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Spotlight on Teaching
Teaching about Religions, Medicines, and Healing
2004 Member Calendar

May


May 1. Nominations (including self-nomination) for committee appointments requested. For more information, see www.aarweb.org/member/submit.asp.

May 7-9. Pacific Northwest regional meeting, Vancouver, BC.


May 17. Registration for the Employment Information Services Center opens.

May 30. Annual Meeting Additional Meeting requests due for priority consideration. (For more Annual Meeting information, see www.aarweb.org/annualmeet/2004)

June


June 15. Membership renewal and Annual Meeting registration deadline for 2004 Annual Meeting participants.

July

July 1. New fiscal year begins.


July 31. Deadline for participants to request audiovisual equipment at the Annual Meeting.

August

Annual Meeting Program goes online.

August 1. Change of address due to priority receipt of the 2004 Annual Meeting Program Book.

August 2. Research Grant Applications due. For more information, see www.aarweb.org/grants.


August 31. Regional development grant applications due to regional secretaries.

September


September 17. Executive Committee meeting, Washington, D.C.

October


October 15. Excellence in Teaching Award nominations due. For more information, see www.aarweb.org/lawandteaching.asp.

October 16. Third and final tier Annual Meeting registration rates go into effect.

October 23. EIS preregistration closes.

November

November 1. Research grant awards announced.

November 18. Executive Committee meeting, San Antonio, TX.

November 19. Board of Directors meeting.

November 19. Chairs Workshop at the Annual Meeting, San Antonio. Free for departments enrolled in the Academic Relations Program. For more information, see www.aarweb.org/department/acadrel.asp.

November 30. New program unit proposals due. For writing and advertising guidelines, please see www.aarweb.org/publications/rsn.

December


December 2. New program unit proposals due.

December 10–11. Program Committee meeting, Atlanta, GA.


And keep in mind throughout the year...

Regional organizations have various deadlines throughout the fall for their Calls for Papers. See www.aarweb.org/regionalcall.asp.

In the Field. News of events and opportunities for scholars of religion. In the Field is a members-only online publication that accepts brief announcements, including calls for papers, grant news, conference announcements, and other opportunities appropriate for scholars of religion. Submit text online at www.aarweb.org/publications/inthefield/submit.asp.

Openings: Employment Opportunities for Scholars of Religion. Openings is a members-only online publication listing job announcements in areas of interest to members; issues are viewable online from the first through the last day of each month. Submit announcements online, and review policies and pricing at www.aarweb.org/openings/submit.asp.
T
AKE A JOURNEY to the Old West at the 2004 AAR Annual Meeting in San Antonio, Texas. The city has always been a crossroads and a meeting place. Sounds and flavors of Native Americans, Old Mexico, Germans, the Wild West, African Americans, and the Deep South mingle and merge. Annual Meeting sessions will be held in the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, the Marriott Riverwalk Hotel, and the Marriott Rivercenter Hotel, all located in downtown San Antonio within easy walking distance of one another.

Mark your calendars now for the opening of fax, mail, and online housing and registration on Monday, May 17, 2004!

2004: Remember San Antonio!

ANNUAL MEETING REGISTRATION OPENS MAY 17, 2004

FAX: 330-963-0319
WEB: www.aarweb.org/annualmeet
MAIL: Annual Meetings of AAR and SBL Registration & Housing
c/o Conferon Registration and Housing Bureau
2450 Edison BLVD, Ste. 2
Twinburg, OH 44087
USA

Questions:
TEL: 800-575-7185 (U.S. & Canada)
+1-330-425-9330 (outside U.S. & Canada)
E-MAIL: aarsblreg@conferon.com

Membership
Don’t forget to renew your membership dues before you register or else you will not be able to get the lower member registration rates. If you are not certain about your current 2004 membership status, please see www.aarweb.org/membership or call 404-727-3049.

Getting Around
Most of the Annual Meeting hotels are within easy walking distance of the Annual Meeting session locations. Shuttle service will be provided along several routes to outgoing hotels. San Antonio has several novel ways of getting around, from the bus trolley system throughout downtown ($3.50 per ride) to the water taxis along the San Antonio River ($6.00 for adults).

Getting to San Antonio
We’ve teamed up with Delta, Continental, and American Airlines to give you the best price and flexibility on airfare. Attendees traveling to San Antonio will receive a discount airfare using the airlines’ telephone reservation system. Please reference the special file number when you or your travel agent makes the reservations.

Carrier Phone Number File Number
Delta 800-241-6760 20H215A
Continental 800-468-7022 VQHJKR
(1 code ZPC3)
American 800-433-1790 A91N44D

International Attendees
It is necessary for all of those entering the United States of America to clear customs and immigration. Non-U.S. citizens should inquire about possible visa requirements from their own country. Official letters of invitation are available upon request by e-mailing your name and the consulate contact information to aarsblreg@conferon.com.

Additional Meetings
Conferon, our meeting planning partner, is now accepting requests for Additional Meeting space. All requests are handled on a space and time-slot availability basis. The Additional Meetings program, held in conjunction with the AAR Annual Meeting, is an important service to AAR members. All Additional Meeting participants are expected to register for the Annual Meeting. Be sure to read the instructions carefully before completing and submitting your space request. The deadline for priority scheduling is May 30, 2004. For more information about the Additional Meetings or to obtain a request form, please see www.aarweb.org/annualmeet. Questions should be directed to Kim Becker Conferon, Inc. TEL: 314-997-1500 E-MAIL: aarsbl@conferon.com

Employment Information Services
The 2004 Employment Information Services Center will be located in the Marriott Rivercenter Hotel. Candidates and employers who wish to participate should visit the AAR Web site, www.aarweb.org. Registration opens on May 17, 2004, along with Annual Meeting registration and housing.

AAR Annual Meeting Online Services
At www.aarweb.org/annualmeet you can:
• Register for the Annual Meeting
• Reserve your hotel room
• Find a roommate
• Retrieve your Additional Meeting requests/forms
• Register for EIS
• Download EIS Center Forms
• Search the online Program Book.
Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop

Being a Chair in Today’s Consumer Culture: Navigating in the Knowledge Factory

This workshop will provide a day of structured discussion where chairs can exchange personal narratives and strategies for navigating the pitfalls of life as a chair. The discussion leaders are experienced chairs. The workshop is formatted as a mix of presentations and small group discussions. During lunch we will break up into groups by institutional type and discuss issues that are unique to religion departments.

Colleagues in your institution, such as chairs, other members of the faculty, faculty being developed to assume leadership responsibilities, and deans, may be interested in attending this workshop. Chairs may want to bring a team of faculty or send a designated faculty person to the workshop.

The topics for past Chairs Workshops have been:

- 2003 Annual Meeting - Scholarships, Service, and Sustaining the Division of Being a Chair
- 2002 Annual Meeting - Running a Successful Faculty Search in the Religious Studies Department
- 2001 Annual Meeting - Evaluating and Advancing Teaching in the Religious Studies Department
- 2000 Annual Meeting - Assessing and Advancing the Religious Studies Department

We look forward to seeing you in San Antonio!

The Academic Relations Task Force: Warren G. Frissina, Chair; Fred Glennon, Kathryn Kleinhaus, Laurie L. Patton, Elizabeth A. Say, and Terrence W. Tilley

TO REGISTER

Complete the information below, arrange payment, and send via fax or surface mail.

Name ________________________________
Department __________________________
Institution ____________________________
Serving as Chair since ____________
Number of faculty in department ________

PAYMENT INFORMATION

☐ Check: payable to “AAR Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop”
☐ Credit Card (check one):
  ☐ Visa ☐ Mastercard ☐ American Express ☐ Discover

Credit Card Number ____________________
Expiration Date ________________________

C.D. ____________________
Cardholder Signature ____________________

Name on Card (Please Print) ____________________

* Card Identification Number (required for Discover cards): 4 digits on front of American Express, 5 digits on back of other cards

Send your registration form and payment of $75.00 *** before October 31, 2004 ($100.00 on site).

Registration is limited to the first 75 participants.

For more information, contact Carey J. Gifford, Director of Academic Relations, at cgrifford@aarweb.org, or by phone at 404-727-2270.

*** Chairs from departments enrolled in the Academic Relations Program receive a complimentary registration. For information on enrolling your department, see www.aarweb.org/department.

Subscribe to chairs@aarweb.org, the listserve for leaders in the field, for updates to the workshop program and other news for chairs. For the most up-to-date information on the workshop, see www.aarweb.org/department/workshops.

Register by Fax 404-727-7959
Register by surface mail: Chairs Workshop American Academy of Religion 825 Houston Mill Road NE Suite 300 Atlanta, GA 30329

The Entrepreneurial Chair: Marketing the Department - Fundraising - Marketing the Department - Fundraising - Marketing the Department - Fundraising - Marketing the Department

The Academic Relations Task Force: Warren G. Frissina, Chair; Fred Glennon, Kathryn Kleinhaus, Laurie L. Patton, Elizabeth A. Say, and Terrence W. Tilley

Friday, November 19, 2004, San Antonio, Texas

TO REGISTER

Complete the information below, arrange payment, and send via fax or surface mail.

Name ________________________________
Department __________________________
Institution ____________________________
Serving as Chair since ____________
Number of faculty in department ________

PAYMENT INFORMATION

☐ Check: payable to “AAR Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop”
☐ Credit Card (check one):
  ☐ Visa ☐ Mastercard ☐ American Express ☐ Discover

Credit Card Number ____________________
Expiration Date ________________________

C.D. ____________________
Cardholder Signature ____________________

Name on Card (Please Print) ____________________

* Card Identification Number (required for Discover cards): 4 digits on front of American Express, 5 digits on back of other cards

Send your registration form and payment of $75.00 *** before October 31, 2004 ($100.00 on site).

Registration is limited to the first 75 participants.

For more information, contact Carey J. Gifford, Director of Academic Relations, at cgrifford@aarweb.org, or by phone at 404-727-2270.

*** Chairs from departments enrolled in the Academic Relations Program receive a complimentary registration. For information on enrolling your department, see www.aarweb.org/department.

Subscribe to chairs@aarweb.org, the listserve for leaders in the field, for updates to the workshop program and other news for chairs. For the most up-to-date information on the workshop, see www.aarweb.org/department/workshops.

Register by Fax 404-727-7959
Register by surface mail: Chairs Workshop American Academy of Religion 825 Houston Mill Road NE Suite 300 Atlanta, GA 30329
Inside the Planning Process

How Meeting Rooms Are Assigned at the Annual Meeting

Ailslin Jones, American Academy of Religion

You Hurry Along to your next destination at the Annual Meeting. When you arrive at the session, you find your room is packed and it is standing room only. As you strain to see the speaker over a sea of heads, you wonder, “Why didn’t the AAR plan this session for a larger room?”

A glimpse inside the AAR’s room assignment process may shed some light. There are several factors that play a part.

1. Estimated attendance
2. Audiovisual equipment
3. Proximity to other sessions

Estimates of expected attendance at all Annual Meetings go to the information that program unit chairs send to the AAR executive office in April when planning begins. The Annual Meeting program director reviews these estimates. Estimates may increase or decrease based on the number of attendees. Sometimes a session may prove more popular than anticipated, despite the best efforts of the program chair.

The meeting rooms are initially assigned, however, according to these estimates.

The second consideration is audiovisual equipment. The use of computers and LCD projectors for Annual Meeting presentations is becoming more prevalent, while the cost of such equipment continues to rise. In 2003, the cost of a LCD projector was $550 per day. Also, there may be limits to the number of LCDs readily available. Due to cost and availability, sessions with similar AV requests will be assigned to the same room to maximize use of the equipment throughout the day.

Sessions with high AV needs are assigned to large-occupancy rooms, such as a ballroom, so that sessions from small to large can use the space. This will be particularly true when sessions with 50 or fewer attendees may be assigned to a ballroom.

Rooms are also blocked based on proximity to other sessions on the same theme or program unit. For instance, if the Study of Islam session has a session scheduled from 1:30-3:30 PM and a second one from 4:30-6:30 PM, the planning team tries to block the sessions in the same room or near one another. Since many attendees will be attending the 1:00 PM session, it is likely to be interested in the 4:00 PM session, it makes it more convenient for them if the two are located closer together.

Of course, not all of the meeting room space in an Annual Meeting location is ideal. Each year, different room assignment challenges must be conquered. Sometimes, a hotel’s meeting room space is smaller and less flexible (i.e., fewer air-conditioning units than a convention center). Of course, not all of the meeting room space in an Annual Meeting location is ideal. Each year, different room assignment challenges must be conquered.

N O W THE NINTH LARGEST city in the United States, San Antonio has retained its sense of history and tradition while carefully blending in cosmopolitan progress. The city offers a unique array of attractions to fill your days and nights with entertainment, exploration, and just plain fun!

San Antonio Charm

The Alamo

The Alamo is truly the heart of San Antonio—the city grew up around it. Come see the old mission where a small band of Texans held out for 13 days against the Centralist army of General Antonio López de Santa Anna. Although the Alamo fell in the early morning hours of March 6, 1836, the death of the Alamo defenders has come to symbolize courage and sacrifice for the cause of liberty. The memories of James Bowie, David Crockett, and William B. Travis are as powerful today as when the Texan Army under Sam Houston shouted “Remember the Alamo” as it routed Santa Anna at the battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836.

The Alamo represents nearly 300 years of history. Three buildings—the Shrine, Long Barrack Museum, and Gift Museum—house exhibits on the Texas Revolution and Texas history. Visitors are welcome to stroll through the beautiful Alamo Gardens. Just a short walk from the River Walk, the Alamo is a “must-see” for all who come to San Antonio.

River Walk (Paseos del Río)

The River Walk, in the heart of downtown San Antonio, is the pride of the city. Lush green foliage lines the peaceful jade-green river, and cobblestone walkways lead visitors to the river-level restaurants and shops. Following the banks of the San Antonio River, the River Walk threads its way through the city one level below the hustle and bustle of the streets. The River Walk has multiple personalities—quiet and park-like in some stretches, while other areas are full of activity with buyers and sellers from the marketplace. European-style sidewalk cafes, specialty boutiques, nightclubs, and gleaming high-rise hotels. The River Walk stretches for approximately two-and-one-half miles from the Conference Center on the north end to the King William Historic District on the south. Elevators and wheelchair ramps are available along the route to allow for disability access.

Yanaguana Cruises, the river’s floating transportation system, provides a novel method of sightseeing and people-watch- ing in downtown San Antonio. Groups can dine aboard open-air cruisers as they wind their way along the scenic waterway. River taxis deliver visitors to Rivercenter, a dazzling three-level glass shopping, dining, and entertainment complex, and to the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center.

San Antonio Missions National Park

The chains of missions established along the San Antonio River in the 18th century are reminders of one of Spain’s most successful attempts to extend its New World dominion from Mexico. Representing both church and state, these missions were changed with converting the local Native Americans, collectively called the Coahuiltecans. More than just churches on the Spanish colonial frontier, the missions also served as vocational and educational centers and economic enterprises involved in agricultural and ranching endeavors and regional trade. They were the greatest concentration of Catholic missions in North America, and formed the foundation of San Antonio. The park contains the historically and architecturally significant structures of Missions Concepción, San José, San Juan, and Espada. Other important cultural resources included are the historic Espada Dam and Aqueduct, and the Rancho de las Cabras.

Mission Concepción

This handsome church looks essentially as it did 200 years ago. Beginning in 1731, religious festivals were held there as friars strove to replace traditional Native American ritual by the demonstration of Christian ideals. Remnants of wall and ceiling paintings in the surviving rooms of the mission’s convento have been conserved. Wayside exhibits lead visitors around the grounds and through the various rooms. The site also features a visitor contact station and a sales area.

Mission San José

Founded in 1720 by Fray Antonio Margil de Jesús, San José was viewed as the model among Texas missions and became the largest and best known. After early setbacks, 300 inhabitants were eventually sustained by the vast fields and herds of livestock. A visitor in 1777 referred to the structure as the “Queen of the Missions.” The carvings on the church are notable features. The famous “Rose Window” is considered one of the finest pieces of Spanish colonial ornamentation in the country. Other features are the convento area and the stairway to the belfry and choir loft—with each of the 25 risers was hand-hewn from a single live-oak log and constructed without nails or pegs. Also featured is a granary with flying buttresses, a gristmill, restored defensive walls, and quarters.

Mission San Juan Capistrano

In 1731, after their retreat from East Texas, with a rich farm and pasture lands it became a regional supplier of agricultural produce which helped support the missions, local settlements, and presidio garrisons. The chapel, with its open bell tower, is still in use. A more elaborate church was never completed. The site includes a self-guided nature trail.

Mission San Francisco de la Espada

In 1731, after their retreat from East Texas, the founders of San Francisco de los Tejas moved the mission to the San Antonio River and renamed it San Francisco de la Espada. Espada appears as remote today as it did in the mid 1700s. It boasts the best preserved segments of the historic acequias (the irrigation system designed to provide water for crops), part of which includes the still-working Espada Dam and Aqueduct. In 1995, the ranch that once supported Mission Espada, Rancho de las Cabras near Floresville, became part of the National Historical Park and is currently open on a limited basis.*

The AAR is sponsoring a bus tour to several of the Mission sites. Check your Annual Meeting Program Book at www.acar.org/anualmeet for more details.
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* The annual AAR meeting program director reviews and monitors the program sites, and he or she will assign sessions from small to large based on the availability of the space. The second consideration is audiovisual equipment. The use of computers and LCD projectors for Annual Meeting presentations is becoming more prevalent, while the cost of such equipment continues to rise. In 2003, the cost of a LCD projector was $550 per day. Also, there may be limits to the number of LCDs readily available. Due to cost and availability, sessions with similar AV requests will be assigned to the same room to maximize use of the equipment throughout the day. Sessions with high AV needs are assigned to large-occupancy rooms, such as a ballroom, so that sessions from small to large can use the space. This will be particularly true when sessions with 50 or fewer attendees may be assigned to a ballroom.

Rooms are also blocked based on proximity to other sessions on the same theme or program unit. For instance, if the Study of Islam session has a session scheduled from 1:30-3:30 PM and a second one from 4:30-6:30 PM, the planning team tries to block the sessions in the same room or near one another. Since many attendees will be attending the 1:00 PM session, it is likely to be interested in the 4:00 PM session, it makes it more convenient for them if the two are located closer together.

Of course, not all of the meeting room space in an Annual Meeting location is ideal. Each year, different room assignment challenges must be conquered.

Sometimes, a hotel’s meeting room space is smaller and less flexible (i.e., fewer air-conditioning units than a convention center). Of course, not all of the meeting room space in an Annual Meeting location is ideal.
What’s On in San Antonio

Eating


Anauqa Grill
555 S. Alamo ST
Located in the San Antonio Plaza Hotel, the Anauqa Grill is a lesson in fine service, finer surroundings, and stellar American bistro cuisine. Beef is certainly the cornerstone of this Texas tradition, but inventive salads and an extensive wine list round out the bill. The Anauqa is a unique setting for a memorable evening. lush gardens, fountains, and high ceilings surround you while dining. The Anauqa features regional American cuisine that is a thrill to the taste buds. $$$

Deluxe
Las Canarias is located inside one of San Antonio’s most historic hotels, La Mansión. It offers formal, courtyard, and patio dining in addition to providing room service for hotel guests. Renowned chef Scott Cohen, who was formally trained in France, strives to provide food and service that go beyond guests’ expectations. All this attention, however, does not come without a price. A full bar and an extensive wine selection are also on hand. Locals flock to the restaurant to enjoy Sunday brunch, which starts at 10:30 AM. $$$$–$$$

Luciano’s Ristorante
849 E. Commerce, Suite 183
Your best choice for the truly delicious Italian cuisine. Specializes in authentic Italian delicacies, highlighted by delicious seafood, succulent veal, tender broiled chicken, old country pasta, and gourmet pizza from the wood-burning oven. Fine wines and homemade desserts add to your dining pleasure. $–$$

Madhatters Tea House & Cafe
320 Beauregard ST
Madhatters is located in the heart of the historic King William neighborhood. It is within walking distance of the San Antonio River Walk and just minutes from all the San Antonio missions. The Tea House Cafe serves an eclectic breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Open seven days a week. $–$$

Mexican Manhattan
110 Soledad ST
Family-owned and operated since 1958, Mexican Manhattan serves some of the best Mexican food and margaritas in town. Relax on our patio overlooking the San Antonio River Walk. $$–$$$

Republic of Texas Steakhouse
429 E. Commerce ST
Southwest Texan cuisine served in the historic Clifford Building. Forty-six-ounce margaritas, fajitas, half-pound burgers, and more. $–$$

Sushi-Zushi
203 S. St. Mary ST
As the old Japanese proverb says, if you have the pleasant experience of eating something you haven’t tasted before, your life will be extended by 75 days. Multiply that by all the new spectacular taste encounters you will have at Sushi-Zushi, and you will add significant life extension on top of a sensational dining experience! $–$$

Swig Martini Bar
429 E. Commerce ST
This bar pours more than 40 varieties of liquor, and a Lava Lamp Lounge. Topping it all off is Polly Esther’s Culture Club on the third floor. Take a nostalgia trip back to the ’80s, complete with black-light bars and a laser-lit Purple Rain dance floor.

Drinking

Durty Nelly’s
200 South Alamo ST
When you think of San Antonio, you don’t necessarily think of an Irish pub, do you? Well, think again. Durty Nelly’s, located on the River Walk on the river level of the Hilton Hotel, is a rollicking good time. Pull up a chair, order a beer (or two, or ten) and sing along with the pianist. A versatile guy, the pianist takes requests and can play just about anything. Probably the most fun thing to do is lunch on the peanuts and toss the shells on the floor. Yes, it is allowed!

Houston Street Alehouse
420 East Houston
Central downtown location, beer, martinis, margaritas, and cigars — the Houston Street Alehouse seems to have it all. Featuring decor from the turn of the 19th century as well as the turn of the 20th, this alehouse is a bit of a contradiction. With an extensive list of martinis named after famous streets, 25-plus draft beers, 35-plus bottled beers, and a decent selection of cigars, you won’t soon run out of things to try. A daily happy hour gives you $1 off all drinks from 2 PM–7 PM, and you can enjoy free pizza from 5 PM–8 PM Wednesday–Friday.

Polly Esther’s
212 College ST
Totally retro, totally kitsch, and totally fun. This dance club occupies three floors of a former office building overlooking the River Walk. The first floor features ’90s and current music and is decked out with plenty of mirrors, silver tones, and neon colors. Polly Esther’s Disco holds court on the second floor and features music from the disco era. The ’70s experience is complete with a Saturday Night Fever-style lighted disco floor, a Retrò Race Car bar, and a Lava Lamp Lounge. Topping it all off is Polly Esther’s Culture Club on the third floor. Take a nostalgia trip back to the ’80s, complete with black-light bars and a laser-lit Purple Rain dance floor.

Swig Martini Bar
111 West Crockett
Ultra-chic without trying too hard, Swig is San Antonio’s ultimate martini and cigar bar. The full-service bar features more varieties of potent martinis than you can count. Along with delicious hors d’oeuvres, Swig offers the cigar aficionado perhaps the most complete humidor on the River Walk. Live jazz adds zizzle to the ambiance each night. This is easily one of the best spots to either start your evening or wind it down.

Zinc Champagne & Wine Bar
207 North Presa ST
This bar pours more than 40 varieties of wine available by the glass, including more than five varieties of champagne. If none of those suits you, you can purchase a bottle of the numerous brandies or liqueurs, or enjoy a premium mixed drink from the fully stocked bar. Beautiful but small, Zinc has a nifty little eater, yet friendly, feel. It is as if you have discovered the claque and have been welcomed. Its crowds are small, even though it is just one block off the beaten path of the River Walk.

Instituto de Mexicano/Mexican Cultural Institute
600 HemisFair Park
The Institute’s mission is to promote the Mexican culture in order to strengthen the ties of friendship and understanding between our two countries. The Institute has a complete program offering the rich artistic expressions of Mexico for review. Program activities include visual arts, exhibitions, concerts, lectures, workshops, and movies. Closed on Mondays.

La Villita/Little Village
Between Presta and S. Alamo ST on Nueva ST
In the center of downtown San Antonio sit the preserved and restored remnants of the original “Little Village” of San Antonio, La Villita. Built by the Republic of Texas in the 1870s, the historic riverside settlement is now home to artisans, small shops, and restaurants.

San Antonio Museum of Art
200 West Jones AVE
Housed in what was once the Lone Star Brewery, this museum boasts fairly comprehensive collections of both ancient and Asian art. The Nelson A. Rockefeller Center for Latin American Art displays what is probably one of the most impressive collections of pre-Columbian, Spanish colonial, and Latin-American modern and folk art in the United States. On Sundays, the museum sponsors education workshops for children, in which they can create their own pieces of art to display at home. The museum also plays host to touring exhibits, such as one featuring Egyptian artifacts on loan from Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts.

San Antonio Zoo & Aquarium
3903 N. St. Mary ST
Ranked as one of the best in the nation, this zoo exhibits over 3,500 animals of 750 different species. At the headwaters of the San Antonio River, it encompasses 35 landscaped acres. It includes one of the largest bird collections in the world, and is the only American zoo to exhibit the endangered whooping crane. A new “Gibbons Forest” exhibit opened in 2001. The zoo also offers boat rides.

University of Texas Institute of Texan Cultures
801 South Bonnie ST
An educational San Antonio center dedicated to the contributions of the diverse eth- nic groups in Texas and borne out of the 1968 World’s Fair, the Institute of Texan Cultures includes exhibits featuring the cultural contributions of the more than 27 cultures that settled the state of Texas. лечение.

Religious Studies News — AAR Edition

6 • May 2004 AAR RSN
Where to Stay in San Antonio

Homewood Suites by Hilton–Riverwalk

432 West Market ST (3 blocks from convention center)

The Homewood Suites by Hilton is an all-suite hotel located on the banks of the beautiful San Antonio Riverwalk. It is a one-25-story high-rise building that was the original home of the San Antonio Drug Company and is listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Amenities include: fully equipped kitchen in each room, in-room Internet access, business center, iron/board, hairdryer, free breakfast, free newspaper, fitness center, free shuttle service to and from downtown. Room rates per night: $107 double, $110 triple, $116 quadruple.

Emily Morgan

705 E. Houston ST (4 blocks from convention center)
The Emily Morgan Hotel provides lodging accommodations next door to the Alamo and just steps away from the San Antonio River Walk. Cited as one of the finest examples of Gothic Revival architecture in America, it served for a long period as a medical arts building. In fact, if you look very closely, terra cotta gargoyles hanging over the ground floor windows hint at turrets and other medical maladies. Amenities include: bar/lounge, voicemail, iron/board, hairdryer, free newspaper, phone with data port, fitness center, business center. Room rates per night: $114 single, $124 double, $134 triple, $144 quadruple.

The Historic Menger

204 Alamo PL (2.5 blocks from convention center)

This hotel has more history behind it than some cities. William McAllister, an Irish brewer, built the first two floors of the hotel in 1859, making this one of the oldest hostelries in America still in its original form. Over the years the building has been added to until it encompassed a full city block across the street from the Alamo. President from 1824 Ulysses S. Grant to Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon have stayed here, as have famous writers and sports figures. Most recently, Prince Charles visited his Rough Riders in the Menger Bar and stayed here while he trained his troops at nearby Fort Sam Houston. Modern-day pundits have said they have found his ghost return to the dark little barroom off the main lobby. Teddy Roosevelt visited the only ghost — the Menger Bar, that all-day lounge and bar of one of the most haunted hotels in the U.S. A former San Antonio resident, O. Henry included the hotel in several of his short stories. Amenities include coffee maker, iron/board, in-room Internet access, hairdryer, safe in room, laundry service available, business center, fitness center. Room rates per night: $107 single, $107 double, $107 quadruple.

Sheraton Gunter

204 E. Houston ST (6 blocks from convention center)
The Sheraton Gunter Hotel was built in 1909 and once served cattle and oil barons. Recently renovated, the hotel has its own full-service upscale restaurant and bar, a large gift shop, banquet facilities, and an evening pub lounge with a big-screen TV and “happy hour” buffet. It also boasts a heated pool, exercise room, sundry and bath and five plants, it still hasn’t lost its sense of Old West charm. Amenities include: coffeemaker, iron/board, in-room Internet access, hairdryer, safe in room, laundry service available, business center, fitness center. Room rates per night: $99 single, $120 double, $130 triple, $140 quadruple.

Marriott Rivercenter ★ Headquarters Hotel ★ 101 Bowie ST

The Marriott Rivercenter is all about location. Nestled next to the convention center and connected to the Rivercenter Mall. It is on the River Walk, with easy access to shopping and entertainment, and across the street from the convention center and the Marriott Riverwalk Hotel. Annual Meeting sessions will be held in the hotel’s beautiful meeting room space. Amenities include: bar/lounge, coffee maker, iron/board, in-room Internet access, hairdryer, safe in room, laundry service available, business center, fitness center. Room rates per night: $127 single, $145 double, $166 triple, $186 quadruple.

Marriott Riverwalk ★ Headquarters Hotel ★ 711 E River Walk ST

A luxurious convention hotel, the Marriott Riverwalk offers the same excellent service and location as its sister hotel, the Marriott Rivercenter. Located across the street from the convention center and the Marriott Rivercenter, some Annual Meeting sessions will be held in this hotel. Amenities include: coffee maker, iron/board, in-room Internet access, hairdryer, safe in room, laundry service available, business center, fitness center. Room rates per night: $137 single, $157 double, $166 triple, $186 quadruple.

Hilton Palacio del Rio ★ 200 South Alamo ST (across the street from convention center)
The Hilton Palacio del Rio is ideally located across the street from the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center and along the famous River Walk. As the longest consecutive recipient of the AAA Four Diamond Award, in San Antonio from 1972 to present, the Hilton Palacio del Rio offers unmatched service and extensive guest amenities, such as private balconies in all rooms, an exquisite view of the Spanish provincial decor features Mexican onyx and brass, and infaid mesquite floors with white oak. Amenities include: coffee maker, iron/board, high-speed Internet in room, free newspaper, microwave oven, refrigerator. Room rates per night: $136 single, $154 double, $175 triple, $195 quadruple.

Hyatt Regency San Antonio 123 San Antonio ST (2 blocks from convention center)

There’s something stimulating about all that glass and steel rising from this hotel’s lobby, where the Hyatt’s signature cage elevators ascend and descend the sky-lit atrium. Maybe it’s airiness that determines the difference between a hotel that’s bustling and one that just feels overcrowded; this one’s definitely bustling, both with business travelers and families who enjoy its convenience to all the downtown attractions. The San Antonio River runs through the lobby with dramatic effect. Guest rooms, done in light woods with white oak. Amenities include: wireless Internet, phone dataport, hairdryer, laund- dry/ironing equipment, fitness center, coffee maker, express checkout, voicemail. Room rates per night: $122 single, $140 double, $161 triple, $181 quadruple.

Plaza San Antonio – A Marriott Hotel 555 South Alamo ST (2.5 blocks from convention center)

At Marriott’s Plaza San Antonio Hotel, you’ll discover a luxury resort atmosphere in a unique downtown setting. Nestled on six acres of sun-bathed courtyards, century-old oaks, sparkling fountains, lush gardens, and free-roaming Chinese pheasants and peacocks, the Plaza offers an enchant- ing atmosphere and unparalleled service. Just steps from the famed River Walk and only three blocks from the historic Alamo, this dump is perfect for that getaway or leisure travelers alike. Rated “excellent” in all categories by Zagat, they strive to pro- vide the level of comfort and service befitting the level of comfort and service befitting the top four-diamond hotels in the U.S. Amenities include: bar/lounge, complimentary shoeshine service, dataport phone, voicemail, coffee maker, fitness center, complimentary bicycles, iron/board, complimentary paper. Room rates per night: $125 single, $141 double, $152 triple, $162 quadruple.

The St. Anthony – A Wyndham Historic Hotel 300 E Travis ST (6 blocks from convention center)

At the St. Anthony, you’ll experience a world of luxury and grace on only once available to a lucky few. Built in 1909, this beautiful hotel was awarded AAA Four Diamond Award for excellence 14 years in a row. For nearly a century, the St. Anthony has greeted guests to Texas with timeless elegance and first-class service. Beautifully restored, the hotel’s lavish carpets, bronze, and works of art from around the world recall a bygone era. Whether you stroll among French Empire antiques in the Peacock Alley promenade, you can almost hear the music of a black-tie ball as you step back in time. Amenities include: coffee maker, hairdryer, iron/board, dataport phone, complimentary newspaper, voicemail, business center, express check-out. Room rates per night: $112 single, $132 double, $142 triple, $152 quadruple.

The Westin Riverwalk 420 W Market ST (2.5 blocks from convention center)

Opened in late 1999, this ultraluxury prop- erty was designed to blend in architectural- ly, yet set itself apart. The River Walk, with its clean, elegant lines are arrayed to 21st-century sensibilities. From the lobby to the rooms, earth tones are in- stance with Spanish colonial accents to cre- ate an atmosphere that’s soothing without being bland. Rooms are small, but they make up for it with the latest in-room amenities, including the latest in Internet access. Amenities include: high-speed Internet access, coffee maker, Heavenly Bed, business center, hairdryer, in-room safe, iron/board. Room rates per night: $125 single, $143 double, $143 triple, $143 quadruple.

These hotels are known best for providing good rooms, clean, basic rooms at reasonable rates. The AAR has negotiated some spec- tacularly low prices for the Annual Meeting.

AmeriSuites Riverwalk

601 S. St. Mary’s ST (1 mile from convention center)

AmeriSuites include: free breakfast buffet, laundry/valet service, iron & ironing board, fitness center, valet parking, coffee maker, high-speed Internet in room, free newspaper, microwave oven, refriger- ator. Room rates per night: $94 single, $104 double, $115 triple, $125 quadruple.

Drury Inn & Suites – Riverwalk

201 N. St. Mary’s ST (5 blocks from convention center)

Free breakfast buffet, laundry/valet service, iron & ironing board, fitness center, vocal steel, hairdryer, coffee maker, high-speed Internet in room, business center. Room rates per night: $121 single, $141 double, $152 triple, $162 quadruple.

Hampton Inn Downtown

414 Bowie ST (3.5 blocks from convention center)

Amenities include: free breakfast, free newspaper, in-room coffee maker, vocalist, irons. Hairdryers are available on request. Laundry/laundry service. Room rates per night: $120 single, $120 double, $120 triple, $120 quadruple.

Holiday Inn Crockett

320 Bonham ST (3 blocks from convention center)

The Historic Crockett Hotel, located in the heart of downtown San Antonio, is adjacent to the Alamo and across the street from the Rivercenter Mall. Built in 1909 and steeped in Texas tradition and history, this landmark and its staff will make your stay in San Antonio a memorable one. Amenities include: free breakfast buffet, free newspaper, laundry/valet service, iron & ironing board, complimentary shoeshine service, dataport phone, voicemail, coffee maker, fitness center, complimentary bicycles, iron/board, complimentary paper. Room rates per night: $125 single, $141 double, $152 triple, $162 quadruple.
VER THE LAST several years, the Academy’s Academic Relations Task Force has conducted six workshops for department chairs, usually in conjunction with the Annual Meeting. The goal of these workshops is to support department chairs and other institutional leaders in managing and strengthening their academic units. The response year after year has been overwhelmingly positive, and the Academy looks forward to continuing this tradition in the years to come.

During the 1999 Annual Meeting, we offered a workshop on “Department Review.” During the 2000 Annual Meeting, we offered a workshop in Nashville entitled “Assessing and Advancing the Religious Studies Department.” The next year in Denver the topic was “Evaluating and Advancing Teaching.”

One of our most popular workshops, “Running a Successful Faculty Search,” was held in Toronto in 2002. It was conducted by two nationally recognized scholars who had published and spoken about hiring faculty, teaching, and faculty development: Baron Peilman and Lee McCAIN, both of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh. The workshop focused on the process of recruiting faculty who will be a good fit for a given department and institution, and who have the potential to be good teachers. Emphasis was placed on practical information and exercises. The discussion was organized as follows:

1. The Educational Context for Recruiting: • Recruiting in Higher Education • Ethical Guidelines in Recruiting Planning; Taking Stock and Looking Ahead
2. Good Teaching and Scholarship: • The Unique Nature of Your Position • Recognizing Good Teaching • The Teaching Portfolio • Evaluating Scholarship
3. The Search: • Organizing the Search Committee and Getting Started • Developing a Pool of Candidates • Screening Candidates and Selecting Seminalists • Identifying Final Candidates and Selecting Campus Visitors • The Campus Visit • Concluding the Search: Hiring, Reopening, or Closing • Retaining Your New Hire

Each of the participants at this workshop received a complimentary copy of the speakers’ book, Recruiting Good College Faculty: Practical Advice for a Successful Search (Anker Publishing Company, 1996).

In July 2003 we offered a two and one-half day workshop at Georgetown University entitled “The Entrepreneurial Chair: Building and Managing Your Department in an Era of Shrinking Resources and Increasing Demands.” It was not affiliated with an Annual Meeting, yet the turnout was equally high. It featured three plenary speakers and several breakout sessions.

4. Georgetown Dean and AAR President-elect Jane McAuslin discussed how to work with the dean.
5. Founding Director of the Wabash Center, Raymond Williams, talked about teaching and learning.
6. University of Rochester Dean William S. Green discussed the role of the chair in building a religious studies department.

The breakout sessions focused on:

• Retaining, promoting, and tenuring good faculty
• Effective ways to mentor junior faculty
• Making faculty evaluations helpful

Due to the thoughtful insights of the attendees, as well as the enthusiasm of the leaders, all of the above themes resulted in constructive and lively discussions. Each of the attendees received a complimentary copy of The Department Chair as Academic Leader by Irene W. D. Hecht, Mary Lou Higgerson, Walter H. Gmelch, and Allan Tucker (American Council on Education/Oryx Press, 1998).

Last year at the Annual Meeting in Atlanta we offered a daylong workshop, “Scholarship, Service, and Stress: The Experience of Being a Chair.” It opened with Laurie Patton (Emory University) speaking on identity and leadership, followed by a three-person panel composed of Ellen Armou (Rhodes College), Joel Gerboff (Arizona State University), and Patricia Killen (Pacific Lutheran University) discussing professional identity. In the afternoon a two-person panel made up of Terrence Tilley (University of Dayton) and Karen Jo Torsveen (Claremont Graduate University) addressed leadership styles and department cultures. The workshop ended with Laurie Patton discussing discernment.

Our next workshop will be offered in San Antonio on Friday, November 19, on the topic “Being a Chair in Today’s Consumer Culture: Navigating in the Knowledge Factory.” This workshop will address the increasing commercialization of the university, and how chairs can operate in a university’s consumer culture. Details regarding this workshop will become available in late spring on the Academy’s Web site, and will also appear in the Annual Meeting Program Book. For more information, see the article on page 4.

Examples of the types of administrators who have benefited from our chairs workshops include:

• New chairs seeking to learn what it takes to be a good chair
• Seasoned chairs looking to sharpen their leadership abilities
• Campus teams looking to help their institutions
• Deans seeking to improve their working relationship with chairs
• Seasoned chairs who are grooming their successors.

There is no shortage of challenges facing the academic chair today; and at the Academy we will endeavor to address as many of the pressing issues as we can go forward. If you are an administrator, we hope you will join us for one of our future workshops. We know you will find it worthwhile. Details about the workshops can be found at: www.aarweb.org/ department/workshops.asp.

Departments enrolled in the Academic Relations Program receive one complimentary registration to these workshops, which can be used by the chair or a designee. For further information on how to enroll in the Academy’s Academic Relations Program go to www.aarweb.org/ departmentscadrel.asp.

Religion Reporters Rank Top News Stories of 2003

Kyle Cole, American Academy of Religion

THE NATION’S LEADING religion reporters overwhelmingly chose the Episcopal Church’s ordination of its first openly gay bishop as the top religion news story of 2003.

Bishop Gene Robinson’s election fueled threats of a schism both in the United States Episcopal Church and throughout the Anglican communion, and sparked emergency meetings within the church.

More than 80 percent of the journalists, who all cover religion in the secular news media, also selected Robinson as their Religion News Association’s (RNA) ranked the top religion news stories of 2003.

1. Episcopal Church approves and then ordains first openly gay bishop, sparking threats of a schism both in

the United States and throughout the Anglican Communion, and leading to emergency meetings. The bishop of New Westminster Diocese in British Columbia draws criticism for approving same-sex unions.

2. Pending war in Iraq splits religious communities; most mainline denominations, led by the National Council of Churches, oppose it, while many evangelicals support it. Religious groups sponsor follow-up relief efforts.

3. Definition of marriage becomes a hot topic in the Massachusetts Supreme Court overturns a gay-marriage ban; a constitutional amendment on marriage is proposed. Earlier, the United States Supreme Court strikes down a ban against homosexual sodomy in Texas, and Ontario’s highest court legalizes gay marriage.

4. Ten Commandments monument is finally removed from Alabama Judicial Building after state vs. church debate. Chief Justice Roy Moore, its proponent, is removed from office.

5. Roman Catholic Church seeks to implement plans to combat sex abuse by priests; efforts bring both praise and criticism. Sean Patrick O’Malley of Palm Beach succeeds Bernard Law in Boston and earns high marks. Convicted sex-abuser John Geoghan is killed in prison.

6. Pope John Paul II celebrates the 25th anniversary of his election, but growing concerns about his health capture the spotlight, and debate over his eventual successor intensifies.

7. Slumping economy forces budget cutbacks in many denominations.

8. Presbyterian Church (USA) retains “Fidelity and Chastity” clause after lengthy debate; elects first clergy-woman moderator.

9. The United States Supreme Court agrees to hear this term a California case that challenges the inclusion of the words “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance.

10. The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod overturns the suspension of New York President David Benke for participating in an interfaith service after 9/11; a similar case involving Valparaiso University ends in an apology. A showdown on the subject is expected in 2004.

RNA members ranked 28 news items in a survey conducted December 12–16, 2003. About one-third of the group’s 240 members responded. They have ranked religion stories each year for about three decades. RNA membership is comprised of print and broadcast reporters whose primary responsibility is the coverage of religion in the secular media.†
On March 15 and 16, over 130 humanities advocates descended on Capitol Hill to speak with members of Congress and their staff on behalf of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and other issues of concern to the scholarly community.

The annual event known as Humanities Advocacy Day is sponsored by the National Humanities Alliance (NHA) and is co-sponsored by some 35 organizations, including the American Academy of Religion. Now in its fifth year, Humanities Advocacy Day is developing a network of humanities advocates from across the country and from a variety of institutions, including colleges and universities, humanities institutes, scholarly societies, state humanities councils, libraries, and museums.

The primary focus of the event was advocacy for federal appropriations for the NEH, the largest single funder of humanities programs in the United States. This year, NHA advocates were seeking congressional support for $162 million for the NEH included in President Bush’s proposed 2005 budget. Last year the president’s original request for NEH was $152 million. The $162 million request represents a 20 percent increase over the final 2004 appropriation of $135.3 million and includes $35 million for the “We the People” initiative.

“We the People” aims to educate Americans about U.S. history and encourages scholars, teachers, filmmakers, curators, and librarians to submit grants applications that explore significant events and themes in U.S. history and culture, and that advance knowledge of the principles that define America. For more information about this new program, see www.we-the-people.gov.

On the afternoon of March 15, the NHA arranged a policy briefing for participants. Amended drew from speakers who passed along some practical advice on making congressional visas and how to be an effective advocate. Participants were also briefed on a number of pending issues of concern to the scholarly community including funding needs for such history/archival entities as the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Institute for Museum and Library Services, Foreign Language and Area Studies, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). At the end of the day, participants were encouraged to call their congressional offices about the NEH budget proposal and to call their senators and representatives about other pending issues.

On March 16, the NHA sponsored multiple visits to capitol offices to speak directly with congressional staff about pending issues of concern to the scholarly community. The afternoon’s events included a visit to the offices of the Library of Congress, The House of Representatives, The Senate, and White House.

Participants were also briefed on the current appropriations climate and given a chance to practice their skills in face-to-face advocacy.

This was a real opportunity for me to see the legislative funding process from the inside . . . I came away with a better understanding of the role of government in funded research.

International Education Programs under Title VI, and Teaching American History Grants.

The last speaker, Michael Stephens, Minority Staff Director of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies of the House Appropriations Committee, spoke in detail about the current appropriations climate. Stephens indicated that, as a starting point for humanities appropriations, he felt “things were about as positive as any year” in terms of the president’s proposal but then warned participants “not to be fooled into thinking that this robust start will indeed materialize.” Stephens stated that it is “hard to be optimistic,” as there is a huge deficit and members of Congress are challenged as to how best to get a handle on it.

He also reported that largely because of the pending presidential election, “partnership is at an all-time high” and as a result “analytic arguments” that have helped the cause of humanities may not prove as effective in this political environment as they have in the past. He also noted that only a few appropriations bills (Interior, which includes the NEH budget line; being one) have a chance of being finalized prior to the election. Instead, Stephens expected that Congress would pass a series of continuing resolutions to put off tough decisions until after the November elections.

In the evening, during the NHA-sponsored reception, NEH Chairman Bruce Cole addressed the group. The NEH then honored Representative Louise M. Slaughter (D-NY) by presenting her with the Sidney R. Myesha D. Jenkins, American Academy of Religion

Alcolm David Eckel has been appointed the new Coordinator of Juries for the AAR’s Award for Excellence in the Study of Religion book award program. The coordinator appoints as jurors AAR members who have a broad grasp of religious studies, who are recognized for their expertise in one or more of its subfields, and whose fairness and critical judgment are widely respected in the profession.

For more information about the Awards for Excellence in the Study of Religion program, visit www.aarweb.org/awards/bookjuries.asp.
Samford University Department of Religion

Kenneth B. E. Roxburgh, Chair

The department has also recently received a grant from the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion to engage in a 16-month process of teaching and learning.

Roxburgh: In pursuit of project goals, proposed activities include a commissioned essay on the post-World War II departmental culture at Samford, and a consultation on teaching, and a consultation on teaching and religion departments.

Roxburgh: We will take part in a two-day departmental retreat on vocation and disciplin ary directions, discussions with alumni and students, and a consultation with other Samford core faculty. We hope to arrange two site visits to exemplary religion departments, an off-campus, three-day Consultation on Teaching for Mission, pedago gical experimentation and evaluation, and research and writing on teaching and religion.

RSN: What are your hopes for the process?

Roxburgh: New ways of being a department are expected to emerge. These might include new courses, new pedagogical approaches, new forms of instructional technology, new partnerships with each other and faculty outside our department, and new departmental forms and practices that nurture an enabling environment for faculty and students alike.

Furthermore, the department will work closely with the Samford in Mission project to provide theological, biblical, and historical reflection on vocation, faith, and learning. Indeed, it is hoped that the Religion Department will become a model of teaching for mission at Samford University.

We hope that the results of our work together will be disseminated through one or two articles for Theological and Ethical Inquiry, or perhaps an article for the Chronicle of Higher Education, a summer seminar or workshop for faculty at Samford University offered in conjunction with the Samford in Mission program, and a session at the American Academy of Religion on teaching and learning in religion. One might even be the development of a book proposal based on either a single Samford case study or multiple case studies from church-related colleges and Christian universities.

RSN: What gives you the greatest satisfaction as chair?

Roxburgh: I like being involved in people’s lives. I try to take time to have coffee and eat lunch with faculty members on a regular basis. I try to get to know them and any issues that have arisen within the classroom or the university as a whole. I try to be a good advocate for the department in the wider life of the College of Arts and Sciences. I adopt an open-door policy and hope that faculty members feel free to speak to me about any issue that arises within their lives. One of the enjoyable aspects of our life together is our regular Friday lunch-time meetings at the University Cafe, where we have the opportunity to catch up with news, discuss current affairs, share experiences of teaching, and dream about the future development of the department.
Beyond the Annual Meeting

Religion in the Schools Task Force
Marcia Beauchamp, California Institute of Integral Studies

RSN: Tell us, what does your committee do?
Beauchamp: The Religion in the Schools Task Force is concerned with furthering the AAR’s goals to foster excellence in teaching about religion, furthering the future of the academic study of religion, and contributing to its public understanding by facilitating access to resources for secondary and elementary school teachers involved in teaching about religion.

RSN: It seems so obvious, but let me ask, what makes the work of this committee important for the Academy?
Beauchamp: It seems to me that the work of the Religion in the Schools Task Force is important to the Academy because of the growing religious diversity of America’s classrooms from the earliest grades, and our consequent need to prepare teachers to address both the resulting classroom dynamics and the growing presence of religion content throughout the curriculum. The Academy will undoubtedly benefit if more students entering colleges and universities have some basic understanding of religion’s role in history, literature, art, and current events, as well as other subjects covered in elementary and secondary education. The desire for materials to teach accurately and sensitively about Islam following the events of 9/11 is an example of the need for this kind of information.

RSN: What contributions have different members made?
Beauchamp: So far our members have partnered with public and private school teachers to develop curricula through the recent CASTL grants, have organized preconference workshops in teaching about religion during the last four Annual Meetings, and have written articles and conducted courses on relevant topics for teachers.

RSN: What have been some of the major initiatives of the committee?
Beauchamp: One very successful initiative was the CASTL grant lesson-plan development, done collaboratively with teachers, which is now available on the AAR Web site. We are also planning to facilitate discussions among interested AAR members and education faculty at their institutions to investigate collaborative cross-disciplinary studies.

RSN: What is it about the work of the committee that matters to you?
Beauchamp: Having been both a public school teacher and a professor at the college level, I am aware of the widespread religious illiteracy in our country, which is occurring at the same time our religious pluralism is exploding. With our unique American constitutional protection for religious freedom, which includes the separation of church and state, our schools have become a crucial laboratory in the ongoing experiment in liberty. I am convinced that the future of our democracy is largely dependent on how well our system of public and private elementary and secondary schools addresses these issues, and prepares students to become responsible citizens in a pluralistic nation.

RSN: What would you say to someone interested in your committee?

From the Student Desk

The AAR Wants You!
Kimberly Breler, Princeton Theological Seminary

Kimberly Breler is a doctoral candidate at Princeton Theological Seminary in Princeton, New Jersey, and is Student Director of the AAR. She can be reached at kimberly.breler@ptsem.edu

M Y SECOND AAR Annual Meeting (Atlanta 2003) was far busier than my first (Toronto 2002) — and far warmer, too! Being newly elected as incoming student director for 2004-06, I had many people to meet and plans to make for the coming year. Under the able leadership of Rich Amesbury, student director for 2001-03, and with the considerable help of Shannon Planck, our former AAR staff liaison, the Student Liaison Group (SLG) was able to offer more programming at the 2003 Annual Meeting directed specifically to students than ever before. In addition to offering the Student Lounge and Student Members’ Reception, the SLG also offered:

• an Introduction to Syllabus Writing
• the ever-popular Wabash Student-Teacher Lunches
• "Putting Your PhD to Work: Alternative Careers for Religion Graduates"
• “Top Ten Ways to Survive Your First Year on the Job.”

In addition, other groups sponsored “Money Matters: A Professional Development Workshop Geared toward Early Career Decisions,” “The Use and Abuse of Adjunct Faculty in Religious Studies,” and a mentoring session with the Women’s Caucus and the Status of Women in the Profession Committee.

The discussion at our SLG Business Meeting indicated strong support for continuing this wide variety of programming options for students. Of course, the success of such offerings depends entirely upon the willingness of people like you — yes, I mean you — to contribute your time and talents to preparing and presenting such fine programs. It also depends, in some cases, on generous contributions from sponsors like the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion. If you are a reader of this issue of Religious Studies News — and this includes everyone, not just students — then you are someone who can be involved more fully in AAR programming for students. We rely on the dedication of our elders for mentoring, advice, and the lessons of experience, such as Bill Pachler provided in the discussion of syllabus writing this year. We look to those engaged in specialized fields of research for insights into student concerns, such as those provided by John Curtis of the American Association of University Professors in the discussion of the use and abuse of adjuncts. We also rely on behind-the-scenes persuasion and organization by students, and particularly student liaisons, to bring together quality presentations.

We are already busy at work planning student programming for next year’s Annual Meeting, but new ideas and suggestions are always welcome. Of course, the chance of favorable action on your suggestion increases dramatically if you also volunteer to help implement your idea!

If you have some expertise on one of these topics or on another that might be of interest to students in the AAR — or if you know someone who does — I urge you to consider how you or your acquaintance can contribute to the planning or presentation of this topic, either at the 2004 Annual Meeting in San Antonio or the 2005 Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. The AAR is entering a time of both opportunities and challenges, as we move toward stand-alone meetings apart from the SBL in 2008. Take advantage of this historic transition to figure out how you can become more involved in promoting excellence in your chosen field and profession by building up those who have committed themselves to teaching and learning about religion. I look forward to working more closely with all of you in the coming years. See you in San Antonio!"
The AAR is grateful for these loyal contributors whose gifts support our goals.

This list reflects donations received from July 1, 2003 through March 15, 2004.
Caucus to Meet under New Auspices

Stephen R. Haynes, Rhodes College

The CAUCUS OF SCHOLARS at Religiously Affiliated Institutions (RAI) was initiated in 1998 to offer a forum at the Annual Meeting for teacher-scholars who labor in RAIs to meet, build professional networks, and discuss issues of common concern. Each year since 1999 the Caucus has convened between the morning and early afternoon program sessions. Approximately 50 teacher-scholars enjoy a buffet luncheon, renew friendships, and discuss the particular challenges and opportunities associated with teaching religion and theology at an RAI.

Since its inception, the Caucus has enjoyed strong support from the AAR executive staff, including the AAR Academic Relations Task Force (with whom the Caucus co-sponsored a special topics forum in 2002), and the Lilly Endowment (which funded the annual luncheon with a generous grant). At the recent luncheon in Atlanta, however, it was announced that Lilly funding for the Caucus has come to an end.

Paul Myhre, Associate Director of the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Religion and Theology, suggested that the group join forces with the Center. That suggestion led to discussions between the leadership of the Wabash Center and the Caucus. The result is that, beginning with the 2004 Annual Meeting in San Antonio, the Caucus will meet under the auspices of the Wabash Center and will focus on the unique opportunities and challenges associated with teaching and learning religion at religiously affiliated institutions.

While the Caucus luncheon has attracted over 100 different participants since 1999, the group remains a relatively well-kept secret. Our advertising has consisted of a listing in the additional meetings section of the program book, an e-mail invitation to previous attendees, and word-of-mouth invitations. But given how many members of the Academy work in RAIs (over 50 percent, according to the recent AAR census), there is potential for considerable growth.

Thus we invite anyone who is interested in learning more about the Caucus to join us for a free luncheon in San Antonio. To reserve a spot, simply e-mail Haynes@rhodes.edu. For more information about the Caucus, contact a member of the steering committee (Richard Hughes, Pepperdine University; Elizabeth Newman, Baptist Theological Seminary at Richland; Lynn Japeng, Hope College; Keith Graber Miller, Goshen College; John Carey, Agnes Scott College (emeritus); Bill Cahoy, St. John’s University; Bill Leonard, Wake Forest University; and Peg Cowan, Maryville College).
Ursula King, STL, Paris, MA (Duke), PhD (London), FRSA, is Professor Emerita and Senior Research Fellow at the University of Bristol, where she held the Chair in Theology and Religious Studies from 1989–2002, after teaching for many years at the University of Leeds, in London, and in India. She was Visiting Professor in Feminist Theology at the University of Oslo (1998–2003) and, during the fall semester of 1999, she held the Charles Briggsman Chair in Ecumenical Theology and Interreligious Dialogue at Xavier University, Cincinnati. She is currently also an Associate Member of the Institute for Advanced Studies at the University of Bristol and a Professorial Research Fellow of the Centre for Gender and Religious Research at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. She works as a consultant on gender and religion studies for the editors of the Macmillan Encyclopaedia of Religion (New York, 2005).

She has published numerous books and articles, especially on the French thinker Pierre Teilhard de Chardin; her first book was Towards a New Mysticism: Teilhard de Chardin and Eastern Religions (Collins and Harper & Row, 1980). Among her recent publications are Christian Mystics (Routledge, 2004); the edited volumes Gender, Religion and Diversity (co-edited with Tina Beattie, Continuum, 2005); Religious Women (Academic Press, 2003), and Gender, Religion and Conscience (Routledge, 1998); and the 1996 Bampton Lectures at the University of Oxford: Christ in All Things: Exploring Spirituality with Teilhard de Chardin (SCM Press and Orbis Books, 1997) and Spirit of Fire: The Life and Vision of Teilhard de Chardin (Orbis Books, 1996). She has contributed to many broadcasts and TV programmes. Her current research is concerned with aspects of contemporary spirituality and with comparative gender perspectives in different world religions. She has been honorary avoidant doctors from Edinburgh University (1996), Oslo University (2000), and the University of Dayton, Ohio (2003).

**RSN:** Can you tell us about your work on religion and gender studies, especially your work in feminist theology in Great Britain?

**King:** Nobody starts with gender studies. We all travel a long way to get there. That is certainly true of my own studies, spread over several countries, if not continents. As a student in the late 1950s I met, especially in France and later in England, several outstanding women leaders who had been active in the early women’s movement and were still working to change women’s position in society and in the churches — women lawyers, professors, doctors, journalists, activists. They greatly inspired me when I was studying theology, philosophy, literature, and religion. And I also read English social history and learned much about the 19th-century women’s movement; I even met some of the old suffragettes who had been to prison because of their campaign to gain voting rights for women! Feminist theology and gender studies in the technical sense didn’t exist then. I first wrote some articles on women in the church, and on women in world religions, from the mid-60s onwards. My experience was greatly enhanced by the ten-year edited volume Women in the World’s Religions (1987).

Later, in 1984, I was invited to give the first broadcast Hibbert Lecture on BBC Radio 4, and this grew into a book, Women and Spirituality: Voices of Protest and Prayer (1991), which gave an overview of the discussions then taking place in feminist theology and spirituality, but with a much larger dimension to it. I was then asked by a publisher to edit a sequel to an existing reader in feminist theology, which became my widely used textbook Feminist Theology from the Third World (1994), dealing with the wide diversity of feminist theologies across the different continents of the world. I used all this material in my own courses on feminist theology in a global context, especially after moving to the University of Bristol in 1989, where I also developed a course on religion and gender (against the opposition of some of my colleagues). In the late 80s gender studies began to provide exciting and challenging new paradigms for the study of religions. I met considerable resistance when I suggested a panel on religion and gender for the XVth International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions in Antwerp in 1990. But it did take place and was a venture well worth taking, as it led to an excellent collaboration between international women scholars, and eventually produced the edited volume Religion and Gender (Blackwell, 1993). This experience led me to research on women’s roles in religion and gender studies. But while at Bristol, I was invited to a position as a visiting chair in feminist theology at the University of Oslo (1999–2002), an experience I greatly enjoyed, as I learnt so much from the collaboration with Scandinavian scholars and appreciated the international atmosphere and stimulating research seminars with doctoral students. I eventually co-authored a major study of the importance of feminist theology and the significance of critical gender thinking, which was eventually written by my MA students on gender issues in the farm cooperatives and churches of their own country.

**RSN:** Can you tell us about your work on any of the journal advisory boards that you have served on? (for instance, the Journal of Contemporary Religion, Religion and Interfaith Understanding, International Journal of Hindu Studies, Method and Theory in Religion, Religion, and Religious Studies)

**King:** I have undertaken a wide range of work, from reviewing manuscripts and books to refereeing for journal and book articles. Since I travel for my job, I have done, although this is still a necessity, given women’s disadvantaged position in society and scholarship. But “gender” is not a synonym for women, as I hope my overview article on “Gender and Religion” will make clear. I helped with shaping the choice of entries, and writing the scope descriptions for the entire encyclopedia. But the whole experience is a very revealing experience — maybe I will write about this one day — but it is a deeply satisfying one. I have, however, been getting a certain amount of gender advice and consultancy work seems to have taken over my life. I am not personally directly involved but it is extremely exciting to be a consultant on a new project. I have reached the conclusion that a new gender project is a large grant for a new research project on Gender, Religion and Diversity: Cross-Cultural Perspectives, empire, edited by Ursula King and Tina Beattie, Liverpool University Press, 2004, which discusses many methodological issues in gender studies, shaped by cognitive fields and multidisciplinary perspectives. This is a much broader and more inclusive perspective than that of earlier, exclusively women-centered studies, as it includes work on men and religious diversity and has a global, cross-cultural dimension.

**RSN:** Can you tell us about your work as a consultant on the gender and religion entries for the new revision edition of the Encyclopedia of Religion?

**King:** This is not an easy question, as the consultancy work seems to have taken over my life. I will have to say yes, although this is still a necessity, given women’s disadvantaged position in society and scholarship. But “gender” is not a synonym for women, as I hope my overview article on “Gender and Religion” will be clear. I helped with shaping the choice of entries, and writing the scope descriptions in consultation with a editor-in-chief, suggesting contributors, and liaising with a lot of different scholars. Examining the first edition of the *Encyclopedia* is a very revealing experience — maybe I will write about this one day — but it is a deeply satisfying one. I have reached the conclusion that a new gender project is a large grant for a new research project on Gender, Religion and Diversity: Cross-Cultural Perspectives, empire, edited by Ursula King and Tina Beattie, Liverpool University Press, 2004, which discusses many methodological issues in gender studies, shaped by cognitive fields and multidisciplinary perspectives. This is a much broader and more inclusive perspective than that of earlier, exclusively women-centered studies, as it includes work on men and religious diversity and has a global, cross-cultural dimension.

**RSN:** Can you describe for our readers the work you did as director of the Centre for Comparative Studies in Religion and Gender at Bristol?

**King:** I developed an MA in Religion and Gender program from 1990 onwards, taught in collaboration with several colleagues. The MA was not only taken by women, but also by some male students. This was the case with the gender option for undergraduates. Out of this work developed, from about 1996 onwards, the Centre for Comparative Studies in Religion and Gender (CCSRG), which had several associate members from other universities and also a doctoral program which produced very good results. We published five monographs based on the empirical and theoretical research undertaken at the Centre, organized regular research seminars, some with international guest speakers, and some with international guest speakers. This work on men and religious diversity and has a global, cross-cultural dimension. It was a large grant for a new research project on Gender, Religion and Diversity: Cross-Cultural Perspectives, empire, edited by Ursula King and Tina Beattie, Liverpool University Press, 2004, which discusses many methodological issues in gender studies, shaped by cognitive fields and multidisciplinary perspectives. This is a much broader and more inclusive perspective than that of earlier, exclusively women-centered studies, as it includes work on men and religious diversity and has a global, cross-cultural dimension.
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Ritual Functions and Authority of Brahmins in Early Historic India: The Creation of a Trans-Regional Cultural Elite

Timothy Lubin, Washington and Lee University

Asoka, self-consciously Buddhist, recorded his third century B.C.E. edicts in Pali (which seem to reflect regional variations); Sanskrit begins to appear in inscriptions only in the early second century B.C.E. (dated palaeographically). Surviving examples include a brief record found at Adaylipu (Sircar 1965: 94–95), written by one Dhana-deva, who, perhaps Brahmanically, addresses himself abhuma-tiṣa (and appears to trace his lineage to Puyamastra, founder of the Suṅga dynasty).

Another inscription of this period, found in multiple versions at Hāṭhīghodi and Chālāganj, provides the worship of the Vaiṣṇava deity Śaṅkaraśana and Vaiṣṇava. The spread of sectarian doctrines and cults (Pātañjali, Pāṇini, Śaṅkara) was another form in which Brahmanical authority spread. Here, too, a variant vāstu-formatted served as an initiation and symbol of piety.

During the first century C.E. numerous short inscriptions in Sanskrit (or high languages) appear, particularly from the earliest (Mauryan era) to those of the Gupta age. I am analysing (a) the distribution of benefactions among various Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical groups by region, period, and type of donor; (b) the distribution of languages used in the inscriptions (Sanskrit, Prakritic, Prakrit vernaculars), as well as the formulaic elements used in them; and (c) the markers of social or ethnic status among donors and recipients. For example, it has been noted that the use of Sanskrit for recording benefactions often is introduced by individuals seeking to lay claim to Arya identity, particularly regional rulers on the periphery of the traditional Arya heartland (Ceylon, the “Realm of the Ayas”). This may correlate with the gradual adoption of Sanskrit royal names, both in India (Ramesh and Tewari 1990) and in Southeast Asia (Coedès 1965). Asoka’s grants to Buddhism become common in Sanskrit (or rather in a slightly less Sanskritized form than is generally found in Brahmanical grants).

But the first lengthy inscription in polished, literary Sanskrit is the famous Jayadeva inscription of the mahābāhu Mahārāja Rudradaman. Inscribed on a rock alongside edicts of Asoka, it commemorates Rudradaman’s renovation of an artificial lake described as having been first constructed by Candragupta Maurya and improved by Ashoka. Indeed the inscriptions record this not in Asoka, as Asoka did, but in a Sanskrit prose typical of the classical style (many compounds, few finite verbs). Moreover, he too presents himself as the upholder of dharma, in his case in the Brahmanical sense: An (already stereotypical) attribution to giving support to “cows and brahmins” (as in Rāmatīrtha 1.24, 13 et seq.) is there; Kiēlohn even sees, in a damaged portion, a probable allusion to the first three “aims” of the Pāṇini: dharma, artha, and kāma (line 11). Perhaps the key detail that might throw light on Rudradāman’s motive in having this inscription composed is that it is Asoka’s description of himself as “having attained wide fame for mastering, remembering, understanding, and practicing the great sciences of word-and-meaning, music, logic, and so forth” (Vaibhavakāśyapaparāhāraśabdam ugraśāhvam prāurvedam pārvanāh

A regular indication of suṣṭa, however, seems to be related to the influence of the Western Kṣatrapas.

Thus there is good evidence that a shift to using Sanskrit, the Brahmanical lingua franca, for the business of state was primarily the initiative of foreign rulers — Śrīyudā and Kauṭayāna — anxious to align themselves with their pious, classically erudite patrons: “Aryanāvarta, the “Land of the Aryas.” Once introduced by aristocrats, this policy was fully embraced, in the Brahmanical form of religious and political authority. The power of this spirit is nicely crystallized in a later verse from the Lakkhād Māndāla pravatī of the seventh or eighth century (Dvija Dwādśatā) in which one King Ayāvarman is praised, in the Ayācaya metre, for his Ayācaya piety.


1 Solomon 1998, 276-280.


1 Kielhorn, Arrabal. Inscriptions.

1 Sircar, D. C. “On the Brahmanical Elements in the Mauryan Inscriptions.” Indian Historical Review 9 (1934): 2, 49-60.


1 Sircar, D. C. Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization, vol. 1, ed. R. C. Majumdar. Calcutta: Calcutta University, 1946.

The committee is seeking nominations for the 2004 AAR Award for Excellence in Teaching. Nominations of winners of campus awards, or any other awards, are encouraged. Procedures for the nomination process are outlined on the AAR Web site at www.aarweb.org/awards/teaching.asp.
Robert B. Slocum, Marquette University. AAR thanks members who attended the event. In his meetings Carp reported that "the members, without exception, held positive opinions about the NEH and its work, although they were somewhat more mixed about the role government funding should play in this arena. They stressed that this would be a very difficult budgetary year, because of the deficit and the election but, in general, indicated the likelihood that the NEH would receive some increase in funding, though perhaps not at the level requested by the president." Cole and Planck received the same message from one of their visits.

Carp also noted that "several representatives were interested in the national security and homeland defense benefits of the academic study of religion, both as it enables us to understand religious motives as they are enacted abroad and at home, and as it encourages the study of languages such as Arabic which are now in short supply and long demand."

McGee, an AAR board member, enjoyed her first trip to Humanities Advocacy Day. She told RSN that "I learned a lot. The presentations on Monday helped me figure out better how to deliver and refine my message when we visited the various offices." In the visits, she noted "The congressional aides we met with were both intrigued by and appreciative of the range of issues scholars of religion have investigated that contribute to a deeper understanding of national, local, and global concerns."

The AAR thanks members who attended the events of Humanities Advocacy Day 2004 and invites members to participate next year. For more information, please contact the executive office at aar@aarweb.org or 404-727-3049.
What individual or movement has been the most influential in your intellectual life?

King: There are many strands, so that it is difficult to tease out just one. My World War II experience as an evacuee child in Germany and my early schooling were very important for my later life. So was a German national scholarship that allowed me to study abroad in France, and later in England. But first I studied at the universities of Bonn, Munich, and Tübingen, where I listened to Ernst Bloch’s lectures on hope, and Hans Küng on theology, apart from passing my Hebrew examination. But it was during my first semester in Bonn, in 1958, when I was registered to study theology, philosophy, and German literature, that I found so fascinating, that I walked into a lecture on the phenomenology of religion by Gustav Mensching which I found so fascinating that I stayed the course, and it was there that I first learnt about Mircea Eliade and his *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. This first encounter had a lasting influence on my study of religions.

The Paris of the early 1960s, where I went from Germany, provided an exhilarating environment of great intellectual vitality for the young German post-war woman student I was then. I shall always remember my days at the Sorbonne, the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, the Institut Catholique—Ricoeur examined me on Kant, and encouraged me to go into philosophy; I went to lectures by Merleau-Ponty, Marrou, Danielou, and Cullmann; semi- nars by Gabriel Marcel; and worked with Pierre Hadot. I learnt much about the Western classical tradition, early Christianity, and the great Catholic intellectual tradition associated with Paris in past centuries. Of course, all my professors were men. I had experienced one woman philosopher lecturer in Bonn, and another one in Paris, but I also felt a real sense of liberation when I first heard a brilliant woman sociologist professor lecture to a large audience—a truly inspiring example.

Later it was the discovery of India, of an altogether different cultural world and the rich religious traditions of a continent so different from the Europe I knew, which greatly enriched my intellectual and personal world. I lived and studied there for five years, but also became immersed in interreligious debate and dialogue. Most memorable was my early meeting with the Dalai Lama in Dharamsala, long before he visited the West. It will always remain with me the meaning of wisdom in Buddhism and Christianity, just among three of us.

Most formative of all, long before I encountered gender studies, has been the global vision of the French Jesuit scientist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, first discovered in my Paris years. I have done much research on him since, and his work also influenced my interest in debates on science and religion.

RSN: At what point in your life did you decide you wanted to focus on gender studies?

King: I think I have already answered that question. My concern with gender studies has grown from small beginnings into something much larger. It has become an intellectual passion which has many practical implications, both personal and social, for my writing and lecturing, but also for my family life, which includes my husband, who is an academic in a different field, four daughters, and now three grandchildren of both sexes—a big enough sample to think about gender questions in practice.

RSN: What are your ideas about the current and future condition of gender studies?

King: There exists still much institutional and individual resistance to this new field, often due to misunderstanding or profound ignorance. It is about more than a paradigm shift in all fields—it is really a shaking of the foundations, and that’s perhaps why people are resistant. It is a huge intellectual and social task as it requires the reexamination of all bodies of knowledge and the recasting of personal and social patterns of life, and in religion the abolition of hierarchical and patriarchal forms of beliefs and practices. It will still take a long time before this can be achieved, but we are on the way. I think the need for gender studies is great, and the field is growing in spite of some backlash. A group of historians has just published a large *Companion to Gender History* (Blackwell, 2004) dealing with the major geographical areas and historical periods of the whole world. There will be much more research coming up in this important area, I think. And it is by no means just a Western interest; these new ideas are being diffused globally. For example, I was asked to lecture on gender and religion as long ago as 1993 when I first visited South African universities. There now exists a growing interest in these issues in Japan and China, and in many other parts of the non-Western world. At the level of teaching and research, the study of religion will have to address and pursue this new field of gender studies in a much more systematic way since it is implicated with all other fields.

We still have a long way to go.