goods that weren’t used during a holiday celebration. What this constant conduit of resources creates are centers of energy, hope, and obligation. “What I hope is that people think about what I am doing when they have their hands on the extras,” Mrs. T once told me. What she conveyed was an element of spectacle that

hearkened back to Biblical scripture; to the notion that Christian giving (as she and others would define it) was more than handing over leaflets or preaching scripture to demand someone gets saved. It is also more than faint prayers of those in secret places who are convinced that their secretive existence composes all of the healing that they should be a part of. Her being the center of many peoples' thoughts – when they have those “extras”, for example – was her part in bringing the “realistic” and the “Biblical” hand in hand, to use Pastor H's thoughts.

In Lumbee missions, often lonesome but full of vibrancy, I see the future of Lumbee community and American society. It seems that this little house, which brings people out of their closets with hands full of clothes and food, and which is a place where different parts of the community cone together in new ways, is a precursor to a much more substantial transformation in how members will come to relate to each other. It is partly a product of an incessant, ecological need of a community that sits so far from prosperity and conventional forms of security and safety, yet is full of individuals who have maintained, in the shadow of religious loyalty, a fervor to make things right.

Conclusion:

In this chapter, I have described the creation of awareness that Lumbee missionaries attempt in the everyday. In their work, Lumbee missionaries aim to give attention to those things that are often born out of revealed shame and a growing awareness of how to connect available resources to those who are desperately needy or otherwise traumatized. However, as Mr. P suggests, it may all

be patchwork. As I introduce in the following chapters, as we mark our discussion of poverty as a global epidemic, I think it is necessary to emphasize the productive place of Christian identities and framings within anthropological discussions, with an understanding that a wholly oppressive sense of Christianity is absurd. In the next chapter, I invite anthropology to revival. That is, I invite readers to understand the relationships between Christianity intervention and Native American communities. To begin to understand these relationships, however, demands that we are forthright in stating that Native American senses of community may necessarily speak through Christianity because it is an appropriate vessel for expression of Native American moral responsibility.

CHAPTER 4

WITNESSES TO APOCALYPSE

In 1994, the American Anthropological Association (AAA), the parent organization for the discipline of anthropology, convened a special presidential session to discuss missionaries and human rights. The group of presenters included anthropologists, missionaries, and anthropologist-missionaries. The session dealt with the politics of brown and black people all over the world who were caught between anthropologists who possessed some continued disdain for missionaries and missionaries who often had the inside track that anthropologists only hoped for with various peoples throughout the world. Anthropologist Jim Peacock, in a special issue of *Missiology*, a journal that printed lectures from this presidential session of the AAA, argues for a “fair hearing” for missions:

How justified is the denigration by anthropologists of missionary work? It seems excessive, and it is part of a larger bias by many anthropologists and by the intellectual posture of the discipline and perhaps by academia generally. This posture is anti-power; it is critical of the military, of government generally, of capitalism, and of any commitment to a positive credo...

So anthropology shows its immaturity and irrationality in failing, often, to give a fair hearing to missionary work. What would a fair hearing entail? (164-165).

Anthropologist Thomas Headland, in the next article, effectively answers Peacock:

It is my goal in this essay to encourage a dialogue between missionaries and anthropologists that may coax a rapprochement between the two groups. I look for ways that the two parties can help each other instead of hindering each other in their programs. I refer here to programs that help people in material ways that promote the humanitarian ideals that both groups claim are part of their goals, and especially ways that defend the human rights of ethnic minorities (167).

What these two anthropologists, in their summary of a need for dialogue, articulate is highly charged territory within which both types of interventionists work: anthropologists as witnesses to their research by often being near human suffering, and missionaries as witnesses to Christ by often attempting to intervene in this same trauma. All of this, according to Headland, circulates around the “human rights of ethnic minorities.”

This notion of witnessing Christ through actions that effectively provide healing or some type of miracle is written throughout the New Testament. I would argue, however, that these two types of witness are not so far apart, and that they are born out of a crisis of intervention that has helped spawn the current states of both anthropology and Christian missions. As anthropologists, we need the world (to study) and the world needs our ways of being there, as witness to life. Likewise, the mandate to follow Revelation 22:2 and take “the leaves” from the “tree of life” to address those same life conditions is primed for the missionary credo. Both the anthropologist and the missionary are defined by what we call globalization and within the intervention that is needed to fix its discontents.

We must, however, address the “economies” or “cultures” that push to enhance the basic living conditions of the world’s population. Again, missionaries and anthropologists are part of this economy or culture. In the case of the Lumbee

community, however, these debates over responsibility – or, more precisely, moral responsibility – sits directly within Lumbee identities as Native Americans, Southerners, members of particular Christian denominations, men, women, et cetera. This takes us back a bit, and removes us from the ungrounded conceptualizations of global intervention (to use the idea of Peacock 2007).

To follow Peacock again (1994), anthropologists are against the forms of power that they see equate with hegemony. Fundamentalism, he argues, is one type of hegemonic religion. If missions act in that way, across the board, we should be very afraid. However, when looking at Lumbee Indian missions, hegemony is of little concern. Why am I so sure? Lumbee people are within an era of great transformation in how they not only identify but also respond to those in their respective mission fields. As a result, their conversations about moral, ethical, and love-drenched responsibility depend on the moderators of economic viability. That is, they depend on an awareness of where they can do the most good and how this interfaces with the deep seeded affinities born within Lumbee community and identity. In that those contexts, since Lumbee missionaries are at least peripherally tied into the debates about how their community functions as a Indigenous community in the broader landscape of U.S. politics, they must consider the implications of their work in larger discussions of their community. Nevertheless, when it comes down to defining the authority of one's existence, Lumbee missionaries share authorities as the Native people of North America and as members of Christian churches, within the Lumbee community, that have developed a type of "sovereignty" within the contexts of their religious identities.

Sovereignty is a big buzzword in Native American studies and Native American politics. When you say “sovereignty”, you are attempting to evoke the core of Native American claims to empowerment, political authority, and social presence. However, as I stepped into conferences and food pantries with Lumbee religious leaders, I began to see how the Lumbee church was not relinquishing its authority or influence.

One of the major forms of this authority or influence is mission work. As missionaries, Lumbee people find that their ability to move from the Lumbee home community to places outside the Lumbee community makes great sense and is effectual in creating change. Lumbee missionaries are not alone in their missions. In various religious organizations and other types of affiliations, Lumbee missionaries share ideas, form coalitions, and encourage others to take on their vision for Christian intervention.

I began to realize this at a United Methodist Church (UMC) meeting early in my research. At this time, Mrs. R was the director of the organization of Native American members of the UMC in the Southeastern United States. She invited me up to an annual meeting where there were Native Americans from all around the Southeastern U.S. gathered to meet for worship services, preaching, mentoring, encouragement, and re-acquaintance. The group was made up of Seminoles from Florida, Choctaws from Mississippi, Cherokees from Western North Carolina, and Lumbee Indian people. There were also some Seneca and Lakota people. A Tinglit evangelist preached one of the services on the first day. On the second day, a Lumbee evangelist preached.

During one of the discussions of missions, a Seneca woman arose to speak. She was part of an intertribal group that was planning a large mission caravan to the Oglala Sioux reservation in the Dakotas. She asked everyone to pray for the group, and she stated that anyone who was interested could help by providing money for shipping costs because they had to rent a tractor-trailer to haul food and supplies from North Carolina to the Dakotas. In the midst of her discussion, she made a startling statement, or at least one that caught me off guard: "We are more than our tribes." This statement was made in the context of shifting resources in the UMC. The UMC, as she and others in the meeting argued, was beginning to force Native people in the UMC to reconsider how they crafted their plans for future missionary activities. For her and many of the people in this room, it meant that Native American people (in the UMC) would have to rid themselves of the habit of focusing strictly on their tribal communities. Several Lumbee missionaries have reminded me that Native America used to be a major priority for UMC resources. However, arguments within the UMC, leading up to the major international conference of the UMC in the summer of 2012, point at a cataclysmic shift to not a reduced shift in missionary funding for Native America.

Later on in this same meeting, a young woman, maybe in her mid-20s, came to the front of the conference room. She seemed a little remorseful and hesitant. She introduced herself as part of the Eastern Cherokee community and she began to apologize: "I'm sorry but my chief was supposed to be here. But he's not." Her chief, Michelle Hicks, was listed as a keynote speaker. There were some grumblings, especially from the Lumbee gathered there this day. Suddenly, a Lumbee UMC

pastor spoke up, attempting to whisper very loudly: “You tell your chief that if he can go to Washington, then he can come here to worship with us.” This pastor was referencing the fact that Chief Hicks had testified, on behalf of the United Southern and Eastern Tribes (USET), against the Lumbee community being federally recognized as Native Americans. For years, USET, which is a coalition of already recognized tribes, has steadily petitioned against Lumbee recognition. They claimed, among other things, that it would put a burden on government resources allocated to Native communities.

This day, however, contained a very important dynamic. While the politics of Lumbee recognition came to the forefront in this pastor’s statement, there was an overwhelming feeling that Lumbee people here understood the importance of participating in this religious space in some sort of coalition. As much as Chief Hicks was the villain who represented the political underhandedness of some Native American people against other Native American people, he was also expected to be there to worship with this coalition of Native American people in the UMC.

For me, this event became a point of reference as I attempted to understand how the volatility and influence of Lumbee religious life came together. This day showed me that Lumbee religious life is a proving ground of sorts, away from the politics of being Indian in the popular sense of debates over the relationships between tribal governments and the United States. Having served as a place where Native Americans were connected and in communion, it was also a space where a particular type of healing was encouraged and supported that defied ulterior motives, political or otherwise. The social bonds here were not only pan-Indian and

cross tribal, but also born of a different type of sovereignty than is indicated in academic and political discussion of Native America. For various scholars (e.g. Wilkins and Lomawaima 2002; Cattelino 2008; Sturm 2002), the place of Native people within tribal communities is essentially framed in terms of pervasive and often confounding notions of Native sovereignty. While Indian identity is intimately tied to lands or resources that Native people (or their governments) have acquired through long struggles against the U.S. government's warfare against Native wealth, the Indian people themselves often remain alienated. In the politics of being Indian, the human sides of Native American communities are often desperate and invisible. Whether as sufferers or as individuals who attempt to intervene, it is difficult to describe the human side of Native America without looking through the filter of a tribal-government entity. This day, in a Native American organization within the UMC, for a brief moment, that filter was lifted.

To understand the mutual expectancies that Christian people will be responsive to humans and God we must consider the trajectory of relationships between Divine sovereignty into the present. There is a long history of Divine sovereignty that goes along with nation-states or imperialism. African and Native American people were enslaved and dislocated because the ideology of Manifest Destiny allowed it. But now in the context of 20th and 21st Century Christian missions, the sovereignty of God, instead of lying squarely within the imperial or the colonial, meets with the sovereignty of humans as humans desire to transform and change the world for good. Individuals who intervene take the sovereignty of God outside their community or globally to heal, repair, and restore. There are many

people who, through the context of connecting their personal abilities and desires to travel and to intervene, which are always grounded in particular backgrounds, articulate how this fusion between these two sovereignties – that of the person and that of the Divine – are not only something new and refreshing but seemingly antithetical to the horrible natures of past confluences of the Divine and imperial-colonial projects.

Over the course of the last few centuries, religious institutions have remained embedded in Native American communities, and notions of the Divine have been transferred into the activities and consciousness of Christianity in various Indigenous communities. Additionally, there has been an emergence of the notion that the sovereignty of God is linked with individual desire to intervene and act in making a difference on a more universal scale. Even as the sovereignty of God has been housed in religious institutions, there is a perpetual weight placed on these institutions to keep up or to help articulate what the relationship between the individual and moral responsibility should be.

This can often cause problems, especially in the Lumbee community, where this means cracking, pulling, and straining community structures that often, in unstated ways, are those paradigms through which Lumbee people (as a community) maintain fights against the long legacies of colonial and imperial disruption. Malinda Maynor Lowery, in her history of the Lumbee community, argues that Lumbee churches serve as sanctuaries not just for Lumbee Christian practices but also for protecting and housing Lumbee “national” sovereignty. Her descriptions are part of a much larger description of Native American politics and

theory. As part of her argument, she articulates that the Holiness Methodist Church, via its acts of separation and self-determination, marked the beginnings of what we would say today is the Lumbee “tribe” or “nation.” The notion of sovereignty in the Lumbee church, for her, seems something of a placeholder for articulations of Lumbee political sovereignty that are now being fought for today within the relationship between Lumbee tribal government and the U.S. government.

Maynor Lowery’s core argument hinges around the fact that separate Lumbee churches were part of a pervasive factionalism, and ultimately indicated that Lumbee people were aiming –through their separation – to be unified. She argues:

Many historians and anthropologists have described factionalism as a driving force in Native societies, (and) they have differed in their views of its origins. Some scholars attribute it to external events, such as the intrusion of the market or white settlement, or to what they perceive as innate biological differences between “full blood” and “mixed-blood” Indians. These writers tend to view factionalism as destructive to Indians’ sense of community and a reason for that community’s failure to effectively combat white intrusion and absorption. Those that view it as a product of Indian’s agency, rather than their victimizations, have more commonly attributed it to internal dynamics that sometimes predate European contact and always reflect Indians’ own political, economic, or social agendas. These writers have seen factionalism as an important part of Indian persistence (XIV).

However, theoretical framing of factional politics (like Maynor Lowery presents) as a fort against elements such as European intrusion or “white supremacy” means that Lumbee people must somehow explain away their politics, their separations, and their “factions” in an effort to honor homogenous community togetherness, which is ideal but not often reality in the activities of everyday Lumbee life. To say that Lumbee people fight to ultimately show their tribal identity through the contexts of unified community sovereignty does not allow sovereignties to exist *in*

plurality within the Lumbee tribal community. Take, for example, one of Maynor Lowery's other statements about Lumbee identity:

People living in tremendous tension with American Identity took that tension and used it to carve out their own sense of nationhood. The Lumbee, in particular, did this by adopting (and adapting to) racial segregation and creating political and social institutions that protected their distinct identity.

Nevertheless, this leads me to several questions. What about the United Methodist Church and its Lumbee members that were loyal to the denomination? What about the Lumbee Southern Baptists who were not granted equality within the Southern Baptist Convention for decades yet felt loyal to the denomination? Does this patient waiting for acceptance within their chosen religious organizations, which ultimately helped distinguish religious space and interrelationships within Lumbee people, speak to some type of protection of a distinct Lumbee identity?

I say no. It is not that a distinct Lumbee does not exist; rather, it is that that distinct identity must be explained in its plurality. In hopes of saying that Lumbee people are a distinct people within a racially Black and White South, it is easy to forget that Lumbee people might have had reasons to not look through the lens of race when choosing their institutions. There might have been something very important and gratifying within their religious institutions that meant more than protection of a homogenous Lumbee identity. Rather than unity, the Lumbee community has been and will continue to be framed by necessary divisions, and within these divisions there will continue to exist plural sovereignties. To say that separate institutions were maintained in the Lumbee community in response to a sense of Lumbee connectivity or singular nationhood, and not for the inherent nature of what these institutions possessed, does not address the gamut of Lumbee

conditions, experiences, and practices.

Even though the leader of the Lumbee Holiness Methodist, Mrs. R's uncle, told me that it was time to stop the "infighting" in the Lumbee community with regard to joint mission efforts, he quickly told me that his denomination was going to finish building some churches and doing repairs, then he said they would become more fully engaged in missions. He then began to describe how several of his churches were attempting missions that were spread throughout the world. For this leader, there was a sense that Lumbee churches were separated *necessarily*, but that they fought *unnecessarily*. There was also a sense that they contained senses of themselves, especially in this age of mission, as types of distinct conduits through which the Lumbee community articulated senses of common suffering. The Lumbee community, through eclectic types of missions that came out of distinct religious spaces, showed eclectic ways of approaching Lumbee healing.

Moreover, if one would argue that tribal government is the most distinguished and recognizable method for a Native American community to express sovereignty, it must then be argued that members of the Lumbee community, who aimed to create a tribal constitution, also understood the particular sovereignty of the Lumbee churches and, in essence, utilized the influence of Lumbee churches for the sake of a newer model of Lumbee sovereignty: the Lumbee tribal government. In fact, the initial form of Lumbee government, the Lumbee River Development Agency, was initially sponsored by the UMC.

Herein lies my enhancement of Maynor Lowery's argument. Maynor Lowery misses an important point that Lumbee factions were, in large part, spinoffs of

church leadership and church authority, which gave small amounts of authority to Lumbee tribal government and other “factions.” Not only is Lumbee tribal government not fully its own entity – that is, separated from the church – but the church also created other realms of sovereignty wherein Lumbee people have continued to attempt to help and protect the people of the Lumbee community.

Thus, the sovereignty exercised by the Lumbee community through today’s tribal government is *secondary* to the sovereignty of the churches because the tribal government and other “factions” were born in churches. Additionally, it makes anything that spins off from the church today as prominent as former spinoffs, as exhibited in Lumbee missions when individuals in need articulate that they do not go solely to the Lumbee tribal government for aid. In the course of asking for bread or housing, individuals pit the resources of the Lumbee tribal council against various Lumbee led missions, which for them are equally as formidable in terms of meeting their needs. The tendency of the Lumbee poor to ask what the Lumbee tribal government is doing – which Christians and non-Christians described as “non-Christian” and “defiled” – speaks to the legitimacy of the Lumbee Tribal government as a source of aid *that sits in the shadow* of the need to be ethical as represented by the Lumbee church.

Out of the Lumbee church, Lumbee people have developed tools to attempt to repair (to heal) the shared pain, trauma, poverty, and invisibility in the Lumbee community. Moreover, in looking outside the Lumbee community, where Lumbee missionaries often exist, Lumbee religious sovereignty easily folds into national and global missions where Lumbee churches, as opposed to an organization like the

Lumbee tribal government, cannot cut themselves off from aiding beyond the Lumbee community. According to Lumbee missionaries and churches, pain, trauma, poverty, and invisibility stretch much farther than Lumbee people themselves.

Selecting Apocalypse:

Lumbee missionaries depend on affiliations with and among an eclectic mix of organizations and congregations. Additionally, while Lumbee missionaries may be in the Philippines or in Haiti or in Bolivia, they are always at home, or at least stretching aspects of “home” with them to their mission field. Thus, Lumbee people, as missionaries, make critical decisions given particular political, religious, and economic conditions. Despite the universal nature of Christ, being Christ-like is context specific. As I witnessed it, the specifics of missionary love were very similar to the discontents of salvation that have long defined Lumbee life.

Growing up, I remember always hearing debates over the inability of evangelists and pastors and Sunday school teachers to interpret the book of Revelation. It was abstract, at best, and it was not uncommon for specialists in Revelation to be called in to preach weeklong revivals just on the book of Revelation. I remember, in the early 1990s, a series of videos that attempted to depict what would happen during the fulfillment of Revelation. They attempted to show apocalypse, as it would take place in the near future and in full certainty. For them, apocalypse was less the uncovering of a divine purpose and more of an impending, horrible death that was inevitable.

The congregation in my church must have been equally balanced between faithful church attendees, some above poverty level, and those who, in my young

mind, had a very rough life. It was nothing to hear family members call out the names of their loved ones during a portion of service called “prayer requests”: “Remember (so and so), they are strung out on drugs.” By saying someone was “strung out”, you were not just talking about addiction, but also about their dislocation within the community. Their identities were defined by their having “strung out” themselves and their community.

And so the days would go by, and a particular individual who was strung out would appear at a revival or at Sunday morning service and get saved, highlighted by a receipt of Christ and framed by an understanding that the churches were places where you put your life back together. The formerly strung out would go to church for a little while, and it was common for their name to be called up once again by a mother or grandmother: “Remember my family, they are on drugs again.” Drugs didn’t necessarily define everyday life for everybody, but it was a major part of it for pretty much everyone. There was a general sense of poverty and disillusionment that created the necessary contexts for drug abuse and the disappearance of souls that seemed to come with it, which is highlighted by the understanding that those who are “strung out”, for example, carry with them a little less in terms of being able to do what is right morally. They were in many ways half-dead, resembling our families and community members but not fully fitting in to the social order of things.

Even as pastors, evangelists, and lay members spoke against the elements that defined the Lumbee “world”, these elements defined evangelism and revelation as much as messages of salvation. Pastors needed the “world”, in all its sinful and secular forms, to help create their positions of guidance. There was one man in my

church who, relative to most everyone, was financially stable. Every so often he would give these long drawn out speeches during Sunday night service, and sometimes on Sunday morning. He would always talk about “the last days” and about how there would be a “great falling away.” He was always attempting to speak from the contexts of the book of Revelation, but he always ventured into its destructive side (as most people did). He didn’t need to remind us of how much we were already suffering. However, he was always attempting to scare the unsaved – mostly young people – so that they would avoid this supposedly impending drama.

The same can be said of pastors who often use Lumbee funerals to make appeals. Their messages – standing often over the bodies of young victims of drug abuse, homicide, and vehicular death – seem primed. “Don’t let this be you!” one pastor shouted at a funeral for my wife’s young cousin who was shot in the home of a known drug dealer a few years before my research. I spoke with the men who worked at the funeral home as we watched his body being lowered. I asked them how many young people they had buried. “Quite a few, it doesn’t seem to trickle off.”

This brings me back to Revelation 22. No one ever spoke in reference to Revelation 22:2. That is, they never said how this cycle of drug abuse, poverty, and death fit into that great healing that Revelation 22:2 promised. When and where would the nations be healed? What are the leaves? And who takes them to heal? Whose “nation” was important? And how is this great divide between the religious and moral centers, and the “world” that they juxtapose, mended? Might we have no one to possess and carry them to where they are needed? The great apocalyptic metaphor of the tree of life, in the midst of this present destruction, demanded that

someone in some capacity treat the nations – ours and beyond – with a bit of healing.

Having passed twenty years or so down the road of my life since I was a young boy seeing the trail of broken people as they sought a resolution in the Lumbee church, I was able to return to these issues. I knew the poverty had not changed, neither had the drug addiction or death. However, from the beginning of my research, I was quite startled to see how many people had set themselves on journeys to define what Revelation 22:2 means.

I was in a United Methodist church in the Lumbee community one Sunday morning when they sung this hymn:

For the healing of the nations,
Lord, we pray with one accord;
For a just and equal sharing
Of the things that earth affords;
To a life of love in action
Help us rise and pledge our word,
Help us rise and pledge our word.

“Love in action.” Love is a complicated idea. People can fall “out of love” as easily as they began to love. We are human after all. We, evolutionarily, are afraid of alienation. That is what anthropologist Miles Richardson speaks about in his book *Cry Lonesome and Other Accounts of the Anthropologist's Project*: “To be, we must speak, but to speak is to risk alienation (1990:4).

Thus, our love, because it is often made comprehensible only by speeches, sermons, and other appeals that press to love, shows signs that it is naturally “fragmented” and apt for alienation. Love is quite often a specialty, not a generality. It is dosed, not pervasive. As much as it seeks to encompass, it defines. That’s what

makes the image of Christ so special in Christian religious experience and practice. He is the figure of general, unbounded, and pervasive love. However, despite this ideal “love”, which seems to be at the heart of Christianity, Lumbee missionaries exhibit that they not only choose where love goes, but that they must frame it. It is context specific. It is born, often, out of contention with Lumbee and U.S. society, with the families of Lumbee missionaries, et cetera.

Leaving out that morning from this United Methodist Church, I chatted with my cousin who I had not seen in many years. We spoke about her membership at this church, which has been one of the most prominent churches in the Lumbee community. I asked her about a recent set of disagreements that caused her church to split off into splinter groups. Her reply was informative:

There were people with differences. They decided to leave.
But...but...we are fine...it is fine. We now have more room to do activities. We have more room to show love (K. Dial 2011).

These activities, among other things, consisted of serving dinner to the community on Wednesday nights. She said they call it “family night.” I asked if it was for those who attended the church, and she responded: “No, anyone, and our own people too.”

In context of the splintering that had taken place in this church, I noticed a trend that seems to define trajectories within the moral ordering of things within Lumbee community. The Lumbee community is known for its established church organizations, but for long it has been perfectly normal for churches to split away, what most Lumbee people call “falling out.” It is written into church histories. One of these histories, which describes the organization of Lumbee Southern Baptist Churches, highlights the founding of several churches out of “disagreements” and

the inability for congregations to get along. However, as one Lumbee missionary assured me, this has not been and is not normal for United Methodist Churches. “You can’t get back in. That’s it. The United Methodist Church will not allow it.” But as this same missionary told me, my cousin’s church broke off because of disagreements that went beyond theological differences or even affiliations with the United Methodist Church. There were interests that extended into the ways the church existed within the greater Lumbee community. My cousin’s declaration that everything was fine, that the church actually had more space – to show love – was at once protective of the significance of this particular church to the entire Lumbee community and, equally as important, the transformations inside and outside the Lumbee community that eventually caused the break.

The fact that a Lumbee church broke apart isn’t exciting or new. The life of the community has been, invariably, the breaking of institutions and collectivities. However, in talking to various people in the community, the breaking apart of my cousin’s church was different. This particular church for long touted one of the largest Sunday morning congregations of all the United Methodist Churches in the United States. This church, in its not breaking, in its holding a particular place in the Lumbee community landscape, was supposed to indicate security and community strength. While Baptist churches may break away, and they often do, it couldn’t.

What became important to me, in hearing this pattern of breakage, was the notion that there was always an economic reasoning that went along with whether churches fell apart or stayed together. More than justifying whether her church should have broken apart or not, my cousin was interested in maintaining the

viability of the breakage. It works similarly with the Southern Baptist churches history that includes falling apart as a normal process. It has an economic underpinning that simply makes sense. However, sitting with my United Methodist missionary friend, this subject evoked a deeper meaning. He was afraid that we were unable to articulate the meaning of the church in the Lumbee community. He was afraid that what made economic sense in the past didn't today.

The young people, they are watching us. They aren't coming back to the same old churches because they are supposed to. They are looking for something different. If not them, who is going to pick up the pieces of all this discord?

My cousin's notion of having more room made sense of the intra-community rupture by indicating that it was a sort of simple disagreement and that the church, as it stood now, splintered, was somehow revitalized, and prepared for its next set of charitable works. But the transformation is so strong that Lumbee churches, more than ever, according to particular church leaders that I have spoken to, are less the sites of political and community influence, and more the sites where important types of transformation are discussed, critiqued, and exposed.

Humanitarianism, the art of exception:

In many ways, missionary success depends on missionaries as interventionists who must triage their resources based on multiple sets of factors. By "triage", I am using a definition similar to the one employed by Gerald Winslow in his seminal book about the emergence of triage as a concept within war and medicine. Having defined what would constitute the rationale for distributing resources – in his case, medical treatment – he concludes:

A sense of the tragedy of triage (and not just academic custom) prompts some final remarks of reservation. “The work of justice will be peace,” the prophet says, “and the effect of justice, quietness and assurance forever.” But in this world our solutions are seldom, if ever, perfectly just. So our quietness and assurance are not everlasting; they are disturbed by intractable moral dilemmas (1982:167).

These moral dilemmas, I would argue, are both a symptom of and the creation of changing conduits of access between peoples across the world. For Winslow it was medical technology, tinged with the reality of war that defined today’s moral landscape. That created his sense of the birth of triage. For me, however, triage – the distribution of resources – has a particularly different genealogy in the evolvment of new symbols of sentimental meaning. Triage, today, depends on how these symbols circulate or how they pervade more permanent cultural structures.

In this sense, as Lumbee people receive these symbols, they grow affinities for need from the local to the global. World Vision may pull Lumbee people to adopt children, or some Lumbee SBC members may follow SBC pastors who have formed relationships with communities in the Philippines or Haiti. This circulation of symbols has also, somewhat ironically, but understandably, allowed Lumbee people to reconnect with other Lumbee people in new ways that defy long established types of alterity in the Lumbee community. These alterities have separated and stigmatized Lumbee relationships and community over the last few generations. These alterities take all forms – e.g. divisions between church organizations, new forms of trauma within Lumbee families because of drug addiction, the presence of populations of immigrants within Robeson County – and mission efforts within the Lumbee community have been created, at least partially, in reaction to them.

Yet, we must consider how missionary work, like all intervention, follows particular trajectories. These trajectories can be determined by individual experiences or by the power of appeals from organizations that the individual – or church, in the context of this dissertation – belongs to. Our moral vision of the world is constantly challenged in our everyday lives, in very obvious and not so obvious ways. In all of our talks of globalization, we have yet to properly address the ways that we travel – the very roads that we commute on – and how they are a medium for how we define our lives and the lives of those around us. There are two books – Moran (2009); Snead, et al (2009) – that attempt explanations of the relationships between roads and social life. Fellow anthropology candidate Gabriel Kaeger has a blog about his current research on Roads in Ghana (<http://anthroad.twoday.net/>). It explores the many activities, policies, crimes, and worldviews that occur and are forged around roads.

In his discussion of moral economy, after calling on Etzioni's "I/we Paradigm" to describe moral commitments in economy (2000:91), and making a subtle argument that "kin" is a special group within the category of "otherness", scholar Andrew Sayer writes:

Moral sentiments and arguments regarding economic activity, rights and responsibilities, continue to affect advanced capitalist societies, although their influence is frequently limited by system forces: the moral economy is in retreat on some fronts and advancing on others. Major political economic changes such as the rise of Thatcherism and the shift from a Keynesian welfare state to a workfare state also involve major changes in the moral economy. Politics is partly about the disputation of responsibilities for others and hence partly about morality, and economics is about how we meet responsibilities to others as well our own needs. Finally, *while the rise of cultural pluralism might seem to render agreement on the normative issues of moral economy more difficult, in an increasingly interdependent world, it also makes confronting these issues all the more important* (99; emphasis mine).

Sayer provides us with the beginning steps toward solidifying moral economy as a realm of critique, and it is important to see how an economy of intervention is the *enacting* of this distribution throughout the spectrum between the "I" and the "we." Intervention becomes an economically situated device that addresses the moral side of politics by making distribution of responsibility something that is normalized and often expected in the occurrences and movements of everyday life.

This is an idea she pushes against the main theoretical leanings and interests in anthropology, which are well represented within in the last paragraph of anthropologist Karen Ho's highly acclaimed book *Liquidated* (2009). She summarizes her study of Wall Street culture as such:

It has become painstakingly clear that the practices of U.S. investment banks have global ripple effects, *and* that these financial practices are both created through and constitutive of "the real" economics of the world. In this era of Wall Street dominance, finance – intimately linked to, not decoupled from, the trajectories of corporations, the livelihoods of many, and the nature of work writ large – has produced a highly unequal, new world order. It remains to be seen whether or not the global financial crises of 2008 are seismic enough to radically change the power relations on Wall Street and beyond (324; emphasis in original).

Ho's emphasis on the idea that investment banking has "global ripple effects" and constitutes world economics echoes the ideologies of power that frame many types of anthropologies. This notion of power, in much the same way as arguments about colonialisms in the United States and globally, attempt to speak of centers of influence in terms of "reverberations" (or similar terms) that aren't explained outside the confines of elite spaces and organizations – "corporate culture", for example. The idea that what happens between these centers of power exists simply as "reverberations" dismisses the concrete notion that these centers of power

operate in terms of – indeed, depend on – conduits. Wall Street has a history laden with symbolism that arguably makes it a street interconnected with many streets in addition to its being a private club. It is accessible, to some degree (take, as a very obvious example, current “Occupy Wall Street” movements). The accessibility between sites of influence and power is important in the creative conversation that often guides our willingness to help create and often dispute the meanings of the places where we live.

Thus, the reverberations that Ho notes, blended with an understanding of Divine inspiration that often moves beyond the corridors of religious space, I would suggest, have much to do with the constant grappling of the American public to see something beyond the images and messages created by the corporations and centers of power that Ho implicates. These are images and messages that speak to both the centers of power that provide fetishized items (items that often seep into our lives and help mold us) and the roads underneath the buildings, billboards, and websites of power. I came to this understanding as I was driving through the center of North Carolina one day on my way to a minister’s conference in the Southern Baptist Church. I passed a church billboard that featured a popular telephone – an Apple Iphone – and below it the words: “COME HERE TO RECHARGE.” Apple, as one of the several major technology brands, has so inundated our everyday lives that the local church seamlessly used the image of its product to advertise its package of healing to the passerby. Is this capitalism? Is this the reverberations that Ho speaks of? I don’t think so. I think to articulate what it means we must understand how the Apple product and our sentimentalities hold positions within a more complicated

economy.

As much as it is a moral statement, intervention is part of an economic plan that can be drawn by the individual. For example, a family may operate under the assumption that the parents raise their children to participate in certain ways with their community. We find ourselves, often, in larger units of social life that circulate positive feedback regarding what “we” should do through personal decision making. If “the moral economy is in retreat on some fronts and advancing on others”, as Sayer suggests, it is important to understand the ebb and flow of these fronts, which is as much dependent on circulation and access to information as much as it is the act of giving bread or aiding in some other charitable way. We must be conscious of the signs and signifiers that make the everyday citizen a hub between centers of power (e.g. Ho’s Wall street) and those we meet in our daily roads traveled (e.g. the people the church billboard were talking to).

What was once a coffee commercial sewn seamlessly within a Thursday evening movie show in the 1940s and 1950s, is now its separate form of entertainment that uses the cause of “making a difference” to both draw customers and to make it about more than the refreshment that the coffee maker promises. Likewise, the bag of candy treats are no longer the fetishized product that is the epitome of indulgence for the taste buds, but they now have a reminder patched on the bag that states how opening up the bag of food to be consumed is an opportunity for reflection about and possibly a donation to a “good cause.” Hosts on BET and MTV, in interviewing guests, make it a point to interject questions about charitable work that the artists are taking part in to both make the viewer realize a non-stable

environment outside of the programmed cycling of music and to vindicate the music artist who, like many generations before, contain within their personas that of ultimate celebrity and wealth. The same goes for major sports athletes whose teams and leagues provide opportunities (e.g. the relationship between the United Way and the NFL) to break the image of the superhuman athlete, who steadily became known for their elevated stature above the rest of society. This introduces us to their actions as beacons for their local communities. They are allowed to maintain their superman status, but they must become human at times. This comes in the aftermath of sports stars that have in the past distanced themselves from being "role models." Christian missionaries, as part of an economy of intervention, may provide a set of guideposts to bridge this gap by bringing the tensions of humanitarianism to the roads that we travel so close to the places of our meaning making as anthropologists in the U.S.

Therefore, our being witnesses to apocalypse – to trauma, to need, to elements of tragedy beyond our human control – is guided in very particular ways. Understanding how these different conduits come together in a global system of making a difference is very critical. However, it must start with the multitude of conversations that are happening within the United States, where Wall Street and other centers of power – such as the church – help articulate the paths that U.S. citizens take to national and global places for the sake of healing.

In his article "Doctor's Without Borders", Peter Redfield articulates his approach to humanitarianism:

The ambition of this work is not simply to produce a general critique of humanitarian action or an elaboration of its political limitations. Although there is certainly much to be said on that score from academic, humanitarian, and journalistic perspectives (e.g., Brauman 1996; de Waal 1997; Hancock 1989; Malkki 1996; Pandolfi 2000; Rieff 2002), the rhetorical force of critique stems from a promise to unveil and denounce untruths and violations. As such, it structurally evades the less comfortable possibilities of implication within the process in question and the problem of approaching what is already represented or already familiar (Latour 2004; Riles 2000). Along with much recent anthropological writing on topics like torture and human rights (e.g., Asad 2003; Wilson 1997), I wish to move away from treating humanitarianism as an absolute value by approaching it as an array of particular embodied, situated practices emanating from the humanitarian desire to alleviate the suffering of others. In so doing, I hope to reintroduce a measure of anthropological distance to a familiar set of contemporary phenomena, while simultaneously accepting the premise that action occurs in an untidy, thoroughly implicating, “second best world” (Terry 2002) (2005).

It is precisely giving credit to that which is already “familiar” that will move us past the often-abstract notion of moral economy, into what I describe as the economy of intervention. This is an economy that operates within the known and attributes that knowledge to the unknown through a network of, the consumption of, and the debates over signs and signifiers that speak about and often to this “second best world” *because* this “second best world” often pervades our world in the West.

In “An Introduction to the Anthropology of Humanitarianism”, Peter Redfield joins anthropologist Erica Born in what is both the introductory chapter of their edited book *Forces of Compassion* (2011) and a treatise about this era that is both a new historical moment and a time of reflection about the discourse of aid and charity in the United States and globally. In this chapter, they introduce a set of ideas – and terms – which they show have capital within the anthropology of humanitarianism. They speak about humanitarian work coinciding with or being the

results of various types of “rupture” (2011:22). They describe the possible confusion over the “mobile sovereignty” that many humanitarian actors are acknowledged to present as they enter certain areas of need (23), and they argue that “moments of violence produce multiple reverberations” (24). Like Ho, they demand the salience of the notion of “reverberation” to take us from places of power to somewhere else where people are probably suffering. After arguing that “clearly a desire to appear – and to be – a moral person remains strong”, they suggest that we consider the voices of varied “aid recipients” (27-28) who are implicated in the battle over who gets to change the world.

What Redfield and Born present, especially within the contexts of violence’s reverberations and the idea of mobile sovereignty, are the beginning scaffolding to a more substantial inquiry into what multiple types of “humanitarians” accomplish for the greater good. While natural disasters, for example, often expose great poverty, they also show how humanitarian efforts are engaged through particular patterns of mediated exposure that shows itself in a plurality of efforts to aid. Division between types of aid in the Lumbee community illustrates something else: projects of intervention are often born from a genealogy of institutional and community division, out of which humanitarian specificity is articulated.

A Daunting Task:

When it comes to regulating and controlling the various resources that come through the church (e.g. offerings and tithes), specific denominations – not the entire Lumbee community – have for long dictated the dissemination of these

resources. While this happens, perhaps, along the Christian spectrum, despite ethnicity or race, there is an overwhelming sense that storied relationships between the Lumbee church and their religious partners (e.g. denominations such as the UMC and the SBC) do not address the quite evident needs that meet Lumbee people every morning.

Ultimately, this has led to the creation of alternative spaces that not only appear on the landscape of the Lumbee community but which also push the Lumbee community to be encouraged to see humanitarianism well beyond the Lumbee community. In my research, quite often, I was pointed to the various ways that Lumbee missionaries, as witnesses to trauma on an everyday basis, were inventive in creating spaces and relationships that broke them out of the stagnancy of resources within particular established missionary relationships (e.g., within particular denominations). Despite the continued importance of the Lumbee church in daily life, various central spaces of resource distribution are becoming prominent within the Lumbee community that beg for (and are creating) new types of conversation about moral obligation within the larger communities and networks that Lumbee people belong to. These spaces – whether food pantries, counseling centers, soup kitchens, etc. – are at the center of a new type of economy that, while growing in importance within the United States in general, has particular ramifications in the Lumbee community.

One Lumbee SBC church member told me, as we were chatting at a food pantry, that members of her Lumbee church doesn't know what to think of these changes. "Our church is worried. He (their pastor) spends a lot of time away." This

church member, who works and volunteers with a local missionary food pantry, was speaking of Pastor H, a fairly young and vibrant pastor who is part of a newer wave of theologically educated and highly inspirational Lumbee pastors. I interviewed Pastor H several times, and he never spoke of this angst felt by any of his church members. Having described his supporting his own travel “on his own dime”, he told me about his work. After describing his recent trip to Dallas to meet a White gentleman who has offered money to help support revival in the Native American communities across the United States, this pastor begins to describe why he must do the work that he does:

The North American Mission Board (of the SBC)...their focus is on where there is more reception to the gospel. I’m not saying this by facts, but by what I’ve seen, that they are probably saying that with conversions and with reception of the gospel, that is people that are able to put monies back into the effort. The big fields for the gospel are like South America. In areas like that, the boards of every denomination, they are going to poor in missionaries there.

After describing sites, which include China’s “underground church”, as places where the gospel is perceived by the SBC to be “freely received”, he continues:

Native Americans, they are (perceived to be) reluctant

I shared this Tuesday night over dinner with a state missions director from New Mexico. I said, you know, when I go to these national meetings, I hear these national speakers talk about how difficult work was for Obadiah Johnson who was a missionary in the latter part of the 19th century, for William Carry who was in India, and David Livingston who was in Africa and how they worked for years and years and years and never had conversions. I said it seems almost a hypocrisy that we say that, and even now we are having difficulty in those areas, and we are still pouring money into there...but we totally cut Native American work. And I said “I don’t understand that. Somebody needs to come along and explain that to me and a lot of other Native Americans – preachers or ministers – who feel the same way.”

I responded:

Hearing you talk about this, there seems to be a distinct separation between the business side of the Baptist church and what you do – you seem kind of rogue – you and the people you are with in Dallas. You are still going to go over here and missionize to Native people, whereas the denomination as a whole has this business element, which is somewhere else. How do you...how does that...

Pastor H responded:

I don't know, 30, 40, 50 years ago, the mentality of Southern Baptists, or how they debated the money, and the money was there and it was not an issue. But I guess today, because of the global aspect of everything, you know the economy, they are trying to stay above the water line, so to speak, with their money, and budgets, maintaining the work they are doing, with the resources they have, and I...uh...and it's frustrating, honestly, because...I say it is frustrating on one hand because I think about it from the perception of what the Bible says we are to be doing, and it doesn't include "well if the money isn't there..." but on the other side, in a realistic sense, and as a person who may look at it as a realist, "well, if you don't have any money, you can't send anybody", I know how it works, I know if the money is not there, there are some things we can't do...I'm glad I'm not the one making the decisions for that.

I began to tell him about my attendance at a North Carolina mission meeting at the local North Carolina Baptist Men's Mission camp, which was established after Hurricane Katrina to help local Southern Baptists be prepared in the wake of natural disaster any other type of disaster that would provide them opportunity to help rebuild houses. At this meeting, in fact, I was slightly surprised at how the presenters identified the different types of missions – from Haiti, to Belize, to Robeson County, the home of the Lumbee community – that were available to the 1,000 people in the room. I articulated this to Pastor H:

Back when Hurricane Katrina happened, everyone seemed to be motivated. It's as if something has to get in their head and say this is pressing and this is important. How do you approach that from the standpoint of advocating

Native American ministries? Are you in that place where you are trying to formulate ways of making people take a second look, or to get them worried about what is going on with Native American ministries?

Pastor H responded:

That's a good point. That is what we talked about during those days I was in Dallas – about how we raise this awareness. And what we basically surmised was that it must begin among Native American leaders. And if it doesn't start with us, then we can't put the ball in somebody else's court...you should do this, you ought to do this because you have the resources...So what the Native leaders that I associate with, from out in Oklahoma and Montana, and in Virginia, what we basically said is that if the work is going to be done, it must be Native led. The big problem right now is resources. Which is what the big organization (The North American Mission Board) for the Southern Baptists has cut. What we know will be the...the...conduit...the conduit for this work we are trying to do, was to be able have an individual who can spearhead the work. It would have to be an individual...Number one, we want a Native person who can spearhead the work. But it would have to be a person who can be full time at the work...

After reference to a recent conversation in Oklahoma, he adds:

But the problem is resources. You know. But the Native churches don't have money. Like, you have a Ronny Floyd church in Springdale Arkansas that has 20,000 members who may give more money than our 70 churches combined (in the Lumbee Southern Baptist churches) give together. The church itself funds millions of dollars of mission work every year throughout the world...

That's why that guy, the Caucasian person (in Dallas), wanted to go out to Springdale (Arkansas) to hold this summit to bring awareness to people all around about the plight of the Native American, so to speak.

It's a daunting task. It's going to be a daunting task...

Our conversation continued for two hours as Pastor H laid out his new relationships within the SBC, which included two upcoming conferences of Native American people within the SBC. The individuals that he associates with on a regular basis are Native Americans in the SBC – from Oklahoma, to Montana, to Virginia. What he describes at the end, however, is his (and their) constant grappling for resources, which added to some members locally who ask why their pastor has to be gone as

much as he does makes for an interesting conversation about how Pastor H's notion of a "conduit for work" may reveal an underlying theme in how Lumbee churches are attempting to deal with pressures of changing moral obligation within and around the Lumbee community.

In that context, understanding Lumbee missions is not exclusively about breakages in the Lumbee community, but also about the conversations about the consistently flexing nature of Lumbee social worlds as they interface with the transformative and steadily growing nature of Lumbee moral worlds. It is also about how apocalypse, as trauma and widespread destruction, is met by groups of people who are devoted to helping initiate apocalypse in its original form. That is, they are attempting to help "good" overcome "evil" – to help reveal and to ultimately heal what for most others is the meaninglessness of life. It is about the invention and creativity that, whether framed in terms of "love", "economics", or community viability, is justifying the creation of alternative pathways to provide healing in and beyond the Lumbee community.

For Lumbee missionaries, the reasoning behind their missions is often articulated by a simple argument: "God put this on my heart to do." What it suggests, most importantly, is the affinity for following God's calling – to following what has been placed on their "heart" – and go. As much as Lumbee people's eyes are opened, their work is born out of particular patterns and genealogies of trauma. For Lumbee people, their work as missionaries has journeyed through a period of not knowing who controlled the roads between their churches. Now that the roads are clear. Now the legacy of Jim Crow and other historical oppressions do not keep Lumbee people

from traveling. Lumbee people consider what to do with these roads that they have become comfortable within. What, in fact, do they do now that their major battles at home have become united with crisis globally?

Multiple sovereignties:

Redfield and Born evoke the notion of “mobile sovereignty” (2011:23) in an era where many, many people and institutions are attempting to define who and what is exactly sovereign, especially given the vortex of apocalyptic rates of natural disaster and the 24/7 news media that covers it. Anthropologist Erica James, who has studied the social life of aid in Haiti, in her introduction to a recently published monograph, highlights a nationally syndicated story about a group of SBC missionaries who were arrested for child trafficking after the 2010 earthquake in Haiti. She writes:

The struggles of the Government of Haiti to protect its citizens and assert its sovereignty are no better demonstrated than by the actions of an American missionary group recently charged with child trafficking. The group claims it was rescuing children from the chaos of postquake conditions and was taking them to an orphanage in the Dominican Republic where they would be adopted. The group felt a divine call to intervene without authorization by the Haitian state in order to save the children, some of who still have living parents. As the case has progressed, questions have arisen about the true intentions of this group, the corruption of the Haitian judiciary, and whether justice is for sale or will be meted out according to the rule of law. But the case is also an indicator of the extent to which international actors feel entitled to intervene in order to fulfill their mandates (James 2010: xviii).

This analysis and point-of-view, however, has been countered by missionaries themselves who take up many of the challenges of dealing with global crises that anthropologists have been well known for.

In fact, one of the accused “child traffickers” that James speaks of was recently highlighted in a Southern Baptist online article. In this article, titled “Trusting God’s sovereignty, from a Haitian Jail”, Laura Silsby, the last person from the missionary group from Idaho to be released from Haiti’s jails, articulates a viewpoint fundamentally opposite of James’. Silsby describes how the Haitian government did not aid their intervention. In describing her motivation to attempt intervention in the lives of children in Haiti, she remembers her reaction to entering post-earthquake Haiti:

As we entered Port au Prince, we were deeply troubled by the tremendous devastation and filled with compassion for the many homeless Haitian children we saw in the streets and crowded tent communities. A Haitian pastor requested our help in bringing the children from his collapsed orphanage to safety in the DR. He told us that there was no one else to care for them. After meeting with a senior official at the DR Consulate, I was told that the documentation we had was sufficient given the humanitarian crisis and told to proceed to the border (Silsby 2011).

Later in this same article, Silsby, in what would appear to be unnecessary terms, speaks about the “corruption” that she witnessed during her time in jail in Haiti. Her acting in “God’s sovereignty” placed her in a vulnerable situation where one type of sovereignty – “God’s sovereignty” and the American sympathies that go along with it – comes face to face with alternative sovereignties that may legitimately challenge the sovereignties that certain agents of intervention bring with them.

However, the disparity between these two viewpoints – that of James and that of Silsby – must be acknowledged and appreciated within studies of modern humanitarianism. This “complete sovereignty” that is articulated by Silsby is and has been a very important concept for decades within Christian motivated interventions. Meanwhile, many anthropologists and missionaries, argue for a very

concerted appreciation of state, national, and tribal authority that they sometimes face in traveling as missionaries.

When looking into Lumbee missions, the idea of complete sovereignty is troubling when you discuss missions. While there is an ideal of God's complete sovereignty, the notion that missionaries quite necessarily depend on human politics – e.g., Native American relationships with the U.S. Federal Government – ultimately pushes Lumbee missionaries to pay attention to the struggles that humans have in establishing relationships with multiple sites of sovereignty. This demands that we discuss shifting conceptualizations of where we as humans can go and how our humanity interfaces with our motivations (which, for missionaries, is often Divine in nature).

Most scholars, especially in anthropology, have focused on common themes of colonialism, neoliberalism, and imperialism to mark the points of significance that define both the presence of the U.S. nation-state and the inability of people within the U.S. to act with agency of any significance. While I agree that these three themes do craft an understanding of the historical traumas and the deliberate control that contemporary sovereignties place on those who arguably are without the ability to act with state-like sovereignty, it is important to realize the validity of other spaces and discourses not just as “alternative sovereignties” but as sovereignties that significantly challenge the “violence” (identified by Redfield and Born 2011, and also earlier by Hansen and Stepputat 2006) that frames well recognized sovereign entities and which produce opportunities for those who practice humanitarianism to step into roles of healing. Like Silsby in her interpretation of her rights to go to

Haiti to “rescue” children, there is a keen sense that she was challenging violence of some sort. For Lumbee people, however, similar to Silsby, this means often battling the tensions from home with grand conceptualizations of “calling” or mandate that often serve as the counter to those tensions from home. As such, breaking from those comforts and familiarity of home may necessarily contain components of violence and trauma as we realize that, as humans, we are often limited in our scopes of influence.

Hansen and Stepputat’s argument for sovereignty is that we study it:

[not as] an ontological ground of power and order, expressed in law or in enduring ideas of legitimate rule, [but as a] tentative and *always emergent* form of authority *grounded in violence* that is performed and designed to generate loyalty, fear, and legitimacy from the neighborhood to the summit of the state (297; emphasis mine).

This “always emergent” aspect of sovereignty, I would suggest, crafts a space for people from “here” to go “there”, often overlooking the dangers and often unwanted publicity that comes with these “national” or “state” characteristics. For Mr. D, it meant ostracization at home and also undergoing intimidation and national sovereignties at national borders as he drove vanloads of goods to the border of Mexico or Nicaragua, just to have them confiscated. His acting in the authority of God to leave locally important revivals to continue in missions against the sometimes stymieing practices of other sovereignties characterize missionary senses of challenge and hope as they continue on missionary paths.

As I see it in the Lumbee community more generally, there are often forms of loyalty that pull at Lumbee people and make mission and humanitarian work a form of escape as they find, within their missionary goals, a more definite end than can

occur back at home where need may also exist intertwined with the politics of being Lumbee. This may mean that helping at home or locally in the Lumbee community may demand that the Lumbee missionary steps across boundaries (denominational, community, political, etc.) that maybe (to some people) more significant and established than the fairly new craft of missionary intervention. Because of this, Lumbee missionaries may help heal trauma as they see it, but they might also be talked about and scorned for thinking that *they* are the ones to do it when it takes them beyond the Lumbee community or against the traditional institutions of the Lumbee community.

However, an affinity to address human suffering, often at the expense of politics, is what Lumbee missionaries are steadily gravitating toward and are attempting to articulate much more loudly within the Lumbee community. This has been helped by the fact that these missions occur within particular Christian denominations that have often served as ground zero for Lumbee transformation. Because of this, and because these churches are not homogenous, Lumbee missionaries work within focused organizations that help them to be confident in the foci of their mission efforts.

Conclusion:

To explain Pastor H's grief more fully, you have to look into the embattled nature of the organizations that these missionaries belong to. In this chapter, using Pastor H as a prime example, the politics on national and even global levels pervade the creation of missionary work locally. In fact, many missionaries, whether their organizations are fully local, global, or somewhere in between, seem bound to

seeing missions through an organizational lens, which often binds them to particular identities and institutional affiliations. As I will explain in the next chapter, this crafting of a Lumbee missionary expertise occurs in the context of civil war – as U.S. historical legacy and as the notion of difference in the Lumbee community – which serves to distinguish the multiple sovereignties and types of missionary expertise that make up the Lumbee community.

CHAPTER 5

LEGACY OF CIVIL WAR

Through my time volunteering and hanging out in Lumbee-led and Lumbee-serving food pantries and soup kitchen, which was a way to make myself obviously useful, I experienced moments where juxtaposed identities in the Lumbee community worked in the everyday activities of humanitarianism. During one of my many days sitting in the local UMC Church and Community Center, chatting with workers and offering hands to pack food boxes and unload trucks, I was privy to an interaction that came out of the blue but which, according to workers, was indicative of a typical day of work in the community center. A woman, in her mid to late 60s, came in stating that her son, who is in his late 20s, was in an automobile accident and could not afford his prescriptions. The secretary, as part of her duties, informed this woman, who happened to be Lumbee, that she could only help elderly members of the Robeson County community with drugs, and that narcotic (oftentimes addictive pain relievers) were not counted as a drug that could be covered, despite who was inquiring. "Did you go to the tribe?" the secretary asked. She was referring to the governmental arm of the Lumbee community that has secured certain monies from the federal government to aid Lumbee people with different types of needs, such as medication costs, house repairs, etc. "Yes, they won't help." "Well, I just know that we can't help anyone who isn't of a certain age,

and we certainly can't cover those pain medicines."

The following is a short bit of what I wrote in my notes:

She was angry. She waited, as if she didn't want to leave. She was thinking about how she could make a case. Then she responded again, looking at me for some reason: "Everybody gets help...the Mexicans...why can't Indians get help?!" I suggested she contact a local commercial pharmacy after she was told by the community center worker that drug assistance is only for elderly. "Then give'm to me, since you can put them in my name since I am elderly." She was again told that this could not happen. When she left, the secretary responded: "I'd love to know who she was...I bet she was one of those." – the secretary ended with a sharp expression, stating that she thought this lady was probably affiliated with a particular Lumbee church that is known for having "uppity" people in its congregation. I was interested in the fact that she said she couldn't pay and was driving a luxury Ford automobile that was no more than one year old. Ms. K, an African American woman who heads the food pantry told me quickly: "David, one thing you learn here is that there are the needy, and there are the greedy. I learned quickly to tell the difference between them." The secretary chimed in: "The thing about it, she didn't acknowledge we provided for the elderly, she was going to make me pay for the meds...stick out her chest and make me do something. Didn't she say she works for DSS [Department of Social Services]? She knows what she is talking about."

This is a day in the life of this particular mission in Robeson County. As you may notice, there are many issues at hand: immigration, the general poverty of this region, juxtapositions of race in a globally shifting U.S. South, the subtle but substantial use of churches as references in the Lumbee community and, in the interactions between Lumbee people, the juxtaposition of "private" interventionist institutions (i.e. this mission) with the public sites intervention that some may describe as government and tax sponsored social umbrellas (i.e. DSS), markers of poverty and wealth (e.g. the Ford automobile that I recognized as an obvious symbol of relative wealth), and (maybe most importantly) the rhetoric of intervention that is constantly negotiated.

This conversation was full of key themes that define the Lumbee community and Robeson County generally. Three of them stand out as definitive of the moral tensions in and around Lumbee missions. The first is the sense that the histories of Civil War – in terms of the institutions that were built out of its discontents – pour meaning into the work that missionaries choose to lead. The second is that Lumbee community division along denominational lines is indicative of more deep seated structures of alterity that work at the interstices of the Lumbee church. The last of these themes is a sense that Lumbee community transformation is defined along the lines of a new type of critique of established institutions within the Lumbee community. Lumbee missions have become subject to this critique.

These themes work out in a quite extraordinary mixing of symbols that are a regular part of Lumbee Southern Baptist services that I attended. What is not easily comprehended is how you bridge these concerns of Lumbee leaders today with a particular genealogy that includes the legacy of long past periods of political and social turmoil within and around the Lumbee community. One must say that the legacy of the U.S. Civil War structures the religious lives of Lumbee people today, if not but only to create a typical missionary context that Lumbee missionaries must work in juxtaposition to.

I found out that this division is articulated in the contexts of choices that Lumbee people have to go where they want to in mission. I was often amazed to watch these religious divisions unfold. At times, in discussing these divisions, I was amazed at how commonsense it was for members of community to justify religious-social divisions. A great example was Ms. B. I sat down for our first introduction

early in my fieldwork. Up until then, I had only heard of her reputation within the Lumbee Southern Baptist Churches as the expert missionary. “She is who you want to talk to. She knows everything about missions,” several SBC members advised me. My arrival at her house was for, what I thought would be, a very brief chat and to make plans to continue our conversation about missions. However, subsequent calls would not help, and she was always busy with some personal or church event.

She was, and still is, an avid traveler to mission fields throughout the United States. During one subsequent call, when I asked about her activities in preparing a breakfast for the men’s group at her church, she retorted with, “It’s a mission too!” I didn’t fret, however, because I realized the importance of that one meeting. It was to articulate her particular place as a missionary. This meeting, so clear in my mind, and a source of many notes in the first pages of my fieldwork diary, was unmistakable in what it represented.

She invited me to her dining room table. It was large and oval, home to 8 chairs. I was sitting back against her window, facing Ms. B and a background of memorabilia from missions. Over to the left, almost propped as a picture of a long lost family member, was a book – mint green, with a black and white picture in the center. I didn’t ask her about it, but I was intrigued. She offered me a series of questions and, almost as if she had done this interview a hundred times, proceeded to talk about her experiences as a missionary, a leader in the Southern Baptist Church, as a continued disciple of Christ and loyal member at her local Lumbee Southern Baptist church that was only one-fourth of a mile away.

She showed me pictures, most of them from her mission to Native American

children in the Dakotas. She described how she had a coalition of Southern Baptists from around the South who were loyal travelers with her to this mission during the summers each year. We talked for over an hour and she paused – got up from her seat – and walked to the kitchen. “Here you are.” She placed in front of me the same mint green book that I had noticed in the corner. “This is the prime example of what a missionary should be. She has done so much for this community. This is her book that I helped author. This is your signed copy.”

I was not in the presence of a novice (not that I expected to be). This book was a biography of her mentor and one of the major figures in the local Lumbee Southern Baptist churches. “I’m sure I’ll hear a lot of about her!” I exclaimed looking forward to the next 12 months of my research. But I didn’t hear a lot about her. I soon realized that this biography – this particular history of missions – was part of an overwhelming presence of the Southern Baptist and United Methodist traditions of missions in and from the Lumbee community. This book, which she had helped author, along with her seemingly established program for presenting her identity as a missionary, a presentation that I would neither hear again or receive a second to, showcased her existence within the modality of missions that both included a Lumbee specific origination and a profound enunciation of the ability for Lumbee missionaries to become part of and remain part of any particular set of discourses that aided their identities as missionaries.

What Mrs. B introduced me to the concept of “falling out” as it impacted missions. I came into my fieldwork with a little naivety, thinking that I would encounter overwhelming willingness by missionaries to share their work with one

another. However, unifying celebration was always heavily seasoned with a firm understanding of community divisions. In my interview with Mrs. B, I asked her about her work and how her local church received it. I asked, "Isn't there a lot of need around here. Do people in your local church want to join you when you are traveling away from a community of need to another community of need?" She looked at me and I was sure that she was recalling some conversations from the past: "I have told them that if they don't want to join me, they can find their own mission!" I continued to pull at her with questions, about why particular people wouldn't want to join her in missions. She began to talk about "falling out" and about other cracks in the façade of the church.

It was in this sense of "falling out" that my sense of plural missions and acceptable divisions within the Lumbee community took root. The differences in how this "falling out" plays out are vitally important. It is within the aftermath of this very simple notion of losing accord and creating a new church (and separate missions that come out of them) that we can see the strange workings of coalition that not only mark differences between the UMC and Southern Baptist Lumbee churches, but also showcase the contexts within which the Lumbee community has arguably suffered, experienced, and practiced the steadily growing presence of missions as a modality for creating and accepting particularly meaningful change within the community. The Baptist churches may separate, but the resulting churches are often welcomed back into the Southern Baptist fold. The UMC churches, as my cousin's story indicated, is much different.

In the local food pantries and soup kitchens, the idea of "falling out" did not

go away. Mrs. T's Traditional Pathways was a site of discord that she did not mention to me. In my many times there, I noticed another woman who came in twice. I asked Mrs. T who the woman was, but she didn't answer. I asked the ladies who cooked and they told me that she helped start Traditional Pathways. She and Mrs. T had a falling out. In the Church and Community Center, similar frictions occurred. Even though the UMC ultimately positioned people there, there were racial tensions and class tensions that escaped the UMC organizational control.

One of the administrators of the Church and Community Center, Mrs. C, opened up her life to me and allowed me to help with the distribution of food boxes, told me about her time there. A Black female, she grew up in the middle of the Lumbee community in Pembroke. "Many people wouldn't even know I was from the Lumbee community. But I was. They were my other parents. They helped raise me." She uses that picture of having to distance herself from being from the Lumbee community to help explain the ways that the politics of disenfranchisement has sealed the legacy of this particular mission in particular ways:

You have to be careful, David. I mean, there is so much favoritism. There are all these people who want to help their own. They are doing God's work, but sometimes it's reluctant.

I asked her about Mrs. R and about how she has changed the climate of the center.

You know, she knows people. She has people coming to her and wanting favors because of the position she is in. But you know, she is different. You can tell she wants to help everyone. There are people who come up here for help, and she just won't turn them down.

Mrs. C's attempt to balance a description of favoritism and bias with a real sense of needed change helped me think about how this community center and all of the

missionary efforts in the Lumbee community were part of a much larger genealogy of discontent that flowed from decades and centuries of civil war.

The contexts of civil war:

If one explores the legacy of the past set of events called the U.S. Civil War, one will often see common themes. It is called “the battle between the states”, the war of “brother against brother” and, especially in many parts of the South, the “war of Northern aggression.” These phrases for describing the civil war speak to the two facets of civil war that are immediate: the simultaneously felt realities of *difference* and *intimacy*. As scholarship of violence illustrates, it is difficult to illustrate how this coexistence is the creator of violence or how it is sustained as the flame underneath the beaker of social upheaval. Scholars of contemporary violence – especially those who have studied genocide between the Hutu and Tutsi (e.g. Gourevitch 1998) and within Srebrenica (e.g. Wagner 2008) – realize that intimacy and a very straightforward articulation of difference have been intertwined throughout these periods of civil war and genocide.

It was no coincidence that Southern Baptist missionaries, as soon as they came out of the U.S. Civil War, emphatically began mission initiatives to foreign locales where they could practice their missionary craft. The Southern Baptist Conference still boasts its Lottie Moon offering. Lottie Moon was a Southern Baptist missionary who is upheld as the matriarch for contemporary missions. On the websites of many Southern Baptist churches and the Southern Baptist International Mission Board, the description of Lottie Moon reads as such:

Lottie's vision wasn't just for the people of China. It reached to her fellow Southern Baptists in the United States. Like today's missionaries, she wrote letters home, detailing China's hunger for truth and the struggle of so few missionaries sharing the gospel with so many people-472 million Chinese in her day. She shared another timely message, too: the urgent need for more workers and for Southern Baptists passionately supporting them through prayer and giving.

In 1912, during a time of war and famine, Lottie silently starved, knowing that her beloved Chinese didn't have enough food. Her fellow Christians saw the ultimate sign of love: giving her life for others. On Christmas Eve, Lottie died on a ship bound for the United States.

Her legacy lives on. And today, when gifts aren't growing as quickly as the number of workers God is calling to the field, her call for sacrificial giving rings with more urgency than ever (Lancaster SBC: 2012).

Descriptions that situate Moon as a matriarch for missions are intimately tied to a conversation about persuasion that is as much a positive quality of Moon and today's missionaries as it is a sign of the hesitancy that is naturally human and that defines Southern Baptists as much as anyone. That is, the mood of needed intervention that Moon drove, and which has come to be today's inspiration and rallying call for mission donations in the SBC, continue to compel Southern Baptists to see the world as a landscape where they can make meaningful change. (I became aware of Moon when I read through the book that Mrs. B gave me where she and another author describe her missionary mentor as "our Lottie Moon" in reference to the traveling she did globally for missions.)

However, for long, Southern Baptists, as one group of missionaries, have compelled individuals in the United States to understand how looking through missions at the world can speak of fallacies and weaknesses at home. Take for example the role of Southern Baptist missionary W.J. Hunnax who was with Moon in

China during the years between 1880 and 1910, who found it expedient to encourage intervention beyond the spreading of the gospel. He, in several letters to officials in the Southern Baptist church and in the greater American community, made appeals to intervene in China's opium economy and prevent opium from being openly available during the decades after the U.S. Civil War when it became a popular drug within the ranks of veteran soldiers of the U.S. Civil War. His report, as a catalog of conversations that came from various missionaries in various Baptist associations, became part of a growing scare in the U.S. at the beginning of the 20th century related to drug abuse.

Popular accounts by missionaries of opium use in the United States generally argue that opium was part of many medicinal closets in the United States up through the U.S. Civil War. However, having witnessed what they thought was the destruction of China by drug abuse, reports of this abuse, most born in the spirit of sentimentality, became reports that inspired and often propelled social and political conversations in the United States that extended beyond sentimentality to become something much more. Public policy, law, and new moral codes were based heavily on local religious life. Medicinal cabinets were raided during the early 20th Century. And, in the movement from the pain of the U.S. Civil War, to secret medicinal closets, to the creation of public conversations that put new emphasis on drug use in the United States, the role of Christian missionaries took root. For many people, missionaries became (or continued to be) the cantankerous, busy body, in-your-business agents who many claimed were out of place. The helped inspire an entire

U.S. nation to intervene. This was a decade or two before massive U.S. military intervention in global locations.

The aftermath of the U.S. Civil War can be articulated to be contemporary because of its very obvious reverberations throughout the 20th century. Jim Crow solidified political and social alienation of non-white peoples throughout the U.S. South. Post-Civil Rights has guaranteed that memory of the civil war pervades contemporary experiences. We don't talk about difference within the United States without a very poignant look at the life of Martin Luther King Jr. and the sit-ins that pitted the vulnerable Black population in the United States against the dominant White power structure. We don't look at Civil Rights without examining the legacy of slavery in the United States.

However, the churches of the Lumbee community, historically, found themselves in the heated debates that were the products of larger national denominations that were unsteady over the polarizing issues of Civil War, slavery, and eventually segregation in the 20th century United States. The necessity to choose or belong to a particular denomination in the early 20th century not only resulted from larger national debates over inclusion, but also guaranteed that divisions within the Lumbee community would develop within the language of these separations between denominations. In the Lumbee community, the division between the UMC and the Southern Baptist church is highly potent. When seeking out oral histories of well-known Lumbee leaders, oral histories that were conducted some 40 or 50 years ago, it is apparent that the need to document these histories often falls along denominational lines. Having interviewed contemporary

missionaries, and gathering their oral histories early in my research project, they too articulated their memory along the lines of who belonged in their particular denomination.

This was the case much of the time throughout my early research until I was introduced to a UMC missionary. As we were talking about local projects, he leaned forward in his chair and said:

You know I was working on a building project with Mike Cummings. You know he is in the Baptist church. We worked well together, but he told me, "Brother, I establish churches. This is your mission. You do this, and I'll plant the churches."

Despite the chuckle that we both had at this very forward comparison that occurred between the two missionaries, such conversations speak volumes about the accepted divisions that have come to define social and religious life not only within Lumbee community but maybe more generally within the U.S. South. Pastor S, in fact, who has been a member of the Southern Baptists and who works across denominations for missions, stated sharply but with a smile, "Those Methodists, they like to socialize. We like to keep people out of hell."

But even in Pastor S's joking, he was quite aware of the frequent blending of social justice and religious conversion. In fact, his goal to work across denominational lines within the Lumbee community, as a current pastor in the Southern Baptist church, is something that several Lumbee people I have interacted with are attempting. Even while Lumbee people were attempting to solidify community in their churches—sovereignty, again, if you will— as Native people in a Southern region that made them racially and socially indefinable, they were eager to

become part of this field of interaction and network of Christian relationships that not only made people “brothers” and “sisters” in Christ but also allowed them agency where exceptional definitions of Christian identity would not allow.

However, the notion of camaraderie is often difficult to defend when those who are similar to us and are in power do not act as we imagine we would.

The introduction of Brother Johnny:

I would advise my successor to be a man of prayer and one who loves and listens to the people. I would advise him to seek God's face daily as he seeks to determine the vision He would have him cast for Southern Baptists. However, at the end of the day, just remember this: all that really matters is that I please God.

These were the words of Johnny Hunt, A Lumbee man and the recently replaced president of the Southern Baptist Convention, when asked by a Baptist News reporter what he would advise his presidential successor to do in his role. Johnny Hunt has many family members in the Lumbee community but he never pastored any Lumbee churches. His words most certainly fall onto different communities with different weight. To the general Southern Baptist community, they were surely a sign of how progressive the SBC – and by extension the South – had become over the course of generations. The SBC, in fact, had elected and re-elected Hunt to two years as president of the Convention and on a larger, national political stage, his image spoke of the success of American multiculturalism.

However, when I heard about Hunt’s election I was unsure of its real impact. First, on a national level, his identity as a Native American who was breaking the “color barrier” within a religious organization that has been at the epicenter of racial

U.S. racial segregation and oppression has largely been lost or completely ignored.

Take a recent article written in light of Southern Baptist expectance that the organization will soon have its first Black president, Fred Luter Jr.:

Growth in traditional white congregations in the 16-million-member Southern Baptist Convention has plateaued. In recent years the denomination has actively sought to reach out to nonwhites, typically Hispanics, African-Americans and Asians.

In 1990, 95 percent of Southern Baptist congregations were white; now the figure is 80 percent, said Scott McConnell of LifeWay Research, a church-related institute.

"Some critic said of us that the Southern Baptist Convention is as white as a tractor pull," Moore (a member of a Southern Baptist Seminary) said. "If that remains the case, the Southern Baptist Convention has no future. I think Fred Luter's election will be pioneering; I pray it will not be an anomaly."

Meeting in Phoenix last summer, Baptists adopted a plan requiring its organizations to nourish minority leadership for the future. That's a turnabout for a convention that was formed in 1845 by Southern slaveholding Baptists who broke away from anti-slavery Baptists in the North.

For much of the 20th century, Southern Baptist pastors and rank-and-file church members across the South supported white supremacy and resisted the civil rights movement.

But in 1995, the convention formally apologized for its past and committed itself to racial reconciliation.

"We need to live up to what we said in 1995," said David Dockery, president of Union University in Jackson, Tenn. "This would be a positive step, but only a first one." (Nolan: 2012).

Luter was not the first to break these color lines. However, for the Southern Baptists, Luter seems to be a more substantial step. In the political conversations about Civil Rights, especially in the U.S. South, White identities and Black identities

are the core markers of this movement. Though Johnny Hunt was elected and re-elected, his presidency's identity as one that pushed the entire SBC to a "Great Commission Resurgence" was pinnacle for the denomination and its money raising efforts for global missions, but did little for the communities that Hunt was supposed to represent according to Lumbee Indians. For other Lumbee Southern Baptists, Hunt's home community was the site of a typical struggle between the growing visions of Lumbee missionaries and rightful tendencies to take care of Native people first.

The lack of acknowledgement of Hunt on a national scale, in the public debate about ending racial barriers, seems to mirror the strange way that Hunt was not present in the Lumbee community. There is a sense that beyond the borders of the Lumbee community, his being Indian didn't make any sense. Within the contexts of the Lumbee community, he wasn't fully Lumbee because, ultimately, he didn't represent the interests of Lumbee people, nor did he acknowledge that he was subject to Lumbee criticisms in a meaningful way. Leaders of the Lumbee SBC churches were happy that Hunt had become president. However, there was a pause when they would express their joy. Mike Cummings, the "Director of Missions", for the organization of Lumbee Baptists called the "Burnt Swamp Association", used me to explain this slight unease since I have lived away from Robeson County for periods throughout my life:

Like you David, Brother Johnny is from here but he is not. He is ours, but we know that he may not think about things like we do.

Cummings and other leaders in the Burnt Swamp told me that Johnny Hunt sometimes came to preach in Lumbee churches. During the 1990s, especially, he had garnered a great reputation as an evangelist within the entire denomination and within the Lumbee Southern Baptist community.

However, his place as the pinnacle leader of the SBC, for several missionary leaders I spoke with, demanded that he consider “where he came” from. Additionally, because he did not acknowledge this, he couldn’t really be considered Lumbee. I was sitting with a Lumbee SBC pastor at lunch one day and we began talking about Johnny Hunt: “He could have just said a few words – spent just 30 minutes on Native American missions – and he would have raised millions.” He paused then continued, “Just because (he looks Lumbee) doesn’t mean that he *is* one of us.” Couched in a bit of disgust, and especially relative to all the work that he does, this Pastor demonstrated the highly intense relationships between conceptualizing one’s identity in the Lumbee community and attempting to be Lumbee in larger scales of movement and identity. In discussing the time that Hunt did not spend on missions, he was referring to Hunt’s second and final address as president of the SBC. For this pastor, Hunt had not only let Native Americans down but the Lumbee community in particular. “You know, of all the things to happen...we get a Lumbee in that type of position and he just doesn’t get it. Talk about us! Talk about what your home community is doing.”

In the context of this pastor’s appeal, Hunt’s mandate that SBC members please God is ideal, but there is always a strong notion that “loving and listening to people”, because it is limited by our human nature, may be a predecessor to

“pleasing God,” especially if you are deemed liable to a particular cultural world or community like the Lumbee community. God, as much as He orders people’s lives, may be an avenue to articulate humans’ inabilities to maintain connections and loyalties (that they should have) to particular people. Communities and cultural groups, nevertheless, can be easily deferred as the human (as agent of change) attempts to reconcile shortcomings in social relationships by stating, at the end, that one must simply “please God.” Moreover, captured in the story of Hunt, the SBC, and the relationship between silenced peoples and various religious realms, especially in the U.S. South, there are elements of racism, segregation, slavery, invisibility, colonialism, and much more. Yet, it also contains a future bright with the possibilities of God’s sovereignty, which works through the contexts of religious organizations such as the SBC.

For the last couple years I have been interested in that ideal image that Hunt conveyed – one that continues to cleanse a seedy past full of social oppression (some at the hands of the SBC) with the images of a bright future. This is a future where the SBC, with guidance by Hunt and eventually Luter, becomes a leading Christian organization in the dissemination of American people into missions. But even while the SBC as a national and global organization grows, the stories of the communities that it and other religious denominations borrow from are also important.

In some of these communities, traces of longstanding bitterness remain. This bitterness, somewhat ironically, has borrowed from long term institutional and ideological boundaries that have separated the SBC from other organizations such

as the United Methodist church, which within the Lumbee community have also served to help individuals speak about community tensions that are often much deeper than religious affiliation. The community that Hunt claims as his “Home” – the Lumbee community – continues to bear the marks of a deeply disturbed past. Yet, even as Hunt speaks of a bright future Lumbee pastors, many of them Southern Baptist, attempt to throw themselves into this optimistic future as missionaries whose work is in many ways only bound by their willingness to act as agents of mission. As missionaries, they bear a bit more burden than Hunt expresses because, as they envision pleasing God, their love in and around the Lumbee community is (and long has been) under constant critique. This has been the life of Mr. D for much of his life.

The illusion of 1958:

In my first meeting with Mr. D, I noticed how he would hold his hand, rubbing it gently. At one point in our conversation, in which he was discussing his first marriage, he stopped: “I still have the bullet in this hand. She shot me. We were apart so much.” Mr. D continued to describe not just how his marriage ended in divorce but how the Lumbee community, eventually, in the shadow of Mr. D’s success as the “Indian Billy Graham” and his divorce, was less and less inclined to accept Mr. D. His divorce separated him indefinitely from the ability to minister in the Lumbee community. He would go on to become a very prolific missionary both across the United States and globally, but when returning to the United States, he lived on the fringes of the Lumbee community. Ministering – being able to be a

pastor or an evangelist – in the Lumbee community has been, for over a century, a very honorable position. In that context, Mr. D’s falling out – from super evangelist to the Lumbee community to a life in invisibility – showcases the gravity of the disconnection that he suffered. His daughter asked me, during one of our meetings, “Did you see daddy’s hand?” “Yes,” I replied. “Those were hard times...they wouldn’t let him back in the pulpit.”

It was in Mr. D’s disconnection that I attempted to understand the Lumbee community’s proclivity to break apart within the context of its religious institutions. As I discuss in “Witnesses to Apocalypse”, my cousin was coming to grips with her church’s splitting. In fact, as I traveled throughout the Lumbee community, I was always intrigued by how members of churches articulated their relationships within their churches and between churches. There was a sense, on one hand, that curiosity about what was happening in other churches led a general sense of intrigue in my research. However, conversations about membership in the Lumbee and Methodist churches, in particular, were rooted in a sense that their paths were inextricably intertwined, and not just because they were all Lumbee churches but that they were Lumbee churches born in a particular period and within particular organizations structures that were themselves defined by Civil War. However, let me set the stage for understanding the falling out after Mr. D’s gunshot and for the intrigue about the stability over my cousin’s church.

In 1958, national coverage of the routing of Catfish Cole, the head of the South Carolina KKK, helped produce national headlines that featured Lumbee in a quite heroic light. Cole came all the way from South Carolina on January 18, 1958,

and he traveled the roads of Robeson County. According to news reports, and the testimony of several members of the routing party, one of which was my wife's grandfather, he told everybody that he was having a rally on the land of the "supposed" Indians. All that work was done for naught, as a single light bulb in a field was shot, and the gathering of KKK members was put in darkness by gathering Lumbee men. But what may be most impressive post-"Battle of Hayes Pond" were the attempts to describe the clash, to contextualize why it happened it all, and to attempt to understand the Lumbee people who ended it. Headlines in major U.S. newspapers and magazines touted cartoon images of stereotypical images of Indians dancing around a campfire in feathers and loincloths. More recently, several blog posts that I've discovered on the Internet have effectively hijacked the story in hopes of other aspirations. One website features a blog by a potential novelist who asks if her recollections of her childhood – one of which was the Battle of Hayes Pond – could be used in a fictional narrative. In another blog, a writer uses the Battle of Hayes pond as rallying call against Islamic fascism:

Fifty years later, we face a similar enemy. An enemy who uses violence, fear and intimidation to achieve an inhumane agenda of superiority, intolerance, and bloodlust...Unless we, in the West, learn from our Native American friends and take a strong stand against these Mohammedan bullies, it will only be a matter of time before we...(and the rant continues)

As the story of the Battle of Hayes Pond is shown to never grow old, I wonder how much is to be said for the crystallization of that story in that particular moment by journalists and other essayists who attempted to capture one brief moment in the life of the Lumbee community.

These images of the Battle of Hayes Pond seem forever sealed as one of those defining moments in the Lumbee community. Again, partly because of nationalized media and partly because the community itself has attached itself to this moment as sort of memorial to how we as a community stand up when we have to, the image of this time in the past is crystallized. However, early in my research, I happened upon the history of one particular Southern Baptist Church in the Lumbee community. It was written in the official history of the Lumbee Southern Baptists, and the pastor who authored it had written this particular church's history with a special note that on January 18, 1958 – the same day as the Battle of Hayes Pond – a lawsuit had been settled that ended a feud between a group of people who had left a Holiness Methodist church right next door – literally – and the group that remained. The group that branched off, instead of remaining Holiness Methodist, eventually became part of the Southern Baptist Conference.

The Holiness Methodist has a particularly intriguing origin story. On the website of the conference of the Holiness Methodist Conference, a part of their history stands out:

Significant educational accomplishments were made during the latter decades of the 1800s, and religious affiliations and denominational changes occurred as well. But, in the midst of good, evil is always present. Racial prejudices and oppressions began to inflict the "spiritual lives" of the Croatan (Lumbees). After 1870 the Methodist-Episcopal Church - South decided to "separate-out" non-white members from its church rolls. Croatan religious leaders, immediately, organized native congregations and maintained already established churches (Lumbee River Conference 2011).

This period of "separating" was not unique to Lumbee people, but it provided an opportunity for them to establish church organizations, if they so chose, that would

not be affiliated with the segregation of the post-US Civil War South. Those Indians who stayed in conference with the Methodist-Episcopal, in the mid-20th century, became part of the United Methodist Church.

In an oral history interview with Mike Cummings, he told me one particular story of how many of the Baptists in the Indian community, in the mid-20th Century, had to wait out segregation, literally: “We sat at the back of conventions. We were patient.” This conflict between how different denominations dealt with post-U.S. Civil War America and its volatile religious institutions tells a lot about their separation and about the struggles to balance this religious trauma with the dedication of their community to the church as a significant institution.

For the most part, these critical decisions made centuries ago to maintain “already established churches” helps me understand the schizophrenic nature of tradition and change that surrounds the Lumbee community. In dealing with the chaos of Jim Crow as part of the U.S. South, Lumbee people aimed to establish and reestablish their churches. Always looking for the appropriate way to resolve fallings-away that had been a common theme in the creation and recreation of Lumbee churches, in the settling of this lawsuit, they were defined by their constant critique and their engagement with the world. In their engagement with Jim Crow politics, as exemplified by some white men covered in sheets hoping to drum up the order that defined antebellum America, the Lumbee community established tradition. So while Lumbee churches have long been tradition, they have been defended. And as they have been defended – with the weight of knowing that

maintaining “already established churches” was in many ways maintaining indigenous identity – they tore apart just to reform quickly.

Lumbee churches, in that sense, have been proving grounds and places of experimentation and processing. As armed Lumbee men set the KKK in their place, the story that is not told is the story of how they journeyed back to their churches and regained a spot as deacons and Sunday school teachers. They dealt with a mixture of their fame as revolutionaries, in their often-cramped sanctuaries of tradition. This juxtaposition – between revolution and tradition – lies at the heart of Lumbee intervention.

In a way, not letting Mr. D back in the pulpit was indicative of a Lumbee community that happened to be caught up in this historical moment where tradition and experimentation were often confused. While Mr. D was at the height of his revival ministry in Robeson County during the KKK rally and the ending of this lawsuit between churches, he would soon find out the harsh realities of bucking against the Lumbee religious traditions. In describing the ways he lost his best friend in the ministry and his wife, Mr. D told a story of how he pulled away from tradition to take the missionary experiment full force. As much as the Lumbee church was a proving ground – a place of sovereignty, if you will – notions of violence, unrest, and intrigue surrounded the church and those who were willing to press “fresh associations” in missions (Comaroff 1993:xx).

Mr. D told me about his fame and influence before he was ostracized:

The local police chief in Lumberton came up to me during one of my revivals. I wasn't the only tent-revivalist, but I drew crowds. The chief came up an

asked me, “How many did you have under the tent?” I said “easily a thousand.” “Well,” he said, “ You had three times that outside listening.”

I wondered through my conversations with Mr. D if his wife, in addition to speaking for her own feelings as a wife and mother of Mr. D’s children through violence toward him, was speaking for those people who couldn’t grasp Mr. D’s work *as an experimentation that depended on a particular breaking away from tradition*. If so, she was not alone. That is, today, that same troubling feeling exists, if just in the form of questions over aspects of social transformation that alienates the Lumbee community from being able to control the relationship between revolution and tradition found in missionary practices.

Civil war’s children:

In following the traditions of giving that the SBC continues to repeat in hopes of being a major organization in the mission landscape, there are many Native American people within the SBC ranks who attempt to be represented in missions. One of these organizations, as Pastor H describes in “Witnesses to Apocalypse”, is a Fellowship of Native American Christians. When Pastor H and I discussed his missions, he attempted to clarify the fact that these Native American coalitions were not attempted to usurp the identity of the Southern Baptists:

No we are in the Southern Baptist Convention, we are not working against them. We need their support.

The same can be said about the United Methodists in the Lumbee community. Because of the way their denominational infrastructure is set up, they must be loyal to the infrastructure of the UMC. As represented by the aftermath of the splitting of

my cousin's church, and concerns that it couldn't come back "into the fold" of the United Methodist Church, to outright splinter would be unwise politically and possibly economically. However, at a three-day meeting in Western North Carolina among Native Americans from around the US., who are affiliated with the UMC, I heard the distress of many Native American leaders who had grown weary of having to fight for monies to continue Native American ministries. Their call to the national and global infrastructure of the United Methodist Church was to not forget whose land and whose country the UMC was founded on. For them, the confines of UMC politics made tussling and jockeying for position a bit more agonizing than may be the case in the Southern Baptist Church.

What the formation of the fights within these two organizations shows is the shifting of and reification of Indigenous identities from stereotyped community centers to these trans-U.S. and international meetings. It is often in these new types of forums where Lumbee and other Native American missionaries often find themselves in a proverbial civil dispute over resources and acknowledgement of their peoples within these religious organizations. The need to subvert the strained relationships within these religious denominations, as a matter of fact, is what has helped defined Pastor S's missionary identity in the Lumbee community during the last decade. His mission to the Philippines, among other things, is a gathering of Lumbee Christians who are from various denominations. He is defined by his willingness to cross-denominational borders. This was an obvious context at the annual meeting of the Lumbee Southern Baptists when Mike Cummings jested with Mrs. R.

After she had described the incredible amount of work that she and others at the UMC mission put in to obtain housing for and feed several families, she ended. Mike Cummings came up to the podium: "The Baptists won't let women preach, but boy will they stir your hearts." In speaking about the hesitancy for the Southern Baptist membership to participate in missions, he adds, "We are teaming up with like-minded people. This is the great commission." His words were words that were divided: sliced both by affinities for helping the entire Lumbee community and, equally as important, the politics of the Southern Baptists. His attempted humor, which was based in his statement about women preaching, was met with some laughs from the mostly male audience. But he didn't dwell on it, and Ms. R was aware that this was the type of gender differences that defined the distinction between denominations. She told me later that this was the toll that she pays in her role as the "one who crosses."

But Mike Cummings, in his own special way, is known for his ability to relate to the community and to help Lumbee community define itself, as witnessed at the "mission celebration." But he is very dedicated to what the Southern Baptist church, in particular, represents in Robeson County. He and his wife, who together are administrators for the Lumbee Southern Baptists, send out monthly newsletters that remind Lumbee Baptists about where their dedications should lie. He also routinely attends churches within his conference during revivals and weekend services.

I was present at a Southern Baptist revival where he was preaching. He saw me in the audience. As he got up to give his sermon, he made it a point for me to

introduce my research and myself. “Please David, tell the people about what you are studying.” I stood up, said something about missions and the importance of understanding its place in our community and beyond, and sat down. Preacher Mike smiled, and seamlessly went into his message by referencing a phone call that he had received earlier from missionaries who were in Oklahoma with several Native communities: “They told me to tell the people that they don’t know how good they have it. We don’t realize how much God has blessed this community. He really has.” He talked about how the Lumbee community had many missionaries and how they were doing great work.

Nevertheless, this great work, as I found out from several conversations, does not come without intra-community and intra-church struggle. As much as the community as a whole contains missionaries, its missionaries are often working at the interstices of the church. As Mike Cumming’s words above regarding Mrs. R show, missionary intervention is a conceptually transcendent practice that heals church divisions. However, all the while, the permanence of division says much about the authority that Lumbee missionaries use in participating in and defending their chosen mission projects.

Conclusion:

The constant battles over morality are part of a growing sense that Lumbee people should utilize opportunities to change in a larger religious and social context where their interests as Native Americans don’t necessarily excite a much larger audience. However, in the next chapter, much of this inability to address the

horrendous circumstances of Robeson County might not just be everybody else's fault. In a sense, in stories of ostracization and inability to allow multiple and different voices to speak, the Lumbee community has suffered an inability to recognize or, possibly, simply react to the larger picture of trauma that defines life in Robeson County. In those contexts, it was important for me to see the sites in the Lumbee community where efforts to defeat ostracization of particular people was the goal. In the next chapter, "The World's a Stage", the legacy of ostracization meets the hopes of current generations to see a future built not necessarily out of unification but respect for difference within the Lumbee community.

CHAPTER 6

THE WORLD'S A STAGE

The recent emergence in the Lumbee community of global missions as a mission field equitable to the already established Native American mission field exhibits how the Indigenous home place (Robeson County, in this case) is turned into the center of missions and into a point of propulsion for Lumbee missionary activities. Moreover, it exhibits how Lumbee missions, and the informal economy that is coupled with these missions, operate in *necessary liminality*. Lumbee missionaries often have no major titles in their churches. They are not paid large salaries, if any. They are thrilled when they are identified. Yet, when they find a stage, it does not seem like they speak for self-promotion. It seems like they speak from an imagined world that others are often slow to see.

This liminality (to use a key term within the work of Turner 1969) is needed to transcend the permanence of structure that is often articulated by those people, institutions, and histories that define particular boundaries for Lumbee people. In many ways, Lumbee missionaries, in the stages they speak from, speak against everything we are taught to think about Native America. They are transcendent. They make people talk. Their world is literally the entire world. In often abruptly prepared messages, which continue to make sense of a drastically shifting world

that is often viewed through the lens of missionary intervention, the world is defined anew.

Not only do Lumbee missions provide important examples within a very important trajectory toward understanding Native America within globalization, they provide retort to a long tradition within cultural anthropology to dismiss the complexities that are often contained within Christian practice. John and Jean Comaroff have written well-respected critiques of missions within the nation of South Africa. In one very important caveat, they make clear what they see as the ineptitude and innate harm within Christian missions:

How, indeed, are we to understand the connections, historical and conceptual, among culture, consciousness and ideology? In seeking to address some of these issues, our study explores a process which, though situated in South Africa, *has echoes* throughout the so-called Third World, and probably beyond, It is a process in which the "savages" of colonialism are ushered, by earnest Protestant evangelists, into the revelation of their own misery, are promised salvation through self-discovery and civilization, and are drawn into a conversation with the culture the culture of modern capitalism - only to find themselves enmeshed, willingly or not, in its order of signs and values, interests and passions, wants and needs. Even the established modes of protest open to them speak in ringing Christian terms - terms like civil rights, civilized liberties, freedom of conscience (Comaroff and Comaroff 1991: xii; emphasis mine).

Despite its crispness, this argument (especially as it is supposed to speak for how the effect of missions supposedly "echoes throughout the so-called Third World") quietly dismisses the ways that indigenous or colonized peoples are intelligent agents in the creation, re-creation, and imagination of their lives in engagement with texts, languages, and senses of regeneration that possess within their uses awakened abilities to engage a highly volatile and ambiguous world. It also dismisses how these people interact and stage their own visions for how healing is

supposed to take place in polite refusal of the rhetoric that states how Christian missions is itself the manifestation of colonialism or imperialism.

For Lumbee missionaries, the ability to speak their ideas of a Christ-centered universe, which ultimately allows them providence to act in transformation, defines a very important Christianity that is missing in the Comaroffs' analysis. Because Robeson County is in the third world⁴, it is important to not let the inspiration of Lumbee missions be dismissed. Their world extends much farther than their close surroundings. Moreover, their work connects them with families, communities, and nations around the world that invite others in the third world to help them, aid them, and become part of their communities. However, to make this important, the Lumbee church remains the main site for the creation of new stages. These are places where, within the contexts of Christian principles, new cases are made about poverty, migration, politics, and many other inequities around the world and close to home.

Creating new stages:

Throughout my fieldwork, I have looked at the term "stage" in two ways: as a place from which proclamations are made and as the contexts for participatory action to help transform something. In both instances, attention must be created to get people to start to talk. This is the magic of social networking on websites such as Facebook. However, there is something say about people, in flesh, performing and presenting in front of others. This was most evident as I began noticing the different

⁴ Robeson County is listed as a "County of Persistent Poverty" by the US Department of Agriculture

and new types of conversations that were happening across the missionary spectrum in Robeson County, particularly, and in North Carolina, generally. Getting people talking, as I have seen throughout my research, has started with physical stages. These stages were always crucial to creating meaning where there was none, for reifying old loyalties and meanings that may be in need of revival, or to, in an ideal world, completely transform the world. However, these stages, because they were often cast within the contexts of Lumbee Christians getting together to both express faith and to solicit for some other part of Lumbee community, were often articulated as they were the objects of serious debate within Lumbee community about the effectiveness or legitimacy of particular mission proposals.

Before I began my research, a broad group of missionaries from several denominations represented across North Carolina, gathered together in Robeson County to discuss Native American issues. Titled the “Native American Coalition of the Carolinas”, this inter-denominational, inter-tribal, and inter-racial group attempted to eke out a short history for and a future in missionary work to the local Native communities in North and South Carolina. However, as I would see, stating that the primary focus was on Native American coalition did not mean that Native Americans were the only peoples being served. It was the beginning of a conversation about intervention and humanity in general.

I read the notes that Mr. P provided. “John”, as the notes have it, is a Cherokee community member who is a minister in the Lutheran church. In the absence of a Cherokee minister, “Cathryn”, who is minister’s training, John is serving the Cherokee community and states that he has a special interest in Native Americans

on the “east coast”:

Contextual cultural ministry is the key to ministry. If you don’t know the lay of the land, how can you be in ministry? The (Lutheran Church) and the UMC have come to an agreement of having the common cup. We are having conversation about how we can be in ministry and partnership with one another. We have to work on this. We can’t come up with great solutions – unless we put them in action, they don’t mean much.

We can’t forget who we are and where we come from. We have to fight for our identity as indigenous people and children of God.

Mr. P spoke to me subsequent to my reading this transcript, pointing out that the United Methodist Church and the Lumbee community were investing a lot of time devoted to the work that they had been “called” to. Pastor S, who would later organize the “mission celebration” (which I describe in detail later), was also present at this meeting. Preparing to give a synopsis of his work, Pastor S began with the changing elements of the Lumbee churches:

When I started preaching, I had two marks against me – I used notes and I didn’t hack/whoop. First time I preached, I thought I had done great, an older lady came by and said, “I enjoyed your talk today.” It does demonstrate how ministry has changed so much over the last 35 years. Expectations and hopes are not the same; things have changed.

In these transcripts, Pastor S continues to describe what he and several other Baptist pastors have attempted to explain to me on many occasions. He discusses how the approximately 70 Lumbee Southern Baptist churches are steadily present in the community, about how the Lumbee Baptists purchased a United Methodist Church in Baltimore and eventually turned it into a Lumbee Baptist church, and

about how Mike Cummings was selected in the 1990s to be the first non-white leader of the state organization of Southern Baptists.

At the time of this meeting, Mrs. R was not present in Robeson County. Her work was solely within the UMC executive office in Western North Carolina. However, her relationship with the UMC would change, and she was asked to come down and take over directorship of the local Robson County Church and Community Center. The first time I saw Mrs. R, after she left her post as the leader of the Southeastern Native American alliance in the UMC, was at the annual executive meeting of the Lumbee Southern Baptists churches. She was one of a few guests, who included: U.S. Congressman Mike McIntyre (who is well known for his advocacy for Lumbee federal recognition), the men who operate the North Carolina Baptist Association's Men's Mission Camp and Pastor H. Congressman Mike McIntyre led the prayer. He told the congregation of this association that his roots were in Robeson County. Before this prayer, he appealed to the all Lumbee crowd, stating how he helped lead the national day of prayer:

Room 219 – (this is) where we build a wall of prayer like Nehemiah did...We put political labels aside.

He was speaking in terms of the politics of Washington, but I was sure he knew how his words would reverberate in this place. This was Robeson County, after all. Politics and divisions are definitive elements here.

This was the second day of this Burnt Swamp associational meeting. The meeting, among other things, was a forum for Lumbee Southern Baptist church leaders to share news of their church, words of encouragement, and fellowship with

people that one may not normally see in the course of daily life. Pastor H was here this day (it was the first time I had ever met him). He was one of several young faces, and one of several people who would get up and describe their particular mission imperatives before the leadership of the Lumbee Southern Baptists.

The keynote sermon, a follow up to “yesterday’s extraordinary preaching” according to Mike Cummings, struck me in its choice of topics. Although I assumed that Mike McIntyre’s presence would evoke a message about the Southern Baptist as part of the “fight for federal recognition, the pastor instead ventured off in another direction. The primary aspect of the message that wrapped up my attention was this pastor’s entrance into challenging the Lumbee community not just in terms of what they should do in missions, but how doing it may challenge the ways that Lumbee people communicate and identify themselves. In a message titled “Church without walls”, which followed a video that was produced by a Filipino member of the Lumbee Southern Baptist churches and that depicted the work of Lumbee SBC members in the Philippines, the pastor continued:

I like that video...

My first mission trip was in the Dakotas...

We were told not to take our Sunday best...to, like Jesus, just fit in...

God has allowed the descendants of sharecroppers to be able to go and share with others...

My heart was filled in the Dakotas...that God had brought me out of sin...saved me...filled me with his Spirit to *go*...

After continuing through a description of how the church cannot leave anyone behind, he continues with an interrogating set of commands that was aimed at this room of church leaders:

There are things going on in our county with drugs and prostitution...that is someone's children...

A lot of our folks...we are afraid to knock on doors because we are afraid of who will answer...I don't have anything new to tell you...but that we can't leave anyone behind

There are people out there hurting and that need help...that is the great commission

We (think) have to know something about them...but that's not what Jesus told us to do...we have to go out where we know *no one*

In Jesus day...the only thing they knew about "being saved" was Jesus. They didn't have a church...He was building people's lives.

This is where it gets tough...we might need to change some of this Sunday morning stuff...we might need to get outside the church...walk hand and hand to the people that that are hurting...(we need to) practice a church without walls

Some people get really defensive about our church...we need to take ownership...but some people say that "my daddy did such and such"... They are fighting - jockeying for position.

Nobody likes change but a baby - you know how we are - but sometimes change is good

As Jesus says - go into all the nations - - teaching them to observe all things... This is action...it is moving...

I hear some people talk about the Mexicans here...well they are here...and I don't think they are going anywhere...when we get to heaven, there won't be a section for the Lumbee people - - or the Mexicans. We can't be afraid of people of different races entering our fellowship...I think about what Heaven will be like; people of all races. We have a great work.

This message centered on the continued improvisation of a fairly new role within the Lumbee community. Whether a discussion of immigration or a church “without walls”, this pastor delicately treaded issues that were meant to severely push pastors within an organization (the SBC) that valued the independence of each church.

What I appreciated most about this message, which I discussed with Pastor H later on, was the way that Lumbee pastors in the Burnt Swamp felt the burden of their independence. Unlike the UMC churches, which are guided and partially funded by the national and global denomination, the churches in the SBC remain independent. While the UMC has mandates for how a particular church is supposed to position itself within a particular community, the independence of SBC churches, as indicated in this pastor’s message, was under the weight of a new era.

This keynote message, for all intents and purposes, contained the full essence of this era in the Lumbee Indian community. At the forefront, there is an effort by individuals in Lumbee churches to “go.” Many of them are inspired by their being introduced (often by other Lumbee people) into the “mission field.” Second, there is a notion that the “traditional” confines and structure of the church is changing – thus the title of this pastor’s message. But the Lumbee churches are not changing for change’s sake. They, like this pastor introduces, are reacting to the ailments of the local community: “drugs” and “prostitution”, among others, to use the words of the pastor. In those contexts, as this pastor indicates, the vision for dealing with these ailments depends on a very practical shifting of how the Lumbee church operates. However, this sermon pushes the audience and the churches represented therein to

transform their churches and to challenge the ways that their churches were limited by “jockeying for position.” He challenges a widely circulating understanding that certain families go to certain churches, and that they often determine the courses of those churches. According to this pastor, members of the church must “walk hand and hand.” He emphasizes the implicit idea – which he makes explicit – of moving. Then he makes his point in another way, emphasizing how the politics of a racialized American society, itself “moving”, is something that this audience (made up, primarily, of Lumbee pastors) cannot ignore. In his statement that “Mexicans” aren’t “going anywhere”, he is articulating a movement, at least of ideas and intentions, that must occur within the Lumbee community.

His message, primed appropriately for this stage, is a series of daggers aimed at bringing Lumbee people into honest conversation with a volatile world. In the Lumbee community, full of people who defy the stereotypes of Native America (as most Native Americans do), church leaders are the community leaders. His message indicates that there are various ways that Lumbee people utilize and respond to various performances that place them in sincere conversations with the world outside the church. These performances, like this pastor’s message, are often quite appropriately situated. As community leaders, Lumbee church leaders understand that the church is in a dialectical conversation with every other facet of community life. This is not just because the church is the moral center. Rather, maybe more importantly, it is a place for people to make their cases about the world.

The Power to Create Stages:

Perhaps some of the most tantalizing elements of American pop culture over the last 30 years have been the proliferation of new ways to do church. For the children of my generation who grew up on the 1980s, we could not escape Jim Baker, the Jimmy Swaggart, or Billy Graham (who often took over our local television station and our favorite programming). The transcendence of the church beyond walls and into multimedia airwaves made spectacle of religious practices that, maybe not ironically, urged the viewer to support those a long distance away so that they could continue to give the viewer at home religious entertainment over the airwaves. Somewhere in the middle, between studio where religious proselytizing was authored and the comfort of a living room, the relationship between religion and resources was lost. Nevertheless, these aforementioned mediated religious leaders were powerful in that they maintained stages that were tied into the expectancies of television programming.

In the Lumbee community, the transition in Lumbee religious institutions consisted of a perpetual notion that in transformation and change – in supreme challenge of the frameworks facilitating the moral – there was hope for incorporation of Robeson County’s most invisible people. Given the prominence of nationally syndicated TV evangelists, the modality of Christianity as a televised practice did not escape entrepreneurs in the Lumbee community. This entrepreneurship encapsulated many things, one of which was a distinctly new relationship between religious space and the Lumbee community. This was indicated in one simple phrase: “God Bless Ya, Can I help Ya?” These were the words that Brother Billy Locklear was known for when he would answer his phone at his

TV church in Lumberton North Carolina. He died toward the beginning of my research, in December 2010, and his death provoked a series of mixed emotions for me.

Brother Billy was the first Lumbee minister to make Lumbee invisibility public in a way that it had never been before. When he would sell his goods, he would also comment on how it benefited his television station that was aired to the “shut ins.” This term was used to describe people who were not able to attend church. However, operating in this way demanded resources. Brother Billy showed that to “carry out the gospel”, as he often said, the church would need resources. This was, as my wife puts it so eloquently, a time when the Lumbee church met the fact that they needed money to operate, and now everyone knew about it. Because Brother Billy’s church operated on television he broadcasted spirit-filled worship politely missed with the formation of economic relationships between his television station and the viewers.

Since the early 1990s, we expected to see Brother Billy in one way or another on the television. This isn’t saying that Lumbee people watched him all the time or much at all, but if you sat in a Lumbee house long enough there was a good chance that his face would eventually appear on the screen. As he would greet people with his famous line (“God Bless you, Can I help you”), he showed more than the products that he sold. He also showed that he was speaking and selling to– and quite possibly entertaining – many in the local Lumbee community. Some of these people watched him ritualistically and some watched him out of sheer curiosity at the longevity of his mission to preach the Gospel over the airwaves. Since Brother Billy’s death,

Gerald Locklear, another local pastor, has continued the operation of another Lumbee television church that broadcasts church services and church sales from time to time. Both of these churches, in their ability to connect the very intimacy of Lumbee worship and the economic nature of religious life, speak to and encourage explicit conversations about the economic natures of Lumbee religious institutions.

I began talking about the realm of televised religious experience after a series of discussion about the way that missions becomes legitimate in the Lumbee community. One of the workers in the Church and Community Center asked me if I heard about Judy Jacobs. She is Lumbee evangelist who was well known within the Lumbee community as part of a musical group called the “Jacobs Sisters.” Now, as a nationally recognized evangelist, she appears on popular Christian television networks such as Trinity Broadcasting Network. Back in 2008, the Lumbee Tribal Council’s website published an article titled “Judy Jacobs Christmas in October”, which features a story that begins:

Judy Jacobs in on a mission. As co-founder of the international Clothes of the World Foundation, she wants to bring awareness to the calamity of poverty throughout the world and improve the self-esteem of the impoverished by distributing needed items while also highlighting Christian principles through ministry and song.

One of her first stops was back home. (Lumbee Tribe 2011; accessed 10/20/11)

“Home”, as in Robeson County, was where she brought a tractor-trailer to rest and handed out boxes of goods to local youth. In the article, she states that she just returned from Honduras doing the same type of work.

Upon asking about the publicity of Jacobs’ work through television and websites such as the Lumbee Tribal Council’s webpage, I was told by several

missionaries that the battles continue between doing significant good and Lumbee imaginations of the church. According to these missionaries, many people in the Lumbee community have avoided more work because everyone assumes the community is taken care of by the large number of Lumbee churches. One worker in the Church and Community Center put it this way:

This community is so amped to see something good. At the end of the day, when you drive in with a truck loaded down, you can see how there is this overwhelming presence – especially within this community that has so much poverty – that things may be changing. But if you look at her (Judy Jacobs) event, it was sponsored by her family. Her family got her recognition. It's still all about looking good.

What this worker noticed is an underlying theme that I witnessed within intervention in the Lumbee community: the incessant need to point out community affiliations in the battle with poverty and other types of need. Because of the tension over Lumbee community/denominational lines, the obvious need to fix poverty is matched by an equally powerful need to save face between Lumbee people.

However, as I noticed in following and observing discussions between Lumbee people who work in missions, it is difficult to separate Lumbee community division from the realm of spectacle. My wife's cousin, who sings with an all Lumbee gospel group, made it easy to understand:

You have to see, this community has several ways of giving, which all basically fell behind one another. First it was barn raisings, then it was benefit singings, now its missions.

In describing mission work within this particular genealogy, he both places himself in the mix (because he is a gospel singer who has participated in benefit singings) but also attempts to associate missions with a groundedness in the Lumbee

community that ties the stage (the place of spectacle) to obligations to the Lumbee community. Whereas everyone knew who helped “raise the barn” when Lumbee people were farming families, and whereas benefit singings continue to be tied the local community’s church stages to particular causes through worship in song, the missions remain tied to a particular obligation to make things make sense at home. Lumbee missionaries can intervene through missions, but in a way that allows people in the Lumbee people can critique and appreciate that good. In that sense, Lumbee missions are performed with the understanding that they exist within Lumbee community critique despite where the missionary works otherwise.

I found myself pondering how the notion of massive poverty and other types of needs in Robeson County floated into and out of imaginations of poverty and other types of need throughout the world. Even as Judy Jacobs was helped in Robeson County to spread her message and missionary vision, she was, like many missionaries I worked with and conversed with, caught between the intimate relationships with a community at home and moral, economic, and spiritual commitments far away. Perhaps Brother Billy was right on point by making intervention at home – that is, reaching out to the alienated through television signals – just close enough for the Lumbee community to see but well outside the critique and politics of the church. Also, perhaps, because Judy Jacobs has a similar role in national television ministry, her role at home is but a breadcrumb where much more is needed.

However, realizing that creating a meaningful stage for intervening in Robeson County often means getting others to see you as authentically caring and

close enough to relate to, I realized that both Brother Billy and Judy Jacobs were in the community as much as they were alienated from it because *caring for the community meant suffering its alienation*. Though there were many who appreciated them, especially those who were impacted by their programs of intervention, there were many who stated that they were outside the context of traditional Lumbee religious life. As Lumbee people commented and critiqued the choices they made, they maintained both Jacobs and Locklear as part of the community.

I wondered if this was true for all missionaries. Could Lumbee missionaries ever be considered the “norm” in the Lumbee community, especially if they were to take the “Great Commission” literally? In considering Pastor S’s event, the “mission celebration”, I became aware of a very critical conversation between the traditional Lumbee churches and people who were extremely motivated by elements that either existed outside the Lumbee community or were largely ignored within the community. I was welcomed to Lumbee religious and community expansion beyond Lumbee church walls and, like Jacobs and Locklear, in creation of continued critique of Lumbee religious.

Mission Celebration:

"We would like you to speak."

This was the directive of Mr. P as we gathered in the fellowship of a local Pentecostal Holiness Church. He was telling me about an upcoming event at the General meeting of the United Methodist Church, which is held every four years. They were going to have a “listening session” to describe the atrocities that have happened to Native Americans, and Mr. P wants to have one in Robeson County so

that local Indian people can hear the same things that are being said at this national and global conference. Mr. P said he was inspired by the great turn out at the "mission celebration."

I was Pastor S's photographer for the day. This room was host to a plethora of Lumbee missionaries - some who led food distribution projects, some who helped take other Lumbee people to mission sites in U.S. and global locations, and some who were spokespeople for large global mission organizations like World Vision. My impression was that this mission celebration", organized by Pastor S, had inspired many, and many had decided to join in celebration. They were from different denominations. As a Southern Baptist pastor, Pastor S organized this event with the support of other Burnt Swamp members. He also garnered much support from members of the United Methodist Church. The place of the event was a Pentecostal Holiness Church. Many of those in attendance sat at their tables, peering around as if they were the shy kid at the dance. I decided to go around and ask them questions. As Pastor S's photographer, I had an excuse to be nosey. "Can you believe all these missions?" I asked almost everyone. The overwhelming response: "No, I can't." Several attendees said it was amazing. The representative for World Vision asked me to donate. "I have children here to feed," was my response. I was referencing my sense of how money floats within families in the Lumbee community. We, overwhelmingly, live in extended families. If there is extra money, it goes to the others who are in need. Within this sense of my place in the community, I could not agree to donate or join his particular mission venture. But I was nevertheless intrigued. I continued, "I'm a student too." With that last statement, I

was sure that he would not continue to ask for support.

Nevertheless, this was an opportunity. I asked him if he had luck gathering donations. He smiled, with that car salesman, door-to-door salesman mystique, always ready for you to reconsider but not willing to let you know how much they depended on you to say yes. “Yes, I think we can make a lot of connections here. I’m hoping that we can do well to represent this cause.” All the missionaries in his group – most of them from his church – had bright orange shirts with “World Vision” on the back. There were missionaries who seemed to huddle together, and they were parts of alliances or churches that normally associate with one another. Others, like Mrs. T, were subtly off to themselves. They seemed reluctant to appreciate this eclectic mix of missions.

Some of them fed the poor every day in the Lumbee community, something that the rest of this room didn’t understand. They were waiting for their next trip to feed and minister people in the Philippines, Belize, or Bolivia. But that was what this meeting was for: to make their worlds collide, in a sense. One sign beside a church’s table listed “contributors” to a local mission project. At the bottom, the maker of the poster placed a quote credited to “Sioux Wisdom”:

First, you are to think always of God. Second, you are to use all your powers to care for your people, especially the poor.

Mr. D walked into the room. He seemed proud. He seemed to glow. He recently turned 91 years of age and he came to this celebration as the main attraction of sorts. This was what he had helped create: a room full of Lumbee missionaries. His daughter escorted him, and she and I chatted after weeks of not seeing one another.

Mrs. R calls for me. She is standing at the front of the fellowship hall with the other people from the Lumbee UMC leadership. They want a picture. They often use pictures for UMC pamphlets that they send out to potential donors. They tell me the UMC offering system is set up so that it relies on an individual possessing a particular account number that represents their causes, which when accessed on an official UMC website allows anyone around the world to donate to their cause. The desire of Pastor S was to hold an event that would provide an opportunity for Lumbee people to see how many missionaries actually existed within the Lumbee community and to be able to start an annual meeting of these missionaries for fellowship and support.

Mrs. T's table, which was round with a peach tablecloth with "Traditional Paths" embroidered in black lettering, was different than everyone else's. Many of the other missionaries who worked globally had pictures on posters and illuminated by projectors onto the wall. Her table was filled with breads and canned jellies and vegetables, the latter of which had her logo and the name of the food on it. Below the table, nestled up closely, were posters that advertised her vision for the Lumbee community. On top of the table, there was a black science fair board, which contained contact information and the central purpose of the Traditional Paths ministry: "Building Relationships That Restore Integrity, Productivity, and Full Human Dignity." Two posters, just below, advertised two of her personal commitments. One was titled "Robeson County Youth Leadership", and the other was her advertisement for a program that helps all youth (despite race or ethnicity, but indicative of economic factors) enter relationships with local leaders that help

the youth become leaders. The other the poster was titled “Spiritual Connections” and it was part of her vision to connect what she saw “dismantled” in the last 30 years in the Lumbee community: the intimate relationship between home, school, and church.

I stopped Mr. D and asked if I could take his picture. He obliged and stood beside Pastor L, a white missionary who has worked for many years with the Lumbee community, and Mr. D’s daughter. After I took this picture, Pastor S shouted that we had limited time and that we must move into the second part of the mission celebration in the church sanctuary. Nevertheless, for some of the people, like Mr. D, it was a time of reflection and he was not in too much of a hurry. For the younger generations, I saw that they were slow to exit also. This room, full of science fair boards plastered with mission statements and photographs, was a revelation of sorts. It seemed that they were attempting to place things in order in their mind. Everyone heard of missionaries or they possibly knew of Pastor S because his intense traveling between churches asking people to support his particular missions in the Philippines and various Native American communities, but to put all these missionaries in one room was amazing, as several of the attendees I spoke with suggested.

When we entered the sanctuary, there were flags of over 12 nations lining the side (Pastor S’s personal touch) which were ushered in by a host of Lumbee teenagers. The agenda was not singing and preaching - the staples of the standard Pentecostal service – because this was a special occasion where religious traditions were mixed for a few hours. Everyone seemed on their toes, ready to see how the

mixing of denominational leaders would lead into a cross-denominational service.

Mike Cummings opened the celebration. He spoke about the fortune that the Lumbee community has because it can send out missionaries. This mission celebration was the first time many Lumbee missionaries were seeing each other and he applauded the cross denominational effort to support and recognize one another. A visitor and friend of Pastor S spoke next. He was from the Creek and Cherokee Indian communities. His words resembled the looks of Lumbee people: reminiscent and somewhat amazed. He spoke with careful speech:

You all are blessed here, but there are so many folks across the country that don't have anyone calling them. We must be available and usable.

He was speaking about the pervasive calling into missions that Pastor S and others used to describe the Lumbee community.

When (Pastor S) and I have gotten together over the years, we have just supported one another. He has encouraged me, and his wife has encouraged my wife. He has been a truly great friend in mission.

He told the audience about a "summit" that the Native Americans in the Southern Baptist church planned to hold in Arkansas in April of 2011. "We are doing there what you all are doing here." He referenced, I assumed, the bringing together of people across tribal community lines. (I wondered if he noticed that this mission celebration was an irregular occasion also, where Lumbee people from different churches gathered together in a religious setting.) He referenced a prominent White Southern Baptist missionary who said that the next revival in United States would begin in Native America.

His statements were full of conviction, as if he was exposing a truth that no

one else wanted to acknowledge. He spoke of cohesion and collective purpose between Lumbee Christians and Native American Christians across the United States. “Don’t give up what you have here,” he warned the audience. “Lumbee people have something special.”

The next presentation, the presentation of an award for “service to missions”, was for a piano player and missionary from the Holiness Methodist denomination. She was given an award for her long history of dedication to missions, and in her speech she tells the story about leaving her full time work “on faith” to go where God wanted her to go. “I’ve never looked back. God took care of me like he promised” she spoke quietly but confidently.

The next speaker was Mr. D. Essentially, Mr. D’s presence at this celebration, as a “celebrated” figure, was filled with irony and a tinge of sadness. As he started his speech, the words of which were seasoned and filtered through the webs of his memory, he paused often. Several times – in moments that made the audience laugh – he invited everyone to do missions with him in Belize. But at one moment he paused, deeply saddened by something that had just crossed his mind, it seemed:

My mission (in Central America) is family. It is like home. They give me anything I want. I have always tried to take care of them. In fact, I feel more at home down there than I do in most places here.

I cringed. The pain was thick. By “here”, he spoke of Robeson County. He made it a point to let everyone there – young and old – know where he thought he stood despite his being a celebrated figure for a day. The back story to this is one that is defined by the essence of what this mission celebration hoped to fix: the separation and anxieties over change that arguably kept all these missionaries from seeing each

other before this day. Mr. D's place at the "mission celebration", in those contexts, was quite fantastic. This celebration was not only a gathering of missionaries from the Lumbee community, it was Mr. D's welcoming back. He made it all make sense. It was his being appreciated now, as opposed to the past three decades when local church leaders in the Lumbee community had no reason to honor him. Today, they did, especially when I considered that a variety of Lumbee community members opened up themselves – released their existence in separated churches – to accept that their identities as missionaries. Many of the attendees who I spoke with said that they realized that day how the Lumbee community was much more than what they thought before, at least in the context of participating in missions.

Getting people talking (outside the church):

The mission celebration made me consider what the implications were for Pastor S. I asked him why he planned this event, and why he wanted to continue it in the future. "You know, it gives us a voice. A lot of people don't know about missions. They don't know that many of us go to the Philippines every year. Or at least we try." He paused, thinking a bit about how he could frame this for me. "I have people who come along and know what I do. They stop me and hand me money. They say to take it. They know what I am doing. But do they do that for everyone?" I was intrigued by the way Pastor S framed this economic relationship between his work and many members of the Lumbee community. But his voice was born out of many years of knocking on church doors and asking for time to speak about missions. For him, he had not garnered the voice that he wanted. He created chatter within the local church community about his mission celebration, but it did not mean that he had the

voice that he wanted, which if in his possession could make more incredible changes.

Like Pastor S and these other missionaries at the mission celebration, many people in the U.S. manage to find their area of expertise or devoted attention and they allow themselves to be vehicles for its circulation. Take for example the plethora of stickers on the back of American vehicles in the shape of a puzzle piece in acknowledgement of autism, political stickers about freeing Tibet, or political bumper stickers (especially before major elections) that in their speaking out for a particular candidate shouts out the a particular message, such as the message of “hope” that was associated with the 2008 Barack Obama campaign. Take, for another example, the dozens of “ribbons” that decorate automobiles. One of these – probably the most famous ribbon beside the yellow ribbon that was always tied “around the old oak tree” – is the breast cancer ribbon. Before its circulation around every college campus, hospital unit, and perfume counter, it was the marketing idea of a member of the Estee Lauder cosmetic company. Evelyn Lauder, when asked about the development of the ribbon, states simply that:

There had been no publicity about breast cancer, but a confluence of events - the pink ribbon, the color, the press, partnering with (model) Elizabeth Hurley, having Estee Lauder as an advertiser in so magazines and persuading so many of my friends who are health and beauty editors to do stories about breast health - got people talking (Coleman 2011).

But in the Lumbee community, movements to recognize and to gain voice are often built into the everyday lives of Lumbee people. They are built into Lumbee church routines, and it is not unusual to see posters at local grocery stores advertising benefit singings for a local cause where Lumbee singing groups perform.

This leads me to an important set of questions. Where does the church end? Where does religious experience cut off? Is it just in the church? How far can it expand? If it is imagined to be somewhere else (in a far off mission, for example), what happens in between?

To begin answering these questions I count on the already established scholarship of Christianity in anthropology. Several scholars have addressed the distinction between Christian experience and “the world.” Most notable among these are Peacock and Tyson (1989), Hinson (2000), and Robbins (2004). Unlike the attempts by some anthropologists⁵, they invite an anthropology of Christianity that seeks to understand meaning making in Christian practice. Hinson, in particular, writes of the ways that the Christians he studies demand an understanding of Christianity that goes well beyond the church walls into what he describes as a “devotional universe” (2000:4-5). But the trap to see Christian life within walls is quite easy. Robbins, in his afterword to an edited volume titled *Limits of Meaning: Case Studies in the Anthropology of Christianity* (2006), begins to describe the value of the anthropology of Christian experience:

Given that Christian insistence on meaning is patent, we can ask how Christianity makes the meaning of things appear to be such an important issue and whence the Christian drive for meaning derives (its) compulsive force. Assuming that we want ethnographic rather than theological answers to these questions...it is evident that Christianity motivates the problem of meaning by constructing the possibility of meaninglessness (213).

Robbins continues later with a much more nuanced claim, which helps me understand how significant missionaries are, generally, for describing the

⁵ E.g. John and Jean Comaroff (1993: xx) They write that ritual does not “press fresh associations, fashion visions for worlds yet unborn, deploy pragmatics of language to invest contemporary practice with new force, (or) call upon the power of poetics to subvert unfamiliar forms of authority”

unboundedness of Christian experience. In response to an essay on Zimbabwean missionaries by Erica Bornstein, Robbins continues:

As Bornstein demonstrates very effectively, the failure of meaning in this case is related to the collapse of Zimbabwean society, a society that can no longer serve as “a ground of expectation” for anyone planning social action. But it is also important to note that Christians usually experience such failures as crises in their ability to make life meaningful, and in discussing resolutions for them, seek to discover ways to cordon off a meaningful church space from the meaningless space that surrounds it – something those who work for World Vision Zimbabwe are finding hard to accomplish. (2006:214-215)

Here, Lumbee missionaries fit in quite perfectly because even as they possess and articulate a long history of political action against racism and various other types of oppression, and even as arguments could be made about why missions can be somewhere else and not at home, they show quite vividly how the power of meaning making is not necessarily subject to a dichotomy that pits a cordoned off Christian experience against something that exists outside a program or particular religious institution. In fact, as expressed in the impromptu gathering of Lumbee people from various denominations that do not normally associate with one another in religious settings at the missions celebration, there is a sense that a particular religious space does not always fully capture the expansive nature of Christian experience, which may be under negotiation at particular moments for very significant reasons in ways that show how Christian experience goes well beyond typical religious boundaries as defined by Robbins.

At the mission celebration, this breaking of religious “walls”, and the subsequent introduction of Lumbee religious experience to a landscape of

interacting fully with “the world”, became quite obvious. The poverty and other forms of trauma that had eaten at particular parts of the world – whether in Native America, the Philippines, Haiti, etc. – effectively created Lumbee missionaries. Yet, as they stood ready to convince someone to join them, they were overwhelmed that the basis of their community contained a cadre of missionaries who, in their own ways, facilitated these various causes. This conflict between the ability of Lumbee people to be agents in mission, and their overwhelming surprise at the plurality of missions that the Lumbee community contains, helps explain the conflict that was witnessed in the descriptions of Judy Jacobs, Brother Billy, and seemingly anyone else who enjoyed their own sense of “a cause” in conflict with what everyone considered to be the religious and institutional norms of the Lumbee community.

Thus, the transition into this era of Lumbee missions has not been easy. While *where* Lumbee missionaries should work is often debated, they are making missions part of the normal structures of Lumbee social and religious life. The projects Lumbee missionaries spend their energy within – what seems to energize them and inform how they talk about need – have become niches where they have become comfortable urging their local churches to push the proverbial envelope. They do this by challenging themselves in terms of place. As Native Americans they go far away. As Lumbee people, they challenge the socio-spatial divides that have long defined Lumbee community.

They have found that their voices of change, which are often the ways that Lumbee people envision the world, their own community, and their abilities to intervene, carries more weight than ever before. These voices, intrinsically, are

linked with the preparation of and search for appropriate stages to speak. These stages, as witnessed at the mission celebration, may quite easily push Lumbee people into alternative religious spaces or social positionings that allow them the ability to see particular aspects of need but may serve to alienate them within the Lumbee community.

Conclusion:

As Pastor S's missionary showcase illustrates, and as this pastor at the annual meeting of the Burnt Swamp denotes, the Lumbee mission field is as much a product of globalization and other currents of change as it is the "culture" of local Lumbee community. The stages that Lumbee missionaries speak from and that Lumbee people respond to are quite enormous in power and effect, yet they are constantly created not as a means to tell the Lumbee community what it should do – although, as you have read, this does take place – but to place the Lumbee community in perpetual engagement with the world. However, to avoid being overwhelmed, Lumbee missionaries operate within religious and missionary identities that are particularly crafted. To begin to understand how this crafting has taken place and continues to take place, you have to properly recognize how they witness and react to the trauma and need of everyday life within the various affiliations and affinities that they have. This provides certain problems for Native American studies. In the next chapter I explain this.

CHAPTER 7
IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES

The Bureau of Indian Affairs “Mandatory criteria for Federal acknowledgement” indicates that being Indian should follow these guidelines:

- (I) Significant rates of marriage within the groups
- (II) Significant relationships connecting individual members
- (III) Significant rates of informal social interaction (within the group)
- (IV) Shared or cooperative labor or other economic activity among the membership
- (V) Evidence of strong patterns of discrimination or other social distinctions
- (VI) Shared sacred or secular ritual activity encompassing most of the group
- (VII) Cultural patterns: language, kinships organization, religious beliefs
- (VIII) The persistence of a named, collective Indian identity continuously over a period of more than 50 years
- (IX) Historical political influence

As I explain in the chapter “Roads to Recognition”, the two pathways from the central place of Lumbee sovereignty – the church – lead in different directions. One

pathway essentially places Lumbee people in positions to help make the Lumbee community fit these rules. These rules do not encompass complex breakages within Native community. They don't identify shared labor or economic activity as it exists in a globalizing world. Lumbee people have not only worked internationally, their work has been defined through policies such as NAFTA. As for point (V), what happens when discrimination happens within the Indian community? What happens when hurting of others through discriminatory practices is partially a basis of how Indian community was set up over the last 400 years? Point (VI) asks for sacred rituals that encompass the majority of the community. So much for separate, distinct, and influential religious spaces that easily counter any type of tribal government that would try to supersede them. Point (VII) continues to restrict religious activity through the notion of "cultural pattern." I am not sure what that could mean in terms of people who imagine themselves beyond this cultural patterning. Moreover, where is the religious experience as it is transformative and volatile in Native America? Point (VIII) is troublesome also. What happens when Native American are raided, split, and given new conduits for survival? Point (IX) asks for "historical political influence." What would historical religious influence mean? What happens when Native America preaches revival and transforms the nations?

I am never amazed at the amount of political rhetoric in the American media that focuses on the religious contours of society. As White, Black, and Latino Americans express concern for the plethora of social and political concerns that affects each group, what is left (for me and many others) is a question about the

implications for Native America. What would it mean for Native Americans to express their affinity for the political and social spaces of a “social gospel” or their desire to hear the opinions of “social conservatism”? I think that an appreciation of such facets of Native American life would move us out of a constant debate in secular, inspired, and arguably non-human forms of existence. If Native people are supposed to separate themselves from the realm of Christianity, what is the justification for others or for themselves?

It is important that anthropology, as a discipline that has stakes in the study of Native America, consider how it has helped develop Native American discussions of our community and lives. For Native American people, the healing of centuries of trauma is evaluated in the anthropological realm as only made whole in terms of recovering land and resources. Meanwhile, anthropology, as a four-field discipline, continues to harness the power and implications of a live and spirited Native America. Anthropology – which grounds its evidence in ethnography or archaeological findings – does not often serve as a welcoming vessel for the evolving spirits and consciousness of people who for so long have been victim to its evidence gathering and other forms of power.

So where does the proverbial rubber meet the road? Where is it that Native people begin to transcend the monotony of rhetoric that connects our authenticity with restricted realms of existence – spiritual, economic, educational, and otherwise? I think it begins with a discussion of the common themes within Native American studies. Sovereignty, which several theorists have discussed as pertaining to a sense that Native people want to exert their will within the contemporary

United States, contains several key elements: land, money, and law. Anthropologist Audra Simpson articulates the relationship between “mis-recognition” and how “capacities of self-rule” are defined. Speaking within the contexts of indigenous peoples in Australia, she articulates a very important set of points:

We see in this example how historical perceptibility is used, and is still used, to claim, to define capacities for self-rule, to apportion social and political possibilities, to, in effect, empower and disempower Indigenous peoples in the present. Such categorical forms of recognition and mis-recognition are indebted to deep philosophical histories of seeing and knowing (Simpson 2007: 69).

But before this brilliant passage, earlier in her discussion of “particular ways of knowing”, she states that:

In those moments (when anthropology created the notion of being “Indigenous”), people left their own spaces of self-determination and became “Indigenous” ... No situation such as the one we all inherit and live within is “innocent” of a violence of form, if not content, in narrating a history or a present for ourselves. But like the law and its political formations that took things from them, there are disciplinary forms that must be contended with by Indigenous peoples. Anthropology and the “law” ... mark two such spaces of knowing and contention with serious implications for Indigenous peoples in the present.

What Simpson articulates in this set of passages is what has become a standard theme within a colonial-postcolonial struggle in and around Native America.

Essentially, if Native people state that they have left certain ways of describing themselves and thinking about their lives, and are now dealing with a never ending ordeal of living within the framework of otherness (Simpson’s conception of “Indigeneity”), then they are forever in debt to finding themselves within the systems of knowledge that are the reasons for their suffering. As Simpson notes, anthropology and the “law” are often the culprits of this. However, if I may return to

Simpson's passage that I find so powerful, I think it is very important to understand misrecognition has not only occurred within frameworks such as the law or the discipline of anthropology. There have been several forms of misrecognition to which even "Indigenous" peoples have been complicit. One of these "categorical forms" is Native American religious experience and practice.

It is here that I make a concluding claim. In violence – that is, in the breaking of Lumbee community and the "infighting" that Mrs. R's uncle claimed was being alleviated by missions – I see the ability for a particular community to touch, feel, and be witnesses to the repercussions of the Divine. Yet, the politics and relationships of the human – that which binds individuals together despite relationships with and to the Divine – bring the community back into conversation with itself.

Stating a link between Native America and Christianity remains a sensitive topic. The well-known ethnography, *Jesus Road*, by Luke Lassiter, Clyde Ellis, and Ralph Kotay, is probably the most complete ethnography of the relationship between Native American and Christian practices. In an effort to warn readers to not assume Christianity is assimilation for Native people, they write:

When, for example, Vincent Bointy suggest that "we lost our Christianity because we turned towards the white man's ways," one is immediately forced to reexamine the limitations of academically constructed models originally founded on assimilation and consider instead the nexus of relations and transactions that engender the meanings of American Indian Christian heritage expressed in language and song (2002:119).

Lassiter, Ellis, and Kotay are not alone in their witnessing of Native religious experience in terms of traditional, inclusive aspects of Native American community.

Anthropologist Jack Schultz researched the churches of the Seminole people of Oklahoma in the early 1990s. His research offers a very cogent account of the double binds that face Native American people who are Christians. Having identified the fact that early anthropologists missed the plethora of Christian revivals that took place in “Indian Territory” in the early 20th Century (Schultz 1999: 4), Schultz expresses concern over the continuance – in early 21st Century scholarship – of the “bias of the assimilation and acculturation models” in anthropological and historical studies of Native peoples. In that context, he argues why he finds the practices of Christians in the Seminole community of Oklahoma intriguing:

The Seminole community’s innovations expressed in the Baptist churches are not passive responses to a dominant society; nor are they an abandonment of cultural integrity; rather, they are creative, deliberate adaptations that ensure community survival within a locally meaningful framework (1994: 4).

Having argued earlier for a critique of “community” as “interaction” (1999: 4), Schultz effectively and attractively articulates Seminole engagement with Christianity. But even in this, Schultz frames this engagement as intra-community, very likely because of his refusal to describe “Christianity” as “assimilation”:

Although relationships of domination and dependency may account for some actions, and although the dominant forces do limit...actions, the Seminole Baptist community is not defined by these forces. Community definition and maintenance results primarily from *intragroup interaction*, not from the community’s relationship to dominant outsiders (1999: 7-8; emphasis mine).

Even in Schultz’s attempt to place Natives within a space of agency and power, he closes them off, very mildly, to existences as Native American Christians that either cross or stretch the borders of their community to help create and reify and recreate their identities as Christians and Native Americans. Moreover, Schultz presents a divide between Native America and what some scholars have described as

evangelism or the entrance of Christian inspiration and influence from outside of a particular Native community. Like Lassiter, Ellis, and Kotay's leaving their investigation situated in "language and song" and not in the other parts of the "nexus of relations", Schultz' study is both gratifying (because he signals the importance of transformation in the Native church) and wanting (because he confines it geographically and conceptually).

In this contemporary era of global mission and humanitarianism, Native people, much like many people from many other communities, are interweaving their identities into global and multidimensional "webs of meaning" (Geertz 1973:5) that have yet to be theorized. Many of my conversations with Lumbee Indian missionaries have been marked by individuals who, for the sake of living the fullness of their identities, have had to situate themselves within larger American and global sentimentalities and relationships.

As Mrs. R and Mr. N illustrate, the post-Katrina era is defined locally in the Lumbee community by a re-situating of Lumbee efforts to minister, heal, and reunite with Native communities. In an appeal to do "what Christ would want", there is steady progression, in some realms, to do mission work that, according to these missionaries, is never denied to anyone (despite race or any other difference). This often means uniting efforts within specific church denominations to aid people in the United States and foreign nations who have suffered from the poverties and disasters that define the plethora of impoverished nations that sit juxtaposed to the West.

Despite declarations that mission work is non-biased, many Lumbee missionaries often articulate their desires to help their “own people”, whether these people are next door in Southeastern North Carolina or in a small community in Bolivia. The negotiation of community inclusion that is part of Lumbee mission work is quite fascinating, to say the least, and says much about the legacy of Lumbee and other Native people seeing other indigenous, oppressed, or traumatized people, whether locally or globally, partake in the healing that is part of the vision of Christian missions. The creation of networks of missionary kin, as I call this negotiation at this time, has been taking place for over one hundred years in the Lumbee community, but it has been revived over the last decade in the context of a new wave of sentimentalities that have taken shape throughout the American landscape.

The Lumbee community’s relationships with connecting their spaces of religious empowerment leads to two core questions: When do we see the “nation building” rhetoric of today’s anthropology as limiting? And, is it time to look beyond Phillip Deloria’s “Indians in unexpected places”? Deloria argues that as consumers, we are all “subject to expectations” (2006: 6) about how Native Americans should look, what activities they should take part in, where they should live, et cetera. I would add that those expectations are arms of more dastardly paradigms – paradigms that are not indicative of both Native American and non-Native missionary worldviews and the imagined communities that are coming out of them. To challenge these paradigms is to provide equity for entire Native communities who have felt the weight of a particular localizing rhetoric from the power brokers

in their own communities and from scholars of Native America who assume Native people within the United States envision their communities' futures wholly in the contexts of local struggle.

As it is, Native America has gone from being made invisible by the often disturbing services of anthropologists to preserve "them", to more recently being cast under the equally disturbing shadow of members (and families) of tribal governments who, like their anthropological counterparts, have attempted to preserve images of current tribal communities as a prerequisite to their becoming politically powerful. This is all in spite of identities that Native people maintain as members of churches, as leaders in transnational movements, as individual business tycoons, and much more.

Anthropologist Orin Starn, in his recent article titled "Here Come the Anthros (Again): The Strange Marriage of Anthropology and Native America" which uses the recent film *Avatar* (2009) as a jumping off point to talk about contemporary perceptions of Native American peoples in anthropological scholarship, discusses the state of Native American anthropology today. He explains, as would be necessary in any conversation about the relationship between anthropology and Native American people, that anthropology was "almost parasitically dependent" (2011: 180) on the Native American as subject of anthropological inquiry. Native Americans were, essentially, the "early man" that showed Euro-Americans how they "used to be." As Starn indicates, times changed and "a period of estrangement between anthropologists and Native Americans" began in the 1960s and 1970s (180). Vine Deloria, prominent Native scholar, would have been more than happy to

substantiate Starn's argument. Deloria's book, *Custer Died for Your Sins*, which was a self-defined "manifesto", articulated Deloria's discontent with anthropology through a very simple idea that "Indians have been cursed above all other people in history" because they "have anthropologists" (1988: 8).

But the sudden withdrawal of anthropology from Native America wasn't happening exactly as Starn suggests. While the Red Power movement of the mid-20th century may have forced anthropology's hand, anthropologists in some of the prominent anthropology programs were steadily trying to resolve "problems" and inaccuracies in the anthropological record of Native America. The South was the epicenter of these problems and inaccuracies. In the late 1960s, for instance, the University of Chicago Department of Anthropology sent down a young anthropologist, Karen Blu, along with her husband, anthropologist Gerald Sider, to study the Lumbee community of North Carolina. Blu, during that time, as indicated in an early 1970s interview of her by a Lumbee community member, was asked to research the Lumbee community because it was one of the various enigmas within Native America. She indicates this in her responses to a Lumbee oral historian:

I wanted to work in the Southeast - - and I asked him (anthropologist Raymond Fogelson, who advised her at the University of Chicago) what to work on and he gave me a lot of literature on the Southeast and said look through it and see what strikes you. And the Lumbee just jumped out because they were such a large group (and they had not been studied before - or) there was no material basically on them. And I said, "Why is this?" And he said, "Well, people just haven't worked there." And I said, "But it's large." And he said, "That's right, and I think it's a fascinating problem but nobody so far has done it." "Well, maybe I will." And then I moved to Washington, D.C., and I met William Sturtevant who is a curator at the Smithsonian Institution. And he thought it was also a good project. And with their mutual blessings, I came down here (to see what I could see) (1973:2).

The importance of anthropologists having not “worked there” is telling from two angles.

The first angle is that Blu’s argument for her study of the Lumbee community would have been fine except for the fact that working “there” in the Lumbee community allowed her to see, at most, only half of the Lumbee community. Or, in other words, there are (and have been) as many people “there” in the Lumbee community as have been within some form of Lumbee diaspora. Movement has defined Native American peoples, especially in the U.S. South, not just in terms of forced removal but also in terms of movement for the sake of personal and community interests. There has also been great movement in terms of Native people being tossed to and fro within definitions of how they fit within the U.S. South and the U.S. in general. What Blu did not see, especially as indicated in her subsequent monograph *The Lumbee Problem* (2001), was that while describing the locations of Native Americans was important, doing so while ignoring the moving parts of Native America – whether in terms of actual diaspora or in terms of the tumultuous landscape of definitions that Native people must endure – would have lasting consequences for Lumbee people who attempt to get out of the mud that is represented by images and connotations that even the brightest Native American studies scholars do not want to fundamentally transform.

The second angle concerns the fact that Blu (via her mentors) suggests that Native America wasn’t officially defined until someone (some anthropologist) “worked there”, making the discipline of anthropology the legitimizing element in the search for some type of truth in or about Native America. While Blu may seem

matter-of-fact with regard to her receiving permission to study the Lumbee community, Blu had to make a conscious decision to study the Lumbee community for what it was (i.e. moving and dynamic) or for what Blu and other anthropologists thought it should be (i.e. somehow corralled, theoretically, like any other tribe). Blu, unfortunately, leaned toward the latter.

Blu's main question was: How do Lumbee Indians and similar communities fit into Native America and within the South? As with any science, anthropology had created "fields" of study, and "Native America" was one of these fields. The U.S. South was also a field, but not to study Native Americans. Blu, in essence, was trying to understand the interface of these two fields. Or, to use the words of anthropologist Lee Baker, she was attempting to resolve what was "out of the way" and "in the way" within the study of race and ethnicity in the United States (Baker 2010:9).

Baker's history of anthropology in the United States, titled *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture* (2010), argues that there was a significant difference between early anthropology, which was dependent on studies of "out of the way" Indigenous peoples, and sociology, which studied Black and immigrant populations that were considered "in the way." Despite the powerful presence of his research in the anthropological literature, Baker's analysis, much like the bulk of anthropological scholarship in Native America today, does not take into account the certainty and absoluteness that is present in the American metanarrative of Indian removal from the U.S. South. That is, he includes no commentary on how the legacy of "removal" guarantees the flawed idea that Native America is somehow not part of

contemporary U.S. society or how his analysis of the Black community's infatuation with Native America's relationship with the U.S. government may have also been based on more pervasive assumptions held by the Black American elite about where Native Americans existed.

In fact, given his discussion of the influence of several Black intellectuals in guiding discussions of race, culture, and anthropology (207), Baker does not acknowledge the significant ways that Native Americans were not allowed by significant Black intellectuals and their anthropologist colleagues, in the early 20th Century, to exist in the U.S. South as Native Americans. The amalgamation and assimilation at the heart of most Black scholars' descriptions of Native American people in the South (e.g., Franklin 1995) mirrored the separation that American Anthropology made between "Native America" and the Black and White South. Boas famously prefaces Zora Neale Hurston's *Mules and Men* with an ending statement that intertwined the U.S. South with a Black and White racial binary that defined it: "To the student of cultural history the material presented is valuable not only by giving the Negro's reaction to everyday events, to his emotional life, his humor and passions, but it throws into relief also the peculiar amalgamation of African and European tradition which is so important for understanding historically the character of American Negro life, with its strong African background in the West Indies, the importance of which diminishes with increasing distance from the south" (1990:xiii-xiv). Additionally, while Zora Neale Hurston was adamant about how "pure" the Native was being kept on the reservation, relative to the "rubbing off" of "negroness" in the rest of U.S. society (Baker 2010:25), some of her contemporaries

in the Black community illustrated how this often made looking at Native peoples in Southern regions *a task of capturing Native American identity within the “mixed” body instead of within a reservation.*

Either hidden away within more substantial racial forms in contemporary times or somewhere out of place geographically, Native America was left to linger and be absent. So, in these contexts, to study Lumbee missionaries is a task not only in dealing with the strange record of anthropological appropriation (which Simpson, above, alludes to), but also the quite evident lack of tools to begin to describe how a socially invisible people – Native Americans – prepare to deal with particular circumstances that now mean that their identities must suddenly morph between an early American history where they were precisely located in anthropological disappearance or severe definitional ambiguity, to the current crisis of worldwide poverty where being Indian and missionary means Lumbee missionaries take meaning –born in a long legacy of oppression and invisibility and framed by generations in a Native-less Southern U.S., in the case of Lumbee missionaries – into a global mission field where meaning making is just as chaotic.

But in all this talk of social, academic, and political dislocation with regard to Native America, we must also consider the dislocation that takes place *within* Native communities. As I have described in the previous chapters, the chaotic nature of defining the disparities that inculcate our lives and worlds as Native people often leave us no room to advocate for our political or otherwise social selves in the contexts of the U.S. In terms of the debates within the broken Lumbee social world, it is similar to what Victor Turn calls “social drama” (Turner 1957: 89-92). This type

of dislocation is often the product of internal community disputes, often, and it is easily dismissed by local tribal spokespeople within the notion that Native people are in need of preservation and that fights for “federal recognition” and like processes of bureaucratic authenticity should not be hampered by seemingly petty internal squabbling.

How can we as anthropologists help this problem? In the anthropology of Native America, there remains an articulated need to speak of a tribal “culture” (Lambert 2007: 23; Cattelino 2008: 162-163) that is only changed under the pressures of “colonialism” or “setter-colonialism.” Cattelino, in particular, imagines an evaluation of Indian identity through the next step of Indian identity. She calls it “sovereign interdependencies” and it in effect situates Native people through a continued emphasis on the relationships between Indian community as tribal government and the other “sovereign” powers that exist around the tribal community.

Cattelino’s analysis is important, and it leaves room for a continued evaluation of what is sovereign and how that which is sovereign interrelates. In essence, we could ask: “what happens when sovereignties do not provide neatly crafted spaces and community frameworks for Native American people to continue their identities?” Recently, Native scholars have suggested a re-conceptualization of how we describe Native American diaspora. A popular text about Native American diaspora, *Native Hubs* by Renya Ramirez, aims to describe this very phenomenon. Her ethnography features the narrative of Indian people leaving “the reserve” for opportunities that couldn’t be found on the reserve. Her principle theme is that

Native community, despite its movement, centers equally on what happens within Native homelands and the diasporas within which Native people move. She explains that:

the hub's *emphasis on the tribal homeland demonstrates its Native specificity*. Diaspora discourse usually concentrates on displacement, loss, and a deferred desire for homeland. The hub, rather than focusing on displacement, emphasizes urban Indians' strong rooted connection to tribe and homeland (2007: 11-12; emphasis mine).

However, the intimacy of Native American identity and a holistic sense of Native American rootedness to a particular locale or set of locales must be extended to incorporate these alternative ways of existing in the world that I have described through the contexts of Lumbee missions. Lumbee diaspora, to add to Ramirez's description of "native hubs", is a part of – rather than an abstraction from – the Lumbee community. While Ramirez's conceptualization of Native diaspora keeps Natives caught indefinitely between the homeland and a locale where they live their everyday lives, the Lumbee diaspora sits in productive conversation with the Lumbee home community.

In essence, as much as "native hubs" protects the whole of the Native community, what I have described in terms of Lumbee missions speaks to the breakages in Native community. What Lumbee missionaries live through is the formation and reification of breakages that provide contexts through which they are able to maintain agency in their worlds. These missionaries work around these divides. In many ways – especially as exemplified by the many conversations that I have documented between Lumbee missionaries and various audiences – the

context of breakage is well understood and utilized by Lumbee missionaries to accomplish their work as leaders.

Yet, what does it mean for Native people to move so fluidly? Anthropologist Liisa Malkki's description of "metaphoric practices that so commonly link people to place" (1992: 27) is important in this conversation. In her article titled "National Geographies", Malkki makes a quite important argument:

The ecological immobility of the native, so convincingly argued by Appadurai, can be considered in the context of a broader conflation of culture and people, nation and nature – a conflation that is incarcerating but also heroizing and extremely romantic (1992: 29).

In the case of Native America, in addition to maintaining incarceration, scholars of Native America, along with local Native people who serve to represent their particular "tribes" or "governments", are borrowing from possibly the most potent metanarrative within American consciousness – a metanarrative that allows scholars to continue to make statements about "native specificity" being linked, almost indefinitely, to particular locales. What frightens me is that this constant ball 'n' chain appropriation of Native people's relationship to particular locales is not regarded, as ironic as it may seem, as a direct contradiction to the small number of voices that advocate for "decolonizing" mechanisms. This is because, more often than not, those from our communities who advocate for decolonization have not been able to define Indigenous freedom and agency in non-local or non-reserved contexts without labeling Indigenous people "sell outs", "assimilated", or "not real."

To follow up Malkki's point that "to plot only 'places of birth' and degrees of nativeness is to blind oneself to the multiplicity of attachments that people form to places through living in, remembering, and imagining them" (1992:38), it must be

noted that this blindness is part of the inherited colonial weight of Native America that many people within Native communities are aiming to reconcile. It does not help that Native America is normally visualized and understood within mandates to “plot” Native America. That is, only by constantly reifying roots, which are the product of their being manufactured within the American-colonial imagination, can Native American people emphasize their right to self-determine the terms of their lives. This is the true Native American double bind, to answer and critique Jessica Cattelino’s evocation of “need based” sovereignty (2010: 235).

Cattelino’s research with the Seminole people of Florida is encouraging, and it gives us a space to see how Native community moves past worldviews that are stifled by the location of the Native home. Nevertheless, she provides an underlying thesis that states that studying Native America in the United States is best started within the premise of Indian identity that is tied ever so intimately to the structures (often the governmental structures) of where they claim home to be. In that context, to begin to talk about Native American wealth, as Cattelino suggests in this article, you must begin by examining Native America as these structures of government – or, as it is, in my words, the elite who speak for the Indian people. This metaphysically positions Native people within the relationship between a tribal government that is supposed to represent “them” and a U.S. colonial order that is supposed to represent what they perpetually fight against.

This rhetoric fails to understand how and where Native people (the people supposedly represented by “the tribe”) are creating and reifying alternative realms of expectation that may not (and often does not) jibe with those who represent them

in the discourses of federal recognition and tribal sovereignty. Alternative realms of living – very often outside the narrow scope of Native American tribal sovereignty politics – may necessarily remove Native people from certain locations, in ways that cannot be easily summed up under commonly articulated theories of “colonialism” or “settler colonialism” in the United States, which need a locatable tribe to effectively defend “the tribe.” Indigenous people, in the United States, often outside the tribal complex, are otherwise invisible.

May the Circle Be Broken:

While I am by no means saying that Native America was the only region or people contained, I am also not the first to attempt to break the “cultural” realm that has contained the essence of anthropological study epitomized in fieldwork. Edmund Leach’s *Political Systems of Highland Burma* (1954) provided one notable precedent for this. What I see, however, is the mandate for recuperation of Native American movement and agency, in particular, in an era where scholars are challenged to define what Indigenous boundaries mean and how much they can be broken. In that regard, my argument is a continuation of Thomas Biolsi’s description of the “four kinds of indigenous space” in his article “Imagined Geographies” (2005: 241). The last two spaces – “transnational political space” and “international political space” – seem to allude to emerging connections or affinities between Native American political realities in the U.S. and emerging political realities that are coming from indigenous political movements, locations, or communities outside the United States.

In fact, seasoned with the ideas of anthropologist Arjun Appadurai about a global “community of sentiment”, Biolsi’s argument about Indigenous spaces may provide the beginning scaffolding for arguments about when and where Native people reach beyond American imaginations of Native community. Appadurai, in fact, argues for a very specific look at how certain motivations impact communities once perceived primarily from their regional or local identities:

Part of what the mass media make possible, because of the conditions of collective reading, criticism, and pleasure, is what I have elsewhere called a “community of sentiment”, a group that begins to imagine and feel things together.

Collective experiences of the mass media...can create sodalities of worship and charisma...Most important...these sodalities are often transnational, even postnational, and they frequently operate beyond the boundaries of the nation. These mass-mediated sodalities have the additional complexity that, in them, diverse local experiences of taste, pleasure, and politics can crisscross with one another, thus creating the possibility of convergences in translocal social action that would otherwise be hard to imagine (1996:8).

This may not seem impossible within the realm of Native America if we consider the extra-national nature of certain narratives that are shared within Native communities and the ability of individuals in local, grounded environments to selectively participate in “communities of sentiment” that by definition transcend the local. While Biolsi’s analysis is critically important, like the work of other anthropologists who attempt to make sense of Native American communities in a globalizing world – Cattelino (2008) attempts this to some extent by discussing Seminole tribal holdings in international locations – it has not brought us to a place where we can distinguish Native people from the one-to-one relationship between Native American identity and Native American tribal government, which is often

described through the ongoing conversation of tribal sovereignty or self-determination.

As Lumbee and other Native American missionaries exhibit, much of the building that Native American missionaries do is for other peoples, communities, and nations. The Navajo Code Talkers – popularly showcased in the movie *Windtalkers* (2002) – were not an oddity. Go to any powwow across the U.S. and you will usually find some part of it that celebrates Native American “warriors.” These are mostly men who have served in the active U.S. military. This, as I described earlier, was how Mr. D started his missionary career. But this distance from the U.S. and from Native community through military service cannot be assumed to be limited or somehow indicative of an artificially simple separation between Native community and Native individual. As Mr. D illustrates, and as other Lumbee missionaries have used for examples, the community extends with the Native community member who, in moments like the mission celebration (e.g. in Mr. D’s speech before the mission celebration audience), continue to calibrate what the home community means to them as they compare it or live through it along with other places of importance.

Nevertheless, this begins a conversation about the multiple worlds of Native people. On a visit to a local Lumbee fire station recently, I heard a conversation where young Lumbee firefighters were describing a message that a Lumbee firefighter and U.S. Marine had written on the whiteboard (similar to a chalkboard) in their main meeting room. It said “I’ll see you boys later”, and had a giant circle drawn around it. The treasurer of the fire station, Pastor H, said that they would

keep the young man's message on the board until he came home from his tour of duty in Afghanistan. In that moment, I couldn't help but contrast the image of his leaving with the intimate but spirited message drawn within a very pronounced circle, leaving behind his overwhelmingly Lumbee firefighter family who were not willing to erase the message. It spoke to the fact that, when at home, this young Lumbee man held multiple roles, one of which made him very capable of leaving the Lumbee community for very long periods of time. But in his absence, the circle – both literally and figuratively – was drawn around his identity to preserve him in this intimate space, in the volunteer fire department, in the heart of the Lumbee community. There was no conversation between this circle drawn around his name and the border of the larger Lumbee community. If anything, only the “boys” in the fire department knew it was there, and within that particular context this young Lumbee soldier remained in the Lumbee community.

Such juxtaposition between staying and leaving – between being in the Indigenous home and somewhere else – symbolizes much of what is missing in contemporary anthropologies of Native America. Again, to borrow from Renya Ramirez's *Native Hubs*, it necessitates a type of transcendence of Native community that is much more fluid. However, this transcendence cannot be simply analyzed as moving from one place to another. This movement must involve other people and it must take account of the many breakages in Native community. We must begin to understand how Native American people break from those communities and how those circles that we draw around the Native community are not the same ones that are drawn around Native identity. Native community circles are often too static to

represent who Native Americans are in their everyday lives. They don't contain within them the animate nature of everyday life.

At the center of Native American studies, and also solidly within anthropology, we have yet to create a theoretical tool kit that allows us to approach and share a dialectical relationship with the animate Native. These tools would break us out of the "ethnographic present" (1995:343), to use the words of anthropologist J. Anthony Paredes, and bring "the Native American" out of American fantasy. In his 1995 article titled "Paradoxes of Modernism and Indianness in the Southeast", Paredes argues that "ethnographic descriptions of native cultures always entail a certain amount of compression of changing lifeways into an artificial timelessness" (1995:344). But time, as Keith Basso skillfully discusses (1996:5), is intricately interwoven with "place."

What is sorely needed at the center of the anthropology of Native America is a renegotiation of the ethnographic locale. While I am in no way stating that locales in the form of Native American home territories do not exist (Keith Basso's *Wisdom Sits in Places* (1996) stands as an excellent example of why this isn't the case), I am concerned with what I consider to be concerted efforts made by scholars of Native America and individuals at the local level of Native American community to ignore, if not intentionally manipulate, the perceptions of the boundaries of Native American home territories in ways that are increasingly more harmful than helpful.

In a section called "dividend days", in her book *High Stakes*, Jessica Cattelino equates drug dealers as "outside" sales people who stalk the Seminole tribe (2008:192). While this may be true, Cattelino's calculus for discussing

Seminole economic fungibility is an exercise in looking from the inside out and guaranteeing fetishization over Seminole dividends. It dismisses, unfortunately, both alternative economies that run rampant throughout Native communities in the U.S. South and otherwise, and the particularly significant position of the Seminole communities near the Interstate 95 drug corridor that connects Miami and New York, running through many Native American communities along the way in Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and beyond. In an informal conversation with a Lumbee friend about a Lumbee artisan whose biggest clients are Seminole people, the impression that the international drug network was somehow “foreign” to the Seminoles of Florida was taken as a joke:

We’ve [Lumbee people] sold to them. Yes, the drugs are driven into Florida, but those aren’t “foreigners.” Those are their own people selling drugs to their own people. It used to be us. Maybe not so much now.

Whether “foreigners” or “outsiders” who may be Lumbee, part of some other Native community, or non-native, the insistence on constantly reifying the borders so that Native people appear to hunker down and not share intimate moments of engagement with these “foreign” elements is quite unethical, to say the least.

Historian Rhett Jones, in a discussion of inaccuracies in previous research on the relationship between Blacks and Indians, states that Native Americans often claim and have “an alternative to a racist nation” (2001: 11). While I agree with him that Native Americans necessarily place themselves outside or above the fray of an American political economy that hinges on the power dynamics between White and Black peoples, they are not, as we are wont to presume, all hunkering down within “nations”(9). No, because Native American peoples, especially in the U.S. South,

attempt to live lives as citizens of the United States and of a global community nowadays, they must balance volatile discourses of race with emerging mandates to act within a changing national and global landscape. While Jones, in his description of Native people having “alternatives”, is speaking in terms of federal recognition and other legal descriptors of Native American borders, I would add that this is also a conceptual and paradigmatic misconception. Issues of race, as Circe Sturm discusses in her book *Blood Politics* (2002), push members of many Native communities to constantly situate themselves in racial complexes that do not align with Native racial experiences that are a product of various factors (region in the U.S., social class, etc.). But, as Sturm and other anthropologists do not adequately address, these racial complexes are more and more global complexes and less nationally centered ones, and many Native communities are filled with community members who are constantly reconfiguring their imaginations to take account of streams of global movement –embodied in people, media, etc. – that have been as important in Native communities (if not more important) than the supposedly pervasive influence of Native national governments.

Pastor H told me that teenagers at a powwow in a nearby Indian community in North Carolina were selling t-shirts that read: “I’m not illegal, I’m Native.” These t-shirts are a telltale sign of what is becoming obvious to younger generations of Native American people: they are, in one way or another, global citizens. Thus, they must react to it in particular ways. While Jones was generally correct to identify a hiding that takes place within bureaucratic definitions that separate Native America from the rest of America, these young Native American people at the local North

Carolina powwow illustrate how those who often scream in defense of tribal exclusiveness do not see the plethora of Native individuals who, by actions that perhaps seem awkward and out of place, are begging for an inclusive conversation about who and where they are.

Seeing ourselves:

There are many aspects of “everyday life” Native American lives that are hidden under the enormous shadow of a contemporary era that is defined by a continual call and response between members of the academy and power brokers at the boundaries of Native communities, both of whom are complicit in avoiding the many layers of power, trauma, violence, and general transformation that define Native America despite politically and bureaucratically laid borders. In the everyday lives of Native people – in the old and new types of suffering and successes that Native people experience – Native people find and help create new types of community formation that are in many ways a critique of the rhetoric that is pushed by scholars of Native America and the members of certain Native communities that situate themselves as spokespeople for “Native America.” These spokespeople, as representatives of tribal governments, are competing in a particular Native centered economy, dependent on subjugating peoples inside the Native American incorporation.

Anthropologist Orin Starn, again in his recent article about the state of Native American anthropology, discusses the relationship between the new generation of Native American ethnographers and the Native American subject. Having listed a

few of the new anthropologists in the field anthropology who are Native American, he continues:

These scholars have focused mostly on their own tribes and, as evidenced by the pronoun switching in their ethnography between the “we” of the native and the “they” of the traditional anthropologist, they navigate the dilemmas of allegiance and analysis, insiderness and outsidersness, and secrecy and disclosure in ways that both overlap and differ from their non-native colleagues. Audra Simpson, for example, speaks of her “ethnographic refusal” to divulge sensitive information.

However, a short time later in his article, he notes a maybe more significant change that he has identified within Native American anthropology:

Instead of treating “Native American” or for that matter “Indian” and “Indigenous” as fixed or preexisting identities, the new poststructuralist-inflected orthodoxy presumes them to be relational, mutable and historically contingent ... The very borderline between Indian and non-Indian is unstable and permeable no matter how clear and even biologically determined it may appear in lived experience (2011: 185-186).

Starn, while not a Native himself, is right on point with this analysis. In fact, his critique of the new era of Native anthropology as containing a “dilemma” over “secrecy and disclosure” has very much defined this era of Native American anthropology. However, to get to his latter point, it is the very “borderline between Indian and non-Indian”, from which most Native American ethnographers position themselves, which is most troubling for the next generation of Native American ethnography.

While many anthropologists of Native America, “native” and “non-native”, have purviews that are in constant defense of their roles as patrollers of Native American borders, they are often *not* voices for the discord, trauma, and political manipulation that take place at and within Starn’s “borderline.” However, the crisis

of the anthropology of Native America may be found in that it has been so focused on keeping particular people out of Native communities, so much so that that it has often missed the people who are often trying to leave the Native community in particularly important contexts. It misses the acts of trauma, revelation, apocalypse, spiritual distancing, and other elements that ultimately show a very different form of Native community than is indicated in the contextualization of Native tribe through government, land, law, Federal Indian policy, et cetera. To realize this now would go a great distance toward reaffirming the hope, imaginations, and confidence of many young Native people whose presence in our communities battle the constant beat of Native American rhetoric that is disseminated as scholarly output or political speech by Native and non-Native alike.

CHAPTER 8

WHAT'S AT STAKE: A CONCLUSION

Perhaps the conclusion to this dissertation is an entrance into something else. In this dissertation, I have attempted to outline the patterns of formation for today's Lumbee missions, with emphasis on seeing a "global" picture from the "inside-out." To that end, I emphasized the discord within the United States – specifically within the contexts of a Native American community in the U.S. South – and how it fostered activities and projects of inclusion. I was interested in what the Lumbee community could tell me about what we all must consider in today's interventionist society. What I have presented in these chapters has been the constant struggle of all anthropology: to pull together stories, experiences, and practices from particular cultural worlds to speak to humanity writ large.

In attempting to do this, I have come to a conclusion centered around my ambition to retain the importance of placing these different worlds that I have identified – Native America, the U.S. South, globalization, the Christian church – in perpetual conversation. It is about the need to understand why Lumbee missionaries feel so comfortable crossing these worlds, making these worlds speak to each other, and exemplifying what at first would seem like simple hybridity or assimilation for many looking into their worlds from a different place.

For me, this is not hybridity. Neither is it assimilation. These are not Native Americans who have given up something. No, this is a much more universal story; one about how we all live in communities of equilibrium. In my introduction, I suggested that a lack of unity – the presence of division – helped create the spaces and identities for “healing.” I would argue that this healing, in whatever form it presents, is part of a process whereby individuals – as parts of families, churches, tribes, etc. – orient themselves in larger communities of equilibrium. The observer may see a Native American in a Christian context and call it assimilation. They may see my argument for division as one that itself tears apart Native community. However, in what context does the Native American – much less the individual from any cultural location and space – express responsibility to various people and communities in reaction to felt responsibilities? What happens when the sixty five year old Lumbee preacher sees pictures of a small Brazilian boy and states that that used to be him, thus making an argument for why he should take on the role of missionary and fly down to interact with the boy and his community in Brazil? This preacher plays a part in the art and science of community building, where “healing” is shown to be a largely universal process crafted in particular terms for the use of the Lumbee missionary.

Yet, in Lumbee missions, whether local or far away, the background of a home community acted on by agents of change, who are parts of the process of finding equilibrium, is important to a story that attempts to explain the Lumbee community’s passion for missions from local to global. The Lumbee are at once part of several communities, each with its own metanarratives of equilibrium. For Native

America, the metanarrative usually consists of the relationship that is supposed to exist between Indigenous people and “states” or “colonial governments.” For the South, the metanarrative usually consists of the relationship between America and its most alienated region as indicated in the U.S. Civil War and its aftermath. For Christians, the metanarrative usually includes the relationships between “believers” and a sense that the Christian faith manifests itself in repeatable patterns of love, charity, and good will.

Lumbee missionaries defy all of these metanarratives, partially because they have never been bound by tribal law and customs that would make them wards of the U.S. Federal government. As such, they are in many ways free to travel and critique as missionaries. However, their place in the U.S. South has made being Indigenous and religious parts of a continually shifting conversation about community boundaries that still seem unstable long after the U.S. Civil War. As Indigenous people in the U.S. South, Lumbee people have many layers of invisibility that ironically push them to seek those elemental truths within today’s humanitarian conversations about the need to do good for all people. If anything, as Native American Christians, Lumbee people are innovators who exemplify how Christian belief, tied to the ability to travel and become “global”, raises the ante for those attempting to describe what Native America, the U.S. South, or Christianity are as categories of analysis. This is particularly important when we consider that the power of the missionary identity means that Lumbee missionaries are able to subscribe to or help create new visions for intervention in spite of governmental

policy regarding Native Americans, the power of religious organizations, or elements of disparity that define life for many people in the U.S. South.

Yet, as their religious spaces are tied to national and global organizations, Lumbee people make themselves agents in the creation of the communities of equilibrium that are forming around them. They are not bound to the tribe, the South, or even the U.S. as sites of healing. They do not follow the prescriptions given to them by large organizations on how to heal. They are in constant conversation with and seeking out methods of completeness. They are at the front line of defining spaces and mechanisms of expressing and providing safety, familial love, emotional support, and much more. As it turns out, as exemplified at the “Mission Celebration”, they all have different pathways and methods to help create this equilibrium. In this eclectic arrangement of healing through missions, we find the stagnation of culture as it is often challenged by the need to find equilibrium.

Perhaps, to begin to understand Lumbee people in Native America today, it begins with a very honest conversation about the relics of a past and present full of dislocation, misappropriation of knowledge about U.S. society, and dishonesty regarding what is at stake within Native America. Perhaps, this era of seeking out equilibrium on a global level allows particular conversations to finally take place locally – in the U.S., in Native America, in the U.S. South, in religious communities across the United States. If this is the case, Lumbee people will be very busy, because they have stakes in finding equilibrium in all of these spaces and ideological realms. As missionaries, Lumbee people showcase a flexibility of conversation that simply

has not been represented in previous academic and social conversations about Native America.

What my research proposes is a legacy that has been largely hidden under the significance of a “Native as law” consciousness that has grown to be normal within American society and the academy. To insert themselves into the present in the United States, Native people must argue from the contexts of their alienation as sovereign entities who must claim that sovereignty through conversations centered on colonial American law and its many discontents. This removes them from asserting and inserting themselves in other ways. This dismisses (or makes largely insignificant) the idea that being Native American often more persuasively correlates with particular moral and Christian practices and conceptualizations of the world. In these practices and conceptualizations, a radical Christianity, one that is full of transformative potential, might show the significance of revivals and other Christian centered activities in Native America.

In that case, we might consider how the “subaltern” is bound to definitions as indefinitely insular. Scholar Gyan Prakash explains what being subaltern means. “Everything that has limited or no access to the cultural imperialism is subaltern -- a space of difference.” She states that we must not speak for the subaltern. We must “give them space” to speak (cited in de Kock 1992). So how do we give them (us) space to speak? In many ways, Native American Christians are the double subaltern. Not only are they not the proto-America that American anthropology built itself with, but they are also connected with the ideologies and tendencies that speak against anthropological professions of faith. To acknowledge them in their space of

Christianity, as not merely oppressed under Christianity but as agents and spokespeople for it, we must give due regard and respect to their Indigeneity and Christianity. Only then can the space be opened up to hear these subalterns speak.

In that regard, I must request a truce between the Christian faith and the discipline of anthropology. I understand that some anthropologists may ask how we are to understand Christian “calling” anthropologically if it seems insular within the notion of belief vs. non-belief. I have a counter question. If we are not able to understand it within the realm of spiritual relationship because of the ardent nature of belief and relegation of Christian ideals to belief or disbelief, might we capture it in terms of social evolution where globalization and religious organization serve, in part, to craft the adaptation of humans within current ecological, economical, and otherwise social-cultural circumstances? Might these show us how Christian experience calls on the early human adaptations that made us a loving, intervening, and imaginatively charitable species? I think so.

Anthropologist Glenn Hinson, who argues that we must consider how the testimony of the Christian should influence our studies of Christianity, best defines the potential in the anthropology of Christian belief by pointing out the error of non-believing scholars in their dismissal of the layers or “degrees” of belief that define Christian life:

The questioning, the testing, the calling for evidence already occur in our consultants’ communities. Yet instead of looking to these established structures of assessment and evaluation, ethnographers have tended to impose their own. And they have often done so in a rather heavy-handed fashion, treating belief as an either/or proposition, without admitting the possibility of degree (2000: 334).

Belief *would* help everyone understand Christian phenomena much better. However, once belief is established to be cordoned off into social instructions within which humans connect the ideally unlimited nature of God with the obviously limited nature of humans, we must then consider how we are all (believer and not) in proximity to and in tension with our visions for connecting the ideal and the unlimited with the necessarily limited. You don't have to be a "believer" to measure the fallibility of humanity. However, like Hinson, I remain interested in how the vulnerability of humanity is relieved and transformed in belief.

In that respect, the actions of humanitarianism are part of general systems of overcoming our human vulnerability. In some respects, the worse of human crimes, such as genocide, are part of this evolution and the curious impartation of human agency upon it. My point is that as much as it has been part of colonialism and other forms of oppression and genocide, Christianity is not a culprit but a *conduit*. Despite its symbolic existence in relationship to colonial destruction and disruption, *Christianity is a fundamental human element*. Very simply, Christianity and the actions that are born within it continue to connect people with one another. This was often, especially centuries ago, detrimental to some. Today's understanding of Christianity cannot be seen as simply trifling and detrimental, but as potentially important for knowledge production and cooperation in the present and future.

This brings me to the issue of how we understand tribalism today. Yes, the notion of tribalism, in the United States, has roots in imaginations of a colonial U.S. presence on top of Native American tribal lands, resources, and interests. However, in a world of indefinite connection, our tribal creation/recreation processes are

increasingly important. One might consider these new tribes less real in comparison to the reality of Native American tribes and their significant meaning for the life of American nationalism. However, seeing Native Americans in the formulations of these new tribal affiliations is important to understand the depth of commitment to a religious, humanitarian, or otherwise interventionist conglomeration of peoples who see themselves as important figures in these new organizations of family and kinship. These organizations stretch across great distances and through new technologies such as social networking.

In those contexts, we must return to the long established debate in anthropology and other social sciences between imagined community and what some have described as “social networks.” Dorothy Noyes, in her chapter titled “Group” in *Eight Words for the Study of Expressive Culture* (2003), explains that imagined community and the often local, but always networked, community are in consistent conversation and tension. The imagined community covers up, often, the relationships of the everyday. Lumbee missionaries illustrate how this imagined community might be hardest fought in the very local. The imagined community is often put into conversation through the appeal of local Lumbee interventionists who ask that Lumbee religious leaders simply do more for the Lumbee community. Likewise, imaginations of who we are as Lumbee people helped Lumbee people ignore Scott Raab’s words, helped push away Mr. D into invisibility, and made it practically impossible to intervene on behalf of Lumbee people outside of tribal government before recent years.

Having established those points, and as Lumbee missionaries illustrate, the

imagined community often breaks down in the midst of oppression, poverty, and need. While scholars of moral economy will make declarative statements about how the imagined and networked communities should meet (e.g. we in the West should look at Haiti and its sovereignty in a particular way), the ways that the tribal realm of humanitarianism forms and continues speak to something much different. They speak to the fact that human imagination is very much tied to the important inclinations in social networks. As such, the human compulsion to make a difference, because it is wrapped with notions of “worldwide webs”, are neither contained nor intimidated. At times, in my research, this was indicated by the fact that Lumbee missionaries felt much more compelled to seek missionary fields somewhere rather than back home because missions necessarily contained a sense of adventure. In other cases, it meant tackling challenging issues back home with an understanding that Lumbee people were, in times past, intimidated to certain degrees in their service to their own community. Now, they are not.

In that sense, we must be aware of how the missionary field may be a relief for some because they cannot or do not want to challenge ideologies and ways of being back at home. Additionally, we must appreciate new senses of community that are forming today in a global interventionist economy that does not fully work within notions of nation-state power. We must acknowledge the ways that our fights for sustenance, often necessarily in the areas where we settle and are rooted economically and ecologically, are much different in this age of global healing.

This brings me to concluding thoughts about how ideological boundaries do not allow us to see common threads through particular communities. Not only are

Christianity and globalization not inherently detrimental, they help each other as they weave through communities, especially within the Third World. The world, in contrast to what Thomas Friedman suggests (2005), is not flat. No, even as networks of people grow indefinitely into the future with the help of everything that is global in nature, the suffering continues for so many. This suffering is far from being visible. If suffering is not visible then the world is not flat.

Thus, if Native Americans, in their plurality, are acting in Christian mission, what does that say about their heritage as subaltern peoples? For much too long, Native people have been forced (and have sometimes taken it upon themselves) to act and articulate their ideas within images of colonialism. What this era of missions illustrates is a concerted effort within Native American Christian communities to make sense of global networks of sustenance. Seeing, hearing, and feeling responsibility across great distances – across the borders of tribal, community, and national borders – places Lumbee missionaries in the driver’s seat to share their affinities for aiding the suffering within religious and charitable organizations that are centers for new types of conversations about the processes of expressing human responsibility today. Yet, these Native missionaries remain fundamentally tied to loyalties at home. These are loyalties that pull them into the heat of tensions to unify a highly dis-unified home community. At the same time, the push to unify interventional efforts far away meets the long heritage of disruption and exclusion that has defined home. As some of the missionaries I have discussed illustrate, the juxtaposition of this unity and disunity often urges these Lumbee missionary practitioners to be creative in how they shed light on points of non-unity and the

great disharmony within most Native communities. Thus, as an emerging global mandate to unite for the sake of human suffering defines the day, disunity stands in juxtaposition to the crisply laid out images of Native America as united, local, and self-concerned. It also stands in juxtaposition to pictures of Christianity as out of touch with the “real world.”

The various realms of Christian experience are not oddly eclectic attempts to only create meaning. They are, rather, extensions of current communities and images of emerging communities that aim to make sense of the world and to fully engage the limitations of the human experience. The human is the least common denominator. The human, if you will, is the weakest link. Thus, as I allude to in my discussion of the “subaltern” above, to emphasize the legitimacy of Christian practices would be to understand how humanity extends beyond its limitations on some level. What does it mean for the subaltern to now speak in terms of biblical prophecy, for example? Who hears, and who does not?

This brings me into a conversation about ethnography. I’m left with one major question: How do we hear these changing subaltern voices? As you may notice in my text, my research and writing have not been based in recording and placing narratives of Lumbee missionaries back onto paper. Rather, as I indicate in my introduction, my research and writing emerges out of a sense of my shared sensibilities with my studied community. I write in continual conversation with my past, my present, and the lives of those who have helped me through this ethnographic journey.

Thus, our art form as anthropologists is not the encapsulating description of a cultural world. Anthropology best serves everyone by being a science and art at the meeting of an ethnographic world - where, ideally, fieldwork is performed - with the ethnographer's sensibilities. Oftentimes, because of our training, these sensibilities are left to exist in the realm of theory, where the witnessing of being human in an ethnographic microcosm helps speak of much larger worlds. We easily forget the foraging of lives that takes place in the ethnographic camp.

Yet, as an ethnographer who has in many ways returned to my own community, I chose to delve more deeply into the sensibilities that define my particular writing. What anthropologist Audra Simpson calls "ethnographer refusal" (Simpson 2007) is for me the excellence of contemporary cultural anthropology. While she argues for "refusal" in terms of her being Indian writing about her people, I look at it as patience in crafting so that the sensibilities that develop within the anthropological writer (over the course of a lifetime) are not lost. I would argue that these sensibilities must be part of the end goal of anthropology. While regarding these sensibilities as important, we should not feel like we are betraying the discipline.

Native Americans, like Simpson and me, should not be forced to articulate "refusal" just to make these sensibilities important. Likewise, other vulnerable peoples in anthropology, many of whom self-describe as non-white, should not be forced to argue themselves into the narrative. Their points-of-view as the oppressed should be able to come out in ethnographical articulation.

This, I think, will help break down some of the ideological barriers that we, as non-white scholars, are forced to contend with as we enter the field. Very simply, we are more than the political and ideological projects that seem to swarm around our community identities. I am not red power or federal recognition. The black scholar is not Civil Rights. The Latino scholar is not immigration. Yet, in the midst of our not being these ideological framings, we carry the crispness of their power with us as we talk with people and plan out how to articulate the cultural worlds that we study. We, in simple terms, need flexibility and we need to be given power over our representations as writers of ethnography. This would make both the cultural world that Simpson protects and the curiosity of anthropology equally important agents in creating meaning. It would free subaltern scholars from being afraid of this relationship every time we put pen to paper. That is, we shouldn't be afraid of the relationship between the academy and our communities because, maybe more importantly, our writing our worlds makes us newly responsible to our communities.

Through our ethnography, we become new types of faces in our community. We will have to live with our research with every phone call from our family members and friends in our community. Thus, we should be able to concentrate on this and not have to worry about whether the discipline of anthropology is going to reject us or not. Maybe this is the new layer on the limited discussion of auto-ethnography. Maybe, among other things, auto-ethnography must be seen from the worlds of those who are using anthropology to make their sensibilities shine.

Our stories are quite complex. We are not – despite what some of "our own" people say – tied to these narratives that are so loosely used to define the studies of us. As is indicated in this ethnography with Native American missionaries in a globalized world of healing projects, the foundations of our communities have not yet been articulated. This should cause great excitement as we move forward in the anthropology of Native America or any other facet of disenfranchised anthropology.

This brings me back to why this study of Native American Christian missionaries is critical. As the structure of political and economic discourses urge Native American identity in one direction, and as Christianity continues to be regarded as fundamentally flawed and unimportant as a space for transformation by anthropologists, we find that the Lumbee missionary community showcases a very important balance that distinguishes the political rhetoric (in common narratives of and around Christianity and Native America) from the actual workings of human interactions and the changing senses of community that come with them. Even as the discipline of history attempts to form narratives of the past and have them frame today, clarity in analyzing today, as anthropologists, is important as we change conceptualizations of worlds of many who are forced to negotiate the tension between human survival and human will to affect the world in today's global landscape.

For people in the United States, it just so happens that a long genealogy of nationalized intervention seems to serve as a quite convenient vehicle for helping resolve this tension. Having been born in the Southern Baptist tradition – arguably, in the legacy of U.S. Civil War – meant that Pastor S, for example, was very

comfortable with his argument that other Lumbee people should join him in missions. His comfort with this stage existed because the stage was both a symbol of sustenance within his local community (through which he could help and make appeals) and, reciprocally, a window through which people observing him and listening to his words could begin to see and articulate their responsibility to the missionary field wherever Pastor S or other missionaries made it exist.

Lumbee people are Native American people whose history fighting the ills of life, as the Indigenous people caught in the American, Southern and emerging global dramas, began to merge with voices that subtly asked Lumbee community members to look inward like they never had before. This fully culminated, I believe, in Lumbee missionaries whose attention to our home, in a very intimate way, needs a global mission field where the act of healing is not placed on our own people as a tool of manipulation. Because global missions exist, missions back at home can exist as a *choice* that our people make. One, arguably, serves the other. Unlike the strained contexts of Native American nationalism in the United States, the context of aiding our people within missionary intervention is always and consistently contextualized in a field of varying nations and peoples, many of whom have affinities for making things right. These affinities mirror the notion of justice that inundates Lumbee community.

Nevertheless, to accomplish their missions, Lumbee people must speak. They must be willing to air the dirty laundry that inundates Native communities (like many other subaltern communities) from inside and out. Ironically, it is the inward manifestation of hurt and distrust – of memories of what happened during the times

we also faced outward oppression – that push Lumbee missionaries along the paths of justice. It is memories of the KKK rallying in the center of Robeson County as much as it is memories of our own people who slighted us in the midst of our worse periods of suffering. It is the smell of hatred from governments and churches that didn't want us as much as it is the stench of Lumbee families whose private rejection of each other shows the lines of division that frame Lumbee life. It was the government of Honduras stealing supplies as Mr. D attempted to aid his missionary family in Belize as much as it was the people back at home that silently supported his wife's shooting him. All of this is violence. All of this is power at work on the lives of individuals who have to make choices about what to do today to serve their human capacity to intervene. All of this is an ongoing conversation within which the healing takes place – not just for Lumbee people, but for the world also.

In those respects, neither the South, nor Native America, nor Christianity is insular. They exist within conversations that illustrate how people exist in their evolutionary space of healing, which is often inspired and empowered by that which is well outside of the evolutionary spectrum. As anthropologists, we must be careful to not ignore this. While we may support the law-driven mechanisms of Native American tribalism, we must be cognizant of these new tribal formations through which we as humans reach across the exclusive community boundary. We must appreciate the tribal pastor as much as we appreciate the tribal chief. We must realize that human vocation plays a possibly larger role in human sustainability than human election. The preacher guides and moves the tribe in ways that the elected chief or any other form of political leadership cannot.

This dissertation ends, but it is not finished by any means. There are more conversations to be had in Native America, in the U.S. Church, and with those who intervene. I will continue this research far into the next years, with an eye toward helping people talk through their voice (not the voice of the past or of the politically powerful). This is a critical time defined by incredible people. I am glad that I have been able to witness it and converse with them.

REFERENCES

Althouse, Ann.

Gov. Corbett suggests that Second Mile groomed children for Jerry Sandusky.
<http://althouse.blogspot.com/2011/11/gov-corbett-suggests-that-second-mile.html>. (accessed January 11, 2012).

American Anthropological Association.

1998. Code of Ethics of the American Anthropological Association.
<http://www.aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethcode.htm> (accessed May 1, 2011).

Americorps.

2012. National and Community Service. Americorps website.
<http://www.americorps.gov/about/programs/vista.asp> (accessed 2/1/2012).

Appadurai, Arjun.

1996. *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Asad, Talal.

2003. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Baker, Lee

2010. *Anthropology and the Racial Politics of Culture*. Durham: Duke.

Basso, Keith H.

1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico Press.

Behar, Ruth.

2008. Ethnography in a Time of Blurred Genres.
Anthropology and Humanism. 32(2): 145-155.

Bertho M., Crawford B., Fogarty E.A.

2008. *The Impact of Globalization on the United States*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Biolsi, Tom.
2005. Imagined Geographies: Sovereignty, Indigenous Space, and American Indian Struggle. *American Ethnologist* 32(2):239-59.
- Blanchard, Jessica Walker.
2010. "They came one at a time": Native-led church planting and growing the body of Christ from the margins of culture. Ph.D. diss., The University of Oklahoma,
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/748762792?accountid=14244>
(accessed May 31, 2012).
- Blu, Karen.
2001. *The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

1996. "Where do you Stay At?" *Senses of Place*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press. Steven Feld and Keith Basso, eds.
- Blu, Karen and Brenda Brooks.
1973. Interview with Karen Blu. Samuel Proctor Oral History Program. University of Florida. Accessed online:
<http://ufdc.ufl.edu/UF00007114/00001>
- Bornstein, Erica, and Peter Redfield.
2011. *Forces of Compassion: Humanitarianism Between Ethics and Politics*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Brauman, Rony
1993. When Suffering Makes a Good Story. *Life, Death and Aid: The Médecins Sans Frontières Report on World Crisis Intervention*. Jean Francois, ed. Pp. 149–158. London: Routledge.
- Cattelino, Jessica.
2008. *High Stakes*. Durham: Duke University.
2010. The Double Bind of American Indian Need-Based Sovereignty. *Cultural Anthropology*. 25(2):235-262.
- Chesnutt, Charles.
1902. The Free Colored People of North Carolina *The Southern Workman*. 31(3):136-141
- Coleman, Korva.

2011. Evelyn Lauder Dies, Co-Founder Of Pink Ribbon Breast Health Awareness.
<http://m.npr.org/news/front/142305799?singlePage=false>
 (accessed 11/15/2011).
- Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff.
 1993. *Modernity and Its Malcontents: Ritual and Power in Postcolonial Africa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1991. *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- de Kock, Leon.
 1992. "New Nation Writers Conference in South Africa." *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, 23:3 (July 1992): 29-47
- Deloria, Phillip.
 2004. *Indians in Unexpected Places*. Lawrence: University of Kansas.
- Deloria, Vine.
 1969. *Custer Died for Your Sins*. New York: Macmillan.
- de Waal, Alex
 1997 *Famine Crimes: Politics and the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Fassin, Didier.
 2005. Compassion and Repression. The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies in France. *Cultural Anthropology* 20(3):362-387.
- Editor.
 1994. Editorial. *Robesonian*. March 9, 1994: Pp. 4A.
- Ferdinand, Renata.
 2009. What's in a Story?: Using Auto-ethnography to Advance Communication Research. *American Communication Journal* 11(3):1-18.
- Finn, Janet
 1995 Ella Cara Deloria and Mourning Dove: Writing for Cultures, Writing against the Grain. *Women Writing Culture*. Ruth Behar and Deborah Gordon, eds. Pp. 131-147. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Franklin, John Hope.
 1995. *The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790-1860*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina.

- Friedman, Thomas L.
2005. *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century*. New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux.
- Geertz, Clifford.
1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gourevitch, Philip.
1998. *We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed with Our Families: Stories from Rwanda*. New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux.
- Hancock, Graham.
1989. *Lords of Poverty: The Power, Prestige and Corruption of the International Aid Business*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Hansen, Thomas and Finn Stepputat.
2006. Sovereignty Revisited. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 35:295-315.
- Headland, Thomas.
1996. Missionaries and Social Justice. *Missiology*. 24(2): 167-178.
- Hernandez, Graciela
1995. Multiple Subjectivities and Strategic Positionality: Zora Neale Hurston's Experimental Ethnographies. *Women Writing Culture*. Ruth Behar and Deborah Gordon, eds. Pp. 148–165. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hinson, Glenn.
2000. *Fire in My Bones: Transcendence and the Holy Spirit in African American Gospel*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Hixenbaugh, Mike.
2011. Robeson County is one of the most violent in state.
<http://www.fayobserver.com/articles/2011/01/05/1057412?sac=Home>.
(accessed December 10, 2012).
- Ho, Karen.
2009. *Liquidated*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hurston, Zora Neale.
[1935]1990. *Mules and Men*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- James, Erica.
2010. *Democratic Insecurities: Violence, Trauma, and Intervention in Haiti*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Jones, Rhett.
2001. Black/Indian Relations: An Overview of the Scholarship
Transforming Anthropology. 10:2-16.
- Kaeger, Gabriel.
2011. <http://anthroad.twoday.net/> (Accessed 10/15/2011).
- King, Samantha.
2008. *Pink Ribbons, Inc.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lambert, Valerie.
2007. *Choctaw Nation: A Story of American Indian Resurgence*.
Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Lancaster SBC.
2012. Lottie Moon Christmas Offering. <http://www.lancastersbc.org/lottie-moon-christmas-offering> (accessed 2/1/2012).
- Lassiter, Luke Eric.
2009. *Invitation to Anthropology*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Lassiter, Luke E., Clyde Ellis and Ralph Kotay.
2002. *The Jesus Road: Kiowas, Christianity, and Indian Hymns*. Lincoln:
University of Nebraska
- Latour, Bruno.
2004. Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern. *Critical Inquiry* 30(2):225–248.
- Leach, Edmund.
1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma*. Cambridge: Harvard.
- Limón, José.
1994. *Dancing with the Devil: Society and Cultural Poetics in Mexican-American South Texas*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Locklear, Brett.
1994. Reader's View. *Robesonian*. March 16, 1994: Pp. 4A.
- Lomawaima, Tsianina and David Wilkins.
2002. *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law*
Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Lowery, Malinda Maynor.
2010. *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of*

- a Nation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Lumbee River Conference of the Holiness Methodist Church.
 2011. *The History of the Lumbee Conference Book*.
http://www.lrchmc.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=50&Itemid=40 (Accessed 10/1/2011).
- Malkki, Lissa.
 1992. National Geographic. *Cultural Anthropology*. 7(1):24-44.
1996. Speechless Emissaries: Refugees, Humanitarianism, and Dehistoricization. *Cultural Anthropology* 11(3):377-404.
- Marshall, Kimberly.
 2011. Performing conversion among the dine oodlani (navajo believers). Ph.D. diss., Indiana University,
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/914714971?accountid=14244>
 (accessed May 31, 2012).
- Moran, Joe.
 2009. *On Roads: A Hidden History*. London: Profile Books.
- Narayan, Kirin.
 1997 How Native Is a "Native" Anthropologist? *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life*. Louise Lamphere, Helena Ragoné, and Patricia Zavella, eds. Pp. 23-41. New York: Routledge.
- Nolan, Bruce.
 2012. Pastor Posed to be First Black to Lead Baptists. *USA TODAY*. <http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/story/2012-02-03/black-baptist-leader-fred-luter/52950446/1>
 (Accessed 2/5/2012).
- Noyes, Dorothy.
 2003. Group. *Eight Words for the Study of Expressive Culture*. Burt Feintuch, ed. Pp. 7-28. Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Paredes, J. Anthony.
 1995. Paradoxes of Modernism and Indianess in the Southeast. *American Indian Quarterly*. 19(3):341-360.
- Peacock, James.
 1996. Anthropology and Missionaries: A Commentary. *Missiology*. 24(2): 163-165
2000. Public or Perish. *Global View* (Winter).

2007. *Grounded Globalism*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Peacock, James and Ruel W. Tyson.
1989. *Pilgrims of Paradox: Calvinism and Experience Among the Primitive Baptists of the Blue Ridge*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Raab, Scott.
1994. Reasonable doubt. *GQ* 64.3 (March 1994): 240-47, 268-70.
- Ramirez, Renya.
2007. *Native Hubs*. Durham: Duke University.
- Redfield, Peter.
2005. Doctors, Borders, and Life in Crisis.
Cultural Anthropology 20:328-361.
- Richardson, Miles.
1990. *Cry Lonesome and Other Accounts of the Anthropologist's Project*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rieff, David.
2002 *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Riles, Annelise.
2000 *The Network Inside Out*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Robbins, Joel.
2006. Afterword: On Limits, Ruptures, Meaning, and Meaninglessness. In *The Limits of Meaning: Case Studies in the Anthropology of Christianity*. Matthew Engelke and Matt Tomlinson, eds. Pp 211-224. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Sawyer, Andrew.
2000. Moral Economy and Political Economy.
Studies in Political Economy 61: 79-104.
- Schultz, Jack.
1999. *The Seminole Baptist Churches of Oklahoma: Maintaining a Traditional Community*. Norman: U of Oklahoma.
- Shiles, Bob.
2010. Letter to Lumbee Tribal Council details lobbying firm's concerns.
http://www.robsonian.com/view/full_story/7854387/article-Letter-to-Lumbee-Tribal-Council-details-lobbying-firm-s-concerns. (accessed 12/15/2011).

- Segrest, Mab.
1994. *Memoir of a Race Traitor*. Boston: South End Press.
- Sider, Gerald.
1993. *Lumbee Indian Histories: Race, Ethnicity, and Indian Identity in the Southern United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silsby, Laura.
2011. First-Person (Laura Silsby): Trusting God's Sovereignty, from a Haitian Jail. *Baptist Press*
<http://www.bpnews.net/BPnews.asp?ID=35318> (Accessed 10/11/2011).
- Simpson, Audra.
2007. "On Ethnographic Refusal." *Junctures* 9:69.
- Snead, James E., Clark L. Erickson, and J. Andrew Darling.
2009. *Landscapes of Movement : Trails, Paths, and Roads in Anthropological Perspective*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology
- Starn, Orin.
2011. Here Come the Anthros (Again): The Strange Marriage of Anthropology and Native America. *Cultural Anthropology*. 26(2):218-224.
- Sturm, Circe.
2002. *Blood Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Terry, Fiona.
2002 *Condemned to Repeat? The Paradox of Humanitarian Action*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Turner, Victor.
1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell

1959. *Schism and Continuity in an African Society*: Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Van Maanen, John.
1988. *Tales of the Field*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Wagner, Sarah E.

2008. *To Know Where He Lies: DNA Technology and the Search for Srebrenica's Missing*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wilson, Richard, ed.

1997 *Anthropology and Human Rights: Culture and Context*. London: Pluto Press.

Winslow, Gerald.

1982. *Triage and Justice*. Berkeley: University of California Press.