
American Theodicy

Human Nature and Natural Disaster

HILLARY KAELL

Bonnie and I were chopping vegetables for lunch in her suburban home outside Kansas City while the television perched on a nearby countertop cycled through scenes of collapsed buildings and landslides in free-fall. The death toll was rising, the CNN announcer intoned over clips of people pressing rags to their mouths to block the dust as they sifted through the rubble. It was already being called the worst disaster on record in Nepal. Bonnie switched off the television. “That’s what I was telling you, Hillary,” she said, setting out the plates for lunch. “I listen to world news so I can get more of what’s going on in places but then it drags you right down. There’s just so much negativity you can handle.” Since I was there to chat about the child she sponsors, I asked her about the materials she accessed through the sponsorship organization. Did she feel the same way about their depictions of dire poverty or disasters, which often covered the same events as CNN? “But it’s different,” Bonnie replied, “because at least I’m *interacting*. It’s not like suddenly [their problems] will be solved but somebody out there is thinking about them, prays [for] them, and cares about them.”

As many studies have noted, both humanitarian organizations and media outlets pitch global connections in the superlative of emergency relief and disaster news. Scholars of globalization remark that these communications—in both their tone and their frequency—often create a sense of uncontrollable global crisis.¹ Experts also tell us that this sense of “negativity,” as Bonnie put it, leads to what in the 1980s was dubbed *compassion fatigue* after military jargon. People become worn out and so they tune out.² Yet what Bonnie expressed to me was that the same information might have vastly different capacities to call forth connection. When it derives from Christian sources, the news can prompt what she views as generative activities, which are characterized by focused giving and prayer. Yet when CNN covers the same story, it may “drag” her into despair or apathy instead. Such subtle differences are crucial if we are to understand how

globally minded Christians hear news from abroad and feel its effects. It also reminds us that there is no simple equation that accounts for donor apathy. In fact, in the 1990s, at the very moment when critics warned most emphatically about compassion fatigue, United Nations Development Program surveys showed no downward turn in public opinion about foreign aid. Instead, there were significant upticks in aid directed to refugee and disaster relief.³ The Christian child sponsorship organizations I study also grew enormously in this period.

Sponsorship is a popular fundraising tool in Europe and North America, and it refers, at the most basic level, to the systematic (usually monthly) support of an individual abroad with some communication between donors and recipients. From its inception, the model was tied to human suffering and insecurity. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions pitched the first sponsorship plans to U.S. donors in 1816, citing the many children left “friendless” in Bombay after they came to the city with families fleeing floods, famine, and other disasters and their parents “not infrequently” died.⁴ A century later, sponsorship made the transition from missionary fundraising to World War I relief. During the war, it was used by dozens of early humanitarian organizations including the American Red Cross and Near East Relief.⁵ This transition cemented the broad versatility of sponsorship beyond missionary circles. The nature of relief organizations’ work also amplified sponsorship programs’ focus on children in extreme distress, which carried over as fledgling nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) adopted it after World War II.

Sponsorship spread in the 1950s as a broad-based fundraising tool for humanitarian campaigns. It was part of the general proliferation of U.S. voluntary organizations working overseas; more than 200 were established in the four years after World War II alone.⁶ More specific to U.S. Protestantism, emerging parachurch organizations revitalized sponsorship even as the denominational missionary boards that once used it declined. The best-known example is World Vision, which grew out of evangelical networks coalescing around Youth With a Mission and Billy Graham in the 1940s.⁷ Christian Children’s Fund (CCF) is another key example. Founded in 1938 by a liberal Presbyterian pastor, it appealed to mainline Protestants and, in the 1950s, was the largest U.S. Christian organization of its type. In many respects, CCF was heir to the pan-Christian fundraising that Heather Curtis has traced at the *Christian Herald* a generation before. (In fact, some of CCF’s most successful 1950s campaigns were partnerships with the *Herald*, which ran short-term sponsorship plans as early as the Indian famine of 1900).⁸

Parachurch organizations such as World Vision and CCF leveraged sponsorship to access larger donor markets and fuel ambitious programs for rapid growth.⁹ While missionary plans had included from a few hundred to a few thousand children at most, these new plans scaled up to support tens of thousands of children by the early 1960s (and hundreds of thousands by the 1980s). This

growth brings us back to disaster: mid-century plans grew their donor base in part because they stoked a sense of urgency in the midst of disasters, notably in their appeals concerning war in the 1950s (mainly in Korea) and then natural events, such as cyclones (Bangladesh in 1970), earthquakes (Nicaragua in 1972), and drought-related famine (Ethiopia in 1984). The Ethiopian famine was a notable windfall: World Vision, which today is the largest Christian organization that uses sponsorship, saw its income jump 80 percent that year.¹⁰

The tight link between disasters and the success of sponsorship organizations remains. In her study of World Vision (WV), sociologist Susan McDonic noted that the international WV partnership circulates fast-breaking information about disasters, “which then is funnelled to the wider press and media associations . . . [allowing WV] to speak authoritatively about situations that are emerging and/or have erupted.” World Vision’s website promises “the most up-to-date information on emergencies, events and issues from around the globe” and, during McDonic’s fieldwork, the organization was mentioned in the North American press an average of 150 times a day. She argues that by offering “the press first-hand accounts from the areas where disaster strikes, footage and pictures,” World Vision promotes itself and makes its subsequent pitches to prospective sponsors more credible.¹¹ Although many of the larger organizations, including World Vision, have changed their marketing strategies since the early 2000s to focus on hopeful, happy children, disasters remain integral insofar as the same organizations still issue regular calls for emergency relief donations, beyond each sponsor’s regular monthly contribution.

At a more existential level, the close relationship of sponsorship to disaster also prompts certain questions. What interests me here is how U.S. donors, like Bonnie, relate what they hear about global poverty and disasters to their belief that humanity is connected in basic terms via its shared relation to a single Creator—and, potentially, Destroyer. What is the space between a sense of existential security and chaos? How do sponsors grapple with persistent threats to human flourishing? These issues are extremely complex since the U.S. Christians with whom I worked credit their God as the only certain power in this world yet refuse the idea that He is capable of perpetrating such injustice. Herein lies a central problem of Christian theodicy.

To explore this topic, I draw on my five-year (2012–2017) study of Christian child sponsorship in the United States, which combined historical and ethnographic work. Here I focus on my conversations with child sponsors, including 196 hours of tape from discussions with 118 child sponsors. The people on whom I focus most closely in this chapter were Protestant supporters of Compassion International, an evangelical organization based in Colorado Springs, and Catholic supporters of Unbound, a liberal, lay Catholic organization in Kansas City.¹² I also worked with Protestants (including those whom scholars would dub liberal or mainline) who supported World Vision and ChildFund (formerly CCF).

Demographically, the people whose interviews I recorded were largely consistent with organizational estimates of the average sponsor; most were married, nearly all self-identified as white and Christian, and most went to church; three quarters were women. Their ages ranged from thirty to eighty-seven; among my Catholic interviewees the average age was sixty-five and among evangelicals it was fifty-five.¹³

This chapter focuses less on the official scripts that sponsorship organizations introduce or that priests, pastors, and other institutional bodies promote. There are, of course, massive amounts of literature produced for Christians about how to understand suffering and evil in the world. Instead, I draw on my conversations with sponsors to explore their grassroots theologies. These are generally ideas in the making rather than coherent pronouncements, and they may draw on more top-down conceptions but are rarely identical to them. One aspect that readers might consider pertains to how our conversations complicate the discourse related to “religious persecution.” These popular campaigns, which most sponsors knew of and many supported, tend to reify the “religious” by downplaying contextual factors, such as poverty, war, or natural disasters; Christians may suffer in either case, but when that suffering is called “religious” it is prioritized as *Christian* suffering par excellence. Nonetheless, I found that the sponsors with whom I worked generally integrated a broad cross-section of concerns into their discussions about, and prayers for, suffering abroad. Though they rarely referred to this suffering as “Christian” per se, they nearly all assumed that the faraway families and communities they supported through sponsorship were, in fact, Christians in distress. Many sponsors also linked their concern about foreign suffering to their own experiences, albeit with caveats.¹⁴ In sum, this chapter teases out how U.S. Christians parse various forms of violence and injustice as they trace the contours of God’s global projects.

The Security and Insecurity of Global Connection

I asked every sponsor with whom I spoke whether they felt the world was becoming more connected. Every one of them agreed—but they drew different conclusions about the results. Did connection lead to greater understanding and equality? Or did they lead to greater disunity and violence? Quite a few sponsors explicitly told me they felt either optimistic or pessimistic about the state of the world. Among Catholics and liberal Protestants, about 20 percent fell into either category, skewing slightly more toward the optimistic.¹⁵ Among those who declared themselves pessimistic, most answers were either a resigned recognition that humans have always been cruel to each other and always will be; a feeling that things were actually worsening since there no longer seemed to be clearly defined global “good guys” and “bad guys”; or a concern about growing terrorism, especially in the Middle East.¹⁶ The specter of Muslim violence haunted

these discussions and many people explicitly mentioned Islam, but only one person among my Catholic and liberal Protestant interlocutors blamed the religion tout court. Nearly everyone else raised the issue to clarify that “real” Muslims were against violence.¹⁷ By contrast, sponsors who chose to support Compassion, a more conservative evangelical organization, clearly swung onto the side of pessimism: almost 40 percent stated they were pessimistic about the world; a bit under 20 percent were optimistic. And nearly three quarters of the pessimists unhesitatingly pointed to Islam as the culprit.¹⁸

A fair minority of the Compassion sponsors whom I got to know, especially those with less education and affiliations with fundamentalist-leaning churches, offered a clash of civilizations model to explain this outlook. “You’re not just dealing with a different religion [in Islam] but a whole *mindset* that is completely the opposite of the Christian one,” said Carol, a secretary in western Massachusetts who self-defines as a Bible-believing Christian. Writing of domestic U.S. politics, Lauren Berlant remarks that intimacy is a powerful affective tool because it resides in familiarity and optimism while also cohering around concerns about threats to the world it seeks to sustain.¹⁹ Globalization creates possibilities for new intimacies, but it also magnifies potential threats. Most sponsors quite handily identified the intimate “we,” which encompassed their families and friends, Christians around the world (including the sponsored child), often extended to Americans in the United States as a whole (at least in the abstract), and sometimes included Canadians and others who seemed culturally and racially familiar (comments likely spurred by my presence). While not all respondents focused on Islam, those who named what was emphatically *not* part of the “we” *always* did. No other group was singled out this way in global terms.

Many sponsors, including Carol, talked about being scared, or even “terrified,” of threats associated with Islam, primarily violence against the “we”—that is, targeting Americans (9/11 came up often) and Christians in the Middle East (televised killings by ISIS had made a recent and indelible impression).²⁰ They viewed Americans and Christians overseas as united by this common threat. It is a new pattern with older roots. Though Islam was rarely mentioned in evangelical sponsorship materials from the 1950s and 1960s, when it did come up, Muslims were blamed for being “aggressive” missionaries for their own religion as well as stubborn and fanatical—as evidenced by how many times they prayed each day or how the women refused to talk with Christian missionaries.²¹ And yet contemporary sponsors are, above all, globally minded, which means that one cannot simply shut oneself off to others: one must try to engage them. Carol followed her previous comment with another one, speaking in the personal register even though she had never been abroad: “You go into these countries and whether they’re Muslim or some other religion, you go to China you have their gods, and the thing is, my prayer would be that they realize that God is God and not Allah and not whoever they are over—you know, the Chinese ones and stuff

like that. That, you know, not just that family [I am sponsoring] but that the country itself would realize that God is God." In responses like this one, "Muslims" (and Chinese "gods") are kept vague, as are the big dreams associated with their conversion. Ultimately, whole countries might come to realize that "God is God," as Carol put it.²²

About a quarter of the liberal Protestants with whom I spoke and almost as many Catholics blamed the United States itself for stoking global insecurity. About 10 percent blamed the U.S. government for wars abroad and another 10 percent said that foreign people had legitimate reasons to distrust Americans. These respondents were all optimistic that the one-to-one charity associated with sponsorship could make amends. Their responses echo decades of American strategies in the world—one thinks of President Dwight Eisenhower's call for "People to People" diplomacy whereby pen pals or the Peace Corps would bring "regular" Americans into friendships with people abroad.²³ In the hands of politicians, these messages tend to efface larger questions about the structures that create and sustain global inequality.²⁴ Sponsors, like most Americans, contribute to those systems through mechanisms such as paying taxes and making investments, benefiting from white privilege and consuming the lion's share of the world's resources. Some of them addressed the issue directly, describing how they felt impotent in the face of structures that seemed so large as to defy clear understanding. Rather than focus on threats from without—Islam, terrorism, disasters—these sponsors viewed themselves as deeply enmeshed in threats to world prosperity. Barbara, an unmarried accountant in her late fifties, put it this way: "Pretty much the U.S. is in a state of permanent warfare. So what's the countervailing force? I can do nothing about the politics of my country. Really I cannot. That's a done deal but I *can* do something about that [child, Jimmy]. For me [sponsorship] is a political action. It's not how Jimmy's family thinks about it but for me it's a political act . . . For me this is my social justice political act. Just trying to nurture one little being."

Barbara lives in Kansas City, where she cares for her aging parents and is deeply involved in her Catholic parish as well as liberal Catholic organizations that promote social justice. She is passionate and educated, and she makes time to consume international news. Barbara was one of the few sponsors I met who drew a structural link between wealth in the United States and poverty elsewhere by, as Susan Sontag put it, mapping American privilege onto the same map as other people's suffering.²⁵ "We also take resources from other countries for our own use, like, since we consume most everything—right?—on the planet," Barbara told me. Other respondents did talk about curbing personal consumption in the West. A few also discussed the unethical practices of U.S. corporations, but they rarely saw these entities as "American" per se; rather, they viewed the U.S. government and people as generous and some corporations (run by certain Americans) as greedy. Only Barb insisted that the U.S. government's militarism

and economic policies was a source of global unrest—and therefore that the American people who elected those leaders were enmeshed in threats to global prosperity.

Human Nature and Natural Disaster

Writing during the 1980s AIDS crisis in New York, with news reports about the recent Ethiopian famine on her mind, Susan Sontag noted how people in Western countries persistently reproduced a nature-culture divide in which calamities that ravaged poor countries were seen as “natural” whereas those in the West were understood as culture-making “world events.” “Part of the self-definition of Europe and the neo-European countries,” she wrote, “is that it, the First World, is where major calamities are history-making, transformative, while in poor, African or Asian countries they are part of a cycle, and therefore something like an aspect of nature.”²⁶

In fact, most of the U.S. Christians I got to know recognized “natural” disasters as part of the fabric of American life, especially if they came from regions hit by annual tornados or hurricanes. However, they did tend to divide disasters in the West into *either* natural or human-made (the latter being “world events” in Sontag’s terms, such as 9/11 or the failed response after Hurricane Katrina). By contrast, when they discussed poor countries they persistently grouped *all* disasters into a seemingly endless, and therefore natural, cycle. The twin natures at stake were earthly elements, for example an earthquake or tsunami, and also human nature, which produced a parade of bad dictators and the like. Nearly every sponsor told me that humans have free will, are greedy by nature, and do bad things as a result. By a wide margin, sponsors blamed global inequality partly or wholly on the ways in which corrupt elites or government officials in the child’s country of origin, giving into this base nature, diverted aid money and resources for personal gain. These responses echoed classic Christian theology, in which the vocabulary and emphasis reflected sponsors’ upbringings and orientations; Catholics talked about free will, mainline Protestants talked about human tendencies, and evangelicals talked about inherent sinfulness.²⁷

All the sponsors I got to know agreed on one major point: God did not target *particular* individuals to suffer. This was no book of Job—at least where the sponsored child and his family was concerned. My interlocutors often referred to poverty as an accident of birth; they had happened to be born in the United States and the sponsored child had not. Yet this idea prompted discomfort. After all, did God not choose where each one of us would be born? The resulting existential problem became even more intractable when the conversation turned to natural disasters, as it often did, which sponsors knew often deepen poverty and increase the unjust allocation of resources. As the term *natural* suggests,

hurricanes or earthquakes are not caused by human action: the implication is that God is therefore responsible.

Western Christians have long believed that natural disasters carried a deeper message from God. This idea was standard before the Enlightenment and remained so, at least among Christian child sponsors, until the early twentieth century.²⁸ In previous periods, sponsorship promoters therefore suggested that natural disasters and war had the positive effect of creating orphans who, having been violently ripped from everything they knew, would be open to hearing Christian truth.²⁹ By contrast, the contemporary sponsors I got to know strongly emphasized that God abhorred seeing anyone suffer and did not *cause* natural disasters. At the same time, most of them also told me that God did *allow* these crises to happen.³⁰ Larger-scale surveys have noted similar responses following natural disasters in the United States. Among committed Christians, surviving such a disaster generally deepens a positive view of God and pushes people to find alternatives to blaming God for negative outcomes.³¹ In our conversations, I heard Christian sponsors reasoning about similar ideas in greater detail.

Most often, sponsors suggested that God allowed poverty in general, including disasters that might deepen that poverty, to encourage Christians to realize their utter dependence on God. “For people that are having all their financial needs taken care of, it might be harder for them to realize that they need God too. And we all do,” said Sue, a forty-seven-year-old who attends an evangelical Lutheran church in Massachusetts with her husband, Ted. She paused and continued, “I think for one thing, God allows trials in people’s lives to draw them [closer] and make them stronger, to learn important lessons in life. . . . Destruction, you know, [like] earthquakes in India and other places and we’ve had our share of hurricanes and everything and floodings and everything [in America].” Sue continued in a personal register: “Disaster sometimes can bring brokenness, because we literally lost everything [in a hurricane] when we were growing up as kids. The family unit, it’s almost like everybody’s off busy-busy-busy and nobody knows their neighbor anymore and then it brings us together too.”³²

Sue knows something about surviving chaos. The hurricane ripped apart her home and, shortly after, as a teenager, she became an alcoholic. As a result, she and Ted have lived with a sense of impending disaster for decades; they chose not to have children because of her volatility. Now sober for five years, Sue feels a sense of relative peace. Along with Ted, she plans their budget carefully each month in order to sponsor three girls in Latin America. Sue does not equate her alcoholism—which she sees as a personal failing—with natural disaster. But in either case, she views God as allowing chaos in order to achieve greater ends. “I believe destruction . . . can bring blessings,” she repeated. “And I don’t believe that God wants people to necessarily to *stay poor*. That’s why he has given people like me [the means] to help other people who are poor.” In Sue’s view, God also sent people to lift her up when she was “broken” by the hurricane and then by

her alcoholism. Now, she believes, God is using her—because of her good fortune at being from the United States—to help other Christians who need spiritual and material stability in turbulent times.

Sociological and psychological surveys of U.S. Christians that ask about natural disasters are heavily biased toward Protestants. If Catholics are included, little distinction is made between responses from Christians of different backgrounds.³³ Yet in my conversations, at least, Catholics offered the most richly varied set of responses. Like their Protestant counterparts, Catholics pointed out that everyone had to bear physical suffering, whether it was “hunger or cancer,” and struggle with spiritual consequences such as greed, envy, or ingratitude. The Catholics with whom I spoke were also much more likely to view the poor in other countries as already spiritually rich compared to Americans, usually because they were pictured as closer to the earth and to their families and therefore better able to recognize their dependence on God’s natural processes—the food culled from the land and the joy that came from family. A large minority of Catholics also turned to the afterlife to reframe material poverty as potentially leading to spiritual wealth. John, a middle-aged Catholic sponsor in upstate New York, put it nicely: “God allows poverty to happen and I think that He sees the bigger picture, one that we don’t see and that being, if heaven is eternal then our lives are very short. Just a tiny grain of sand. . . . And I think that if we really could stand back and see the large, the big picture, maybe those of us that think we’re living in non-poverty would see it differently.”³⁴

No Protestant sponsor I got to know discussed the afterlife or eternity. As Sue demonstrated, they were future oriented insofar as they believed God uses brokenness for “good” ends that only become apparent later on. What sponsors agreed on, however, was that poverty elsewhere should move U.S. Christians to act.

Acting in the World through Prayer

For most globally minded Christians, giving and praying are interrelated ways to act in the world. Both provide ways of interacting, as Bonnie put it at the start of the chapter. As might be expected, prayer came up often with evangelical sponsors, however many mainline Protestants and Catholics (including Bonnie) also told me that prayer was an essential part of what they “gave” abroad. Natural disasters are fundamental in this respect because nearly every sponsor told me that, regardless of whether they prayed on a regular basis, the child and their family became the focus of their prayers in two main circumstances: when the child wrote about a specific need and when the sponsor heard news coverage of a disaster in the child’s region. Generally, this kind of reporting was the *only* way sponsors heard about the child’s country outside sponsorship materials since, as scholars of media note, European and North American media usually reports

on the Global South, which is deemed “foreign” and thus of less interest to viewers, exclusively through the prism of fast-breaking disasters.³⁵

Because so many sponsors told me they followed the news about the places where they supported children, at first I was surprised at how little most of them knew. This realization initially struck me as I was speaking with Melissa, an evangelical woman in her early thirties who worked as a nurse and had a child the same age as my daughter. As we commiserated about juggling parenting and work, she told me that she carved out some time for herself each night. “I’m an avid fan of [ABC] *World News Tonight* with David Muir. I love him. He just delivers it,” she said. “And I watch it very closely for Ecuador and trying to keep tabs on it.” Melissa has sponsored children in Ecuador with Compassion since she was a teenager. When I met her, she was supporting a boy named Jorge. Besides *World News Tonight*, Melissa pays attention to stories about Ecuador on her Facebook newsfeed and then follows up by reading online content from CNN. “Has there been a moment when you’ve seen something about Ecuador that’s made you think?” I asked her. Melissa responded:

M: Yeah, when there were earthquakes and flooding and it was very scary and we got an email from Compassion saying we—you know, “We’re trying to get in contact . . .” And it was a really long time before I heard—I mean weeks . . . it took a really, really long time to hear that [Jorge] was okay.

H: And in that period did you find you were focusing your prayers more or—?

A: Absolutely. Yeah—and not just him, but for him and his community. . . . [I]t really kind of hit close to home. So I found myself praying for Jorge . . . praying for strength for him and for them—not by name, you know, but for the victims.

H: . . . Are there other things [on the news] that you find yourself focused on in connection with [Jorge]?

A: Like I said, I keep up on news about ISIS and I heard about some kind of religious segregation. It was outside of Ecuador, you know, where people were targeted for being Christians and obviously in that area of the world—

H: Wait, sorry, I lost you. You mean it was near—near Ecuador?

A: Yeah, but—yeah, the surrounding areas. And, you know, I remember doing some of my own little research seeing if it was affecting [Jorge’s family’s] area, which I didn’t find anything saying it was. But, you know, just you hear of all that religious persecution and things that it can be very dangerous to be an active Christian in some of those countries.

H: But do you get the sense that Ecuador is a Christian country or—I don’t know if Compassion talks about that in their materials.

A: They’ll send a little bit of demographic information of the country but I think there’s a lot of Muslims and Buddhists also in that area.

Some sponsors were very well informed, of course. But Melissa was also not unique in her stated interest in foreign news yet strangely inaccurate conception of Ecuador. Like many sponsors, she gleans her news from mainstream and Christian sources (in her case, usually through Facebook). Both channels of information focus on natural disasters in the Global South, while the latter also emphasizes Christian persecution at the hands of religious “others,” mainly Muslims.³⁶ Melissa is also not alone in conflating these two presumed threats to Christian well-being in poor countries to create an image of victimized life under duress. In this respect, it is notable that nearly every sponsor with whom I spoke assumed that the child’s family was Christian. In fact they were usually right, at least at Unbound and Compassion,³⁷ but the point is that this assumption means that any threat described in sponsorship materials related to poverty or disasters is understood to put *Christian* families at risk. It is not a leap for U.S. sponsors who follow news about “persecution” to superimpose multiple levels of insecurity into a single picture of Christians abroad as always under threat.

While such assumptions came up in my conversations with all types of sponsors, it was most prevalent among evangelicals like Melissa; in fact, 17 percent of the evangelical sponsors with whom I spoke told me that concern about “religious persecution” was the *primary* reason they felt connected to Christians around the world.³⁸ Some of this focus is undoubtedly due to the strong Anglo-evangelical interest in “persecuted” Christians over the past two decades, but it may be exacerbated in this case because none of the countries where sponsors support children are majority evangelical. Regardless of the actual politics in each country, born-again Christians can therefore always be viewed as potentially at risk from a powerful majority religion that is “other.” By contrast, U.S. Catholics were aware that many of the countries where they supported children, including Ecuador, were Catholic-majority places. It was one reason why they were often drawn to help them in the first place. As a result, Catholic sponsors were much more likely to distinguish between natural disaster/economic poverty and religious persecution, which they talked about almost exclusively in the context of Middle East Christians living in Muslim-majority places.

At a more basic level, inaccuracies also persist because sponsorship subtly discourages detailed information. What I mean is that sponsorship attempts to create kin-like relations that reflect back to U.S. Christians what is presumed to be shared at the most basic level: the hurts, loves, and aspirations that come with being part of a human family. Providing too many local details can muddy these waters. Sponsors never told me so explicitly, but they did often say that they learned “just enough to verify it is a very poor country,” as another woman at Melissa’s church put it. They wanted just enough specific information to be assured that Christian people and organizations were “very poor” and were getting the support they needed. They also wanted basic amounts of information to better focus their prayers. To return to the theme of this section, Christians

understand sponsorship as fostering resilience through relationships—a goal that requires prayers (and letters) alongside monetary donations and development work.³⁹

Not surprisingly, evangelical organizations have been particularly active in producing materials to encourage their donors to use sponsorship as a launching pad for global prayer. For example, in 1989, Paul Borthwick, an evangelical pastor in Massachusetts, wrote an article in *World Vision Magazine* about how to pray in “an ever-widening circle” by launching “brief prayer arrows” across the world.⁴⁰ Borthwick and his wife began this process each week with letters from Oyie Kimasisa, a child they sponsored in Kenya. In studying those letters, they discerned what they understood to be needs (some of which the boy probably stated and others that he did not). They began their prayers with those specific needs, while letting God guide their imaginations further based on what they knew from media reports, including World Vision’s newsletters. This made their prayers “larger” as they prayed for “kings and all those in authority” (1 Tim. 2:2) because, as Borthwick wrote, global leaders are often the key to successful Christian work abroad. Natural phenomena like sandstorms and plentiful ground water were also a key feature of their prayers. Though Borthwick’s article is somewhat outdated, I mention it here because I found similar patterns among sponsors as they scaled up from children’s letters to “big,” or more generalized, needs. The opposite trajectory was also true, as Melissa demonstrated; at times sponsors begin with large-scale disastrous events on the news and then try to gain more targeted information by scanning the child’s letters and, in desperate times, calling the sponsorship organization to pinpoint specific needs.

Prayer is pertinent to U.S. Catholic giving, too; sociological studies show that Catholics rank intercessory prayer and material support as their top two priorities in global giving.⁴¹ In contrast to evangelicals, however, a sizable minority of Catholic sponsors told me they rarely pray extempore; instead, they follow the cycle of prayers during Mass or use the rosary and prayer cards at home to address God, Mary, and their favorite saints. Most did pray for the sponsored child by name, at least on occasion, and they were likely to do so according to what they sometimes called “a basket of intentions.” This term refers to the practice of thinking of many names and keeping them in mind during a more general prayer, such as the Our Father. The “basket” becomes literal in parishes at Lent and other times when those who are present may pass round a basket to fill with strips of paper bearing the names of all who need prayer. These baskets—both literal and metaphorical—gather familiar and foreign names. This pattern of mingling prayers for self, family, and others was important across all my field sites, whether Protestant or Catholic.

Bonnie, the Unbound sponsor mentioned at the outset, offers a sense of these varied links. When she discussed praying for Julia’s needs in Guatemala, she continually returned to prayers she says on behalf of those closest to her.

Clinging precariously to the bottom rung of the middle class, she and her husband had bought a small suburban home outside Kansas City, where they raised their two kids. She taught Sunday school and did secretarial work in the parish while he worked for an electrical company. When he lost his job in 2010, they barely managed to keep their home. Her sister, who was not so lucky, has declared bankruptcy and now Bonnie supports her financially and through prayer. Another challenge concerns her daughter, who has been trying to get pregnant. As she discussed why Julia and her family were poor, Bonnie seamlessly overlapped one set of struggles onto another.

I don't think God is saying, okay, you get to be poor, you get to be—I think there's blessings and all of that. . . . [And] I can't say that my sister who's now in bankruptcy is *not* blessed by the Lord . . . I mean, why is my daughter struggling and struggling to get pregnant? You can't look and say, I blame God. And you can't say, gosh, these people are awful and that's why it's bad for them. I think we need to work harder to find out what we can do to help people. And each person can do more. . . . I think you can find the Lord in all of those places of sadness or challenge.

Bonnie also describes another burden: loneliness. Her husband and adult children are no longer practicing Catholics and her mother, who had been her companion in matters of faith, died not long ago. She says the loneliness feels overwhelming at times. But Bonnie has a few spiritual guides, including a close friend who became a priest and then died suddenly when they were in their mid-thirties. His favorite saying was, "We're only but a prayer apart." "That's how I think of the world too," Bonnie tells me. She gestures at the large world map pinned to her wall. It has been there for years.

It is a sense that we are all here together [in the world]. We really are. So I may not specifically say, okay, now I'm going to pray for Julia, I just feel she's within me. And if I'm deepening my spiritual life, if I'm getting closer to the Lord, they're all coming with me. And I think that helps me because like I said, I'm kind of the loner that still goes to Mass. . . . I was thinking of my mom and sometimes I felt that loneliness but then that sense of we are, in spirit, we are just only but a prayer apart. 'Cause [Julia] is in my heart and I'm in her heart so we—we, spiritually, already have met. We have met. I'm not a traveler . . . I hate traveling. I will never be going to Guatemala!

While telling me about Julia's family, Bonnie says that we must always "be aware of the fact that their experiences are not ours." It's the kind of message Unbound hopes its sponsors will assimilate. Nevertheless, based on Julia's letters, Bonnie feels that they do share a similar worldview, not least because Julia, who is now entering her teens, seems to share what Bonnie views as a Catholic sensibility of

gratitude and activism. For Bonnie, prayers are essential in this regard. They are one way she can do more for the welfare of all those she holds in her heart. They are also a way to make sure the people who are not present with her at Mass—her family, who refuses to attend, and Julia, who is far away—are still “coming with” Bonnie as she moves through this life and, perhaps, into the next one. That’s being only a prayer apart.

To Dwell within Suffering

When sponsors discuss the places where they support a child—places very few of them have been or will ever go—they often talk about human nature and natural disaster. Human sins, including government corruption, sow the seeds of poverty. Disasters deepen it. For sponsors, these twin factors are “natural” insofar as they operate at a level that far exceeds the discrete actions of sponsored children and their families and they seem to drive an endless cycle that keeps the majority of the world poor. For two centuries, sponsorship organizations have built their fundraising model on sometimes sensationalist reports about these twin forces. Perhaps counterintuitively to outsiders, the Christians who have responded to these appeals are, in fact, quite optimistic about how to perceive them. It does not mean that they are necessarily optimistic about the state of the world generally—some are and some are not—but they are certainly hopeful that sponsorship is an effective way to intervene in such cycles by nurturing “one little being,” as Barbara put it.

This chapter identifies a few key patterns in terms of how contemporary sponsors understand the suffering of (what they often identify as) Christian families abroad. First, sponsors tend to access their news from mainstream and Christian sources; they choose when to tune in and when to turn off these various streams of information in order to glean just what they feel they need to spur a sense of connection. It means that they often view themselves as people who follow current events and research foreign news even if some of them are uninformed or incorrect about the places they support. Second, sponsors come to grips with natural disasters, and the suffering they cause, by viewing their God as *allowing* but not *activating* these events. Usually, they say God allows disasters or poverty to encourage people to realize their dependence on Him. Third, sponsors do recognize that human nature (sin) and natural disasters plague the United States, but with respect to poor countries they tend to group these two categories together to fuel a sense of constant crisis. However, we should not assume that they view “home” as always comforting and “away” as always threatening. Many of the sponsors I got to know had lived through death and abuse, depression and loneliness. They usually identify these threats to flourishing as a common human condition—which also leaves room for hope. This connection between struggles at home and abroad is most tangible during prayer, as

sponsors audibly mingle petitions for themselves, their families, and faraway others.

These ideas help complicate what some scholars of globalization have noted about unpredictable events. In times of crisis, writes anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen, most Western people blame processes on a higher scale (“government”) or withdraw to trust only first-hand experience and face-to-face acquaintances.⁴² To some degree the U.S. Christians with whom I worked are committed to being globally minded, as donors at least, so they do not simply fall back on what they know first-hand. They may blame larger human organizations, and thus humanity’s fallible nature, but they also understand themselves to have a direct link to “the top,” which is God. The result is a viewpoint that sees suffering as a mystery and nevertheless solidifies God’s presence. Their answers recall Leibniz’s classic mediations on the problem of theodicy: what may appear to us as evils in the present are in fact doing good from God’s broader perspective.⁴³

Read alongside the other chapters in this volume, my discussion here shows how sponsors talk about suffering in ways that complicate the discourse related to “international religious freedom” or “religious persecution,” even as some of them consume this media and support these campaigns. Sponsors are also concerned about Christian suffering and well-being in the communities they support, but they integrate many contextual factors, such as poverty, war, or natural disasters when they imagine Christians elsewhere in distress. Further, their sense of connection to a “global church,” though it may be sparked by reports of suffering, is rooted in an optimistic certainty that all Christians have something in common—a shared relation to an ultimately loving God.

NOTES

1. Barbara Adam and Chris Groves, *Future Matters: Action, Knowledge, Ethics* (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalisation: The Human Consequences* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998); Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992); Nauja Kleist and Stef Jansen, “Introduction: Hope over Time—Crisis, Immobility and Future-Making,” *History and Anthropology* 27, no. 4 (2016): 373–392.
2. Erica Burman, “Innocents Abroad: Western Fantasies of Childhood and the Iconography of Emergencies,” *Disasters* 18, no. 3 (1994): 247; Susan D. Moeller, *Compassion Fatigue: How the Media Sell Disease, Famine, War and Death* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Alexander De Waal, *Famine Crimes: Politics & the Disaster Relief Industry in Africa* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997).
3. UNDP survey cited in Tara Linn Hefferan, “Deprofessionalizing Economic Development: Faith-based Development Alternatives through U.S.-Haiti Catholic Parish Twinning” (PhD diss., Michigan State University, 2006), 55–56.
4. “Thoughts on Various Methods of Advancing the Cause of Christ by Missionaries at Bombay,” *Panoplist* 12, no.1 (January 1816): 34–39.
5. These two groups are notable as the first and second humanitarian organizations to be granted a charter by the U.S. Congress, in 1900 and 1919 respectively.

6. Sara Fieldston, *Raising the World: Child Welfare in the American Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), 3.
7. More common language at the time was “nonsectarian” or “interdenominational.” On parachurch organizing, see Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith since World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 71–132; and Robert Wuthnow, *Boundless Faith: The Global Outreach of American Churches* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 239. See also David P. King, *God’s Internationalists: World Vision and the Age of Evangelical Humanitarianism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019), 67–118.
8. Heather Curtis, *Holy Humanitarians: American Evangelicals and Global Aid* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018), 153. On the 1950s campaigns, see J. Calvitt Clarke to F. H. Faber, 15 March 1956, Folder 8, Box IB22, ChildFund Archives, Richmond, VA.
9. These organizations scaled up quickly because they were ecumenical in their fundraising and also in the field, where they partnered with a broad subset of established missionaries. Organizations matched donors with children who were already in missionary-run orphanages or schools, sending monthly transfer payments for each child who was sponsored. This system differed from nineteenth-century sponsorship plans run by missionary boards because it did not require that these organizations build their own infrastructure and it was not limited by the number of children missionaries in one denomination could handle at any given time. Thus mid-twentieth-century organizations accessed an essentially limitless “supply” of children to fulfill donor demand. The system’s drawback was that at times organizations were only dimly aware of conditions in the institutions they supported. Changes since the 1970s have greatly improved communication and accountability.
10. David P. King, “The New Internationalists: World Vision and the Revival of American Evangelical Humanitarianism, 1950–2010,” *Religions* 3, no. 4 (2012): 933, 937.
11. Susan McDonic, “Witnessing, Work and Worship: World Vision and the Negotiation of Faith, Development, and Culture” (PhD diss., Duke University, 2004), 117.
12. The Compassion sponsors with whom I worked most closely attended an Evangelical Free Church of America and a Presbyterian (PCUSA) church that was effectively non-denominational evangelical. I met these sponsors through their churches, after volunteering for sponsorship-related events. I conducted 12 interviews in Massachusetts, 13 in New Hampshire, and 8 in San Jose (where I also volunteered), for a total of 43 Compassion sponsors. The Unbound sponsors came from a variety of parishes and were nearly all ‘cradle Catholics.’ I met them thanks to Unbound, which sent out hundreds of letters on my behalf to sponsors in select parishes. I conducted 20 interviews in upstate New York and 19 in Kansas, interviewing a total of 52 Unbound sponsors (including spouses). Mainline Protestant sponsors were hardest to find, since they often supported organizations that were not explicitly religious. I found some through word of mouth, and a few more after I advertised in the *Christian Century* in 2015. I conducted 19 interviews (with 23 people), 8 of which were in person.
13. Rounding the numbers up or down, 87 percent of my interviewees were married or recently widowed; 90 percent had children (many grown); 75 percent were female; all self-identified as Christian and most went to church. My interviewees were somewhat more likely than organizational estimates to self-identify as white—all of my Protestant interviewees did so, along with 95 percent of Catholics. (Compassion and Unbound estimate that 85–90 percent of their sponsors are white). A main difference from

- organizational averages concerned age: my interviewees were a decade older; Compassion's estimates put their average sponsor at 46 years old; at Unbound, it is 55 years old.
14. On resonances in the United Kingdom, see Frances Rabbitts, "Give and Take? Child Sponsors and the Ethics of Giving," in *Child Sponsorship: Exploring Pathways to a Brighter Future*, ed. Brad Watson and Matthew Clarke (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 289.
 15. My question about "connection" did not include the words "optimistic" or "pessimistic" but, since I was conducting open ended conversational interviews, my interlocutors were able to take their response where they wanted. Here, I am only counting those interviewees who explicitly self-identified as pessimistic (18 percent) or optimistic (21 percent).
 16. Although only four individuals stated this directly, scholars argue that the post-Cold War world has seemed especially chaotic and bewildering in the face of the seemingly simple good/bad world of Cold War ideology. For example, Kleist and Jansen, "Introduction: Hope Over Time," 376.
 17. Among Catholic and mainline respondents, 16 percent (n=12) talked about "terrorism," in the Middle East especially. Of these, two people blamed ISIS (implying Muslims) and one blamed Islam in general.
 18. 39.5 percent (n=17) Compassion sponsors said they were pessimistic and 18.6 percent (n=8) said they were optimistic. In other words, about the same percentage were "optimistic" as their Catholic and mainline counterparts. The main difference lies in the fact that 60 percent of Catholic and mainline sponsors did not take a stand either way, compared to 40 percent of Compassion sponsors. In other words, evangelicals were more likely to swing onto the side of stated pessimism (which is not surprising, theologically speaking). They were also much more likely to point to "Islam" as the culprit: 30 percent (n=13) of my evangelical interlocutors did so. On a similar note about Islam, see Peter Ove, "Change a Life, Change Your Own: Child Sponsorship, the Discourse of Development, and the Production of Ethical Subjects" (PhD diss., University of British Columbia, 2013), 247–248.
 19. Lauren Berlant, "Intimacy: A Special Issue," in *Intimacy*, ed. Lauren Berlant (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 7.
 20. Compassion sponsors raised these issues often. Only two connected this global breakdown with the End Times, although relevant theologies might certainly lead conservatives to be more pessimistic generally (see note 18). Some mainline Protestants (8 percent) and Catholics (12 percent) also talked about 9/11. On the importance of 9/11 for shattering American (including scholarly) assumptions about global connection, see Anna L. Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 11.
 21. I am thinking of the materials I surveyed at World Vision and Compassion. Some examples include: *A Call To Prayer* (Newsletter), 31 December 1959 and 15 January 1959, Ministries "Call To Prayer," Jan.–Dec. 1959, World Vision International Archives (WVIA), Monrovia, CA; *A Call To Prayer* (Newsletter), 15 July 1960, Ministries "Call To Prayer," Jan.–Dec. 1960, WVIA. On aggressive Muslim missionizing, see, for example, John T. Seamands, "Christianity's Answer to the Muslim Challenge," *WV Magazine*, May 1964, 6–7, accessed at Billy Graham Center Archives, Wheaton, IL.
 22. Thomas Kidd, *American Christians and Islam: Evangelical Culture and Muslims from the Colonial Period to the Age of Terrorism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

23. Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 49–56; Jonathan P. Herzog, *The Spiritual-Industrial Complex: America's Religious Battle against Communism in the Early Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 78.
24. Lauren Berlant, "Introduction: Compassion (and Withholding)," in *Compassion: The Culture and Politics of an Emotion*, ed. Lauren Berlant (New York: Routledge, 2004), 3.
25. Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (New York: Picador, 2004), 102.
26. Susan Sontag, *AIDS and Its Metaphors* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1989), 83–84.
27. Catholics discussed "free will" in nearly every interview. Of the few Protestants (n=4) who did so, half had grown up Catholic. Such linguistic cues might be worth exploring further. Other scholars have noted how evangelical leaders who engage with global issues (e.g., human trafficking) also blame corrupt foreign leadership for problems; for example, Todd M. Brenneman, *Homespun Gospel: The Triumph of Sentimentality in Contemporary American Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 139.
28. A small number (n=3) of highly conservative Protestant sponsors still said so. On this idea, see Jeanet Sinding Bentzen, "Acts of God? Religiosity and Natural Disasters Across Subnational World Districts," *Economic Journal* 129 (2019): 2295–2321.
29. For example, Address by Miss Classon in *Minutes of Public Meetings N.H. Br. Of W.B.M. Nov. 12 1872–Dec. 11 1883*, entry on July 9, 1874, folder 1, box 4, series 2, Women's Board of Missions Records (WBM), The Burke Library Archives at Union Theological Seminary, New York, NY; James Smith, "Industrial Training in India," *Missionary Herald* 4 (April 1900): 168–172. On similar ideas among U.S. Catholics, see Fr. Paul de Fresonora, Letter extract in *Annals of the Holy Childhood* III (March 1873): 15–17, Special Collections, University of Notre Dame Archives (UNDA), South Bend, IN. Mid-century evangelicals also sometimes said Satan created devastating acts of nature (and disease) to cause human suffering. See, for example, Edmund Janss (dir., childcare ministries), *Manual for World Vision Superintendents* (World Vision International, 1975), 95–100, Folder 9: ORG/WVI 16 FY-74 Sponsorship Programs Manuals, Ed Janss, Central Records, Global Center, Los Angeles, WVIA, Monrovia, CA. Few contemporary sponsors mentioned Satan, and those who did emphasized how his attacks on *individuals* cause personal doubt and sin.
30. On this common distinction between "cause" and "allow," see Edward B. Davis, Cynthia N. Kimball, Jamie D. Aten, Benjamin Andrews, Daryl R. Van Tongeren, Joshua N. Hook, Don E. Davis, Pehr Granqvist, and Crystal L. Park, "Religious Meaning Making and Attachment in a Disaster Context: A Longitudinal Qualitative Study of Flood Survivors," *Journal of Positive Psychology* 14, no. 5 (2019): 665.
31. Davis et al. "Religious Meaning Making"; Jamie D. Aten, Patrick R. Bennett, Peter C. Hill, Don Davis, and Joshua N. Hook, "Predictors of God Concept and God Control After Hurricane Katrina," *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 4, no. 3 (2012): 182–192; A. Taylor Newton and Daniel N. McIntosh, "Associations of General Religiousness and Specific Religious Beliefs with Coping Appraisals in Response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita," *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 12 (2009): 129–146; William C. Haynes, Daryl R. Van Tongeren, Jamie Alten, Edward B. Davis, Don E. Davis, Joshua N. Hook, David Boan, and Thomas Johnson, "The Meaning as a Buffer Hypothesis: Spiritual Meaning Attenuates the Effect of Disaster-Related Resource Loss on Posttraumatic Stress," *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 9, no. 4 (2017): 446–453. A few people in this study did note Satan's role (11 percent and 14 percent at different time intervals), which would undoubtedly be higher with samples of Pentecostals and Fundamentalist

- Protestants, which were not strongly represented in my study (see Kidd, *American Christians and Islam*). By contrast, according to the studies mentioned previously, people in the United States with “negative religious coping” who “avoid” intimacy with God are more likely to interpret God’s role negatively after natural disasters. Most psychology studies are strongly biased towards white women of college age, because of the sample sets. They also favor Protestants over Catholics, and ask about “God” rather than Jesus, Mary, and so forth, and thus give only a very basic sense of how people interact with a variety of other-than-human presences.
32. This is also relatively common reaction, for example in 53 percent of Katrina victims, according to Davis et al., “Religious Meaning Making,” 665.
 33. I am thinking especially of the many studies out of Wheaton College (see Berlant, “Introduction”). Typical is Bruce W. Smith, Kenneth I. Pargament, Curtis Brant, and Joan M. Oliver, “Noah Revisited: Religious Coping by Church Members and the Impact of the 1993 Midwest Flood,” *Journal of Community Psychology* 28, no. 2 (2000): 176.
 34. Nearly 20 percent of Catholics (n=10) offered responses similar to John’s, but not a single Protestant did so.
 35. A classic early study is Johan Galtung and Mari Holmboe Ruge, “The Structure of Foreign News: The Presentation of Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in Four Norwegian Newspapers,” *Journal of Peace Research* 2 (1965): 64–91.
 36. Catholics were somewhat more likely to note that they received their foreign news from missionary priests who spoke in their parishes (these speakers did not emphasize Islam, it seems). Evangelicals were much more likely to refer to work by celebrity anti-Muslim writers like Nonie Darwish and Ayaan Hirsi Ali. For more on this phenomenon, see Melani McAlister, *The Kingdom of God Has No Borders: A Global History of American Evangelicals* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 144–158.
 37. Neither organization restricts its aid, but Unbound focuses on Catholic majority places and Compassion’s program works through local evangelical and Pentecostal churches and schools. Christian parents are therefore most likely be aware of, and take part in, such programs due to their social networks and proximity (indeed, it is a Compassion requirement that children live within walking distance of its Christian service providers). I include Catholics as Christians, although Compassion does not (at least in terms of its service providers), which makes the question about whether children are Christian (and more specifically, “born again”) rather delicate. Compassion does not gather statistics in this respect, but a number of the employees I interviewed did confirm a high probability of self-selection into the program by already Christian parents (e.g., Alistair Sim, program effectiveness research director, June 12, 2014; Mark Hanlon, senior vice president of global marketing and engagement, June 12, 2014).
 38. For more on this trend among evangelicals, see Elizabeth Castelli, “Praying for the Persecuted Church: US Christian Activism in the Global Arena,” *Journal of Human Rights* 4, no. 3 (2005): 321–51; McAlister, *Kingdom of God*, 159–174; Omri Elisha, “Saved by a Martyr: Evangelical Mediation, Sanctification, and the ‘Persecuted Church,’” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 84, no. 4 (2016): 1056–1080; Wuthnow, *Boundless Faith*, 158–161.
 39. I am making an argument that runs parallel to that of Kevin O’Neill, *Secure the Soul: Christian Piety and Gang Prevention in Guatemala* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015).
 40. Paul Borthwick, “Sharpen Your Global Prayers,” *WV Magazine*, August–September 1989, 10–11. Borthwick begins his prayers with “Oyie,” but he is also inspired by thinking

about a missionary couple he supports in Mauritania, North Africa, whom I have not mentioned.

41. Janet Kragt Bakker, *Sister Churches: American Congregations and their Partners Abroad* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 52.
42. Thomas Hylland Eriksen, *Overheating: An Anthropology of Accelerated Change* (London: Pluto Press, 2016), 139–140.
43. Colin Campbell, *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism* (Oxford: Alcuin Academics, 2005), 113–114.