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2005 Member Calendar

March

March 1. 2005 Annual Meeting proposals for Program Unit Chairs.

March 1. Book award nominations from publishers. For more information see www.aarweb.org/awards/bookawards.

March 3–4. Mid-Atlantic regional meeting, New Brunswick, NJ.

March 4–6. Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession Committee meeting, Atlanta, GA.

March 5. Religion and Disabilities Task Force meeting, Atlanta, GA.

March 11–13. Southeast regional meeting, Winston-Salem, NC.

March 12–14. Southwest regional meeting, Dallas, TX.

March 12–14. Western regional meeting, Tempe, AZ.


April
April 1. Notification of acceptance of Annual Meeting paper proposals by program unit chairs.

April 1–2. Upper Midwest regional meeting, St. Paul, MN.

April 2–3. Academic Relations Task Force meeting, Atlanta, GA.

April 6–7. National Humanities Day. National Humanities Day is a advocacy event organized by the National Humanities Alliance and sponsored by the AAR and more than 20 organizations to promote support for the National Endowment for the Humanities. For more information, see www.niae.org.

April 8–9. Rocky Mountain–Great Plains regional meeting, Denver, CO.

April 8–9. Midwest regional meeting, Chicago, IL.

April 15. Executive Committee meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

April 15. Regional Secretaries meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

April 16–17. Spring Board of Directors meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

April 29–May 1. Pacific Northwest regional meeting, Seattle, WA.

May

May 5. Registration Information Services Center opens.

May 30. Annual Meeting Additional Meeting requests due for priority consideration. (For more Annual Meeting information, see www.aarweb.org/annualmeeting2005/default.asp.)

June

June 15. Membership renewal deadline for 2005 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. Research Grant Applications due. For more information, see www.aarweb.org/awards/grants.asp.


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

September
September 1. Executive Committee meeting, Atlanta, GA.

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

September 23–24. Regions Committee meeting, Atlanta, GA.

October

October 1–31. AAR officer election period. Candidate profiles will be published in the October RSN.


October 15. Excellence in Teaching award nominations due. For more information, see www.aarweb.org/awards/teaching.asp.

October 21. EIS preregistration closes.

November
November 1. Research grant awards announced.

November 17. Executive Committee meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

November 18. Full Board of Directors meeting, Philadelphia, PA.

November 18. Chain Workshop at the Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA. Free for departments enrolled in the Academic Relations Program. For more information, see www.aarweb.org/departmentcadet.asp.

November 19–22. Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA. Held concurrently with the Society of Biblical Literature, comprising some 8,500 registrants, 200 publishers, and 100 hiring departments.

November 21. Annual Business Meeting. See the Annual Meeting Program Book for exact time and place.

December
December 1. New program unit proposals due.

December 9–10. Program Committee meeting, Atlanta, GA.


December 31. Membership renewal for 2006 due. Renew online at www.aarweb.org/.

And keep in mind throughout the year...

Regional organizations have various deadlines throughout the year. Make sure that you know the deadlines and call for papers. See www.aarweb.org/regions/default.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/fieldfield/submit.

Openings Employment Opportunities for Scholars of Religion. Openings is a members-only online publication listing job opportunities 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.

Religious Studies News—AAR Edition is the newspaper of record for the field especially designed to serve the professional needs of persons involved in teaching and scholarship in religion (broadly construed to include religious studies, theology, and sacred texts). Published quarterly by the American Academy of Religion, RSN is received by some 10,000 scholars, by departments enrolled in the Academic Relations Program, and by libraries at colleges and universities across North America and abroad. Religious Studies News—AAR Edition communicates the important events of the field and related areas. It provides a forum for members and others to examine critical issues in education, pedagogy (especially through the biannual Spotlight on Teaching), research, publishing, and the public understanding of religion. It also publishes news about the services and programs of the AAR and other organizations, including employment services and registration information for the AAR Annual Meeting.

For writing and advertising guidelines, please see www.aarweb.org/publications/rsn.asp.
Despite the rain, AAR members responded in very high numbers. Survey respondents overwhelmingly described the hotel facilities, accessibility among meeting locations, meeting-room space, and exhibit facilities all received high marks. Annual Meeting attendees came from all corners of the world. California was once again home to the largest number of attendees: 825. Texas was the second largest state represented, with 679 members in attendance. Large numbers also came from New York (470), Illinois (412), and Pennsylvania (361). International attendees visited from over 50 countries, with Canada, the United Kingdom, and Germany being represented in the largest numbers. AAR welcomed 14 Latin American scholars in response to the 2004 international focus. The 2005 Annual Meeting will focus on Eastern European scholars and scholarship.

Registration and housing, handled by the Conferton Registration & Housing Bureau, received high marks from survey respondents. The registration process earned an exceptional 98 percent satisfied or very satisfied rating. Some respondents expressed their frustration with the online housing system; there were problems with the software dropping them or not allowing them to return to registration. Conferton is aware of these issues and is working on solutions in preparation for the 2005 meeting. The online registration and housing system, however, remained the most popular mode of registration, accounting for 61 percent of all registrations. A record number of hotel rooms were occupied. Over 16,000 total room nights were used throughout the Annual Meeting, with almost 4,000 rooms occupied on the peak night of Saturday, November 20.

Overall, survey respondents gave positive reviews of San Antonio, although they did suggest that accessibility to food needs to be improved. Some commented on the long lines at venues or the scarcity of restaurants, especially vegetarian-friendly options. Other respondents noted that the signage for the cafes in the exhibit hall was unsatisfactory and that the Koffee Klatch shop in the convention center had limited hours. One of the major concerns when planning the Annual Meeting is the accessibility of food. In the meeting materials we try to list a range of restaurants for your convenience, including vegetarian and kosher options where available. AAR works each year with the city convention and tourism bureaus, as well as the meeting facilities, to make sure food will be handy to attendees. Some years this means providing “cash-and-carry” stations, such as the outlet in San Antonio’s exhibit hall, or convincing fast food outlets to remain open on a weekend, as we did in Atlanta. We make our best effort each year to warn local restaurants that we are coming. . . and that our attendees are hungry! The long lines at food venues in San Antonio were partially due to the unseasonably bad weather. The rain discouraged many meeting-goers from exploring the restaurants on the Riverwalk and kept the meeting facility restaurants and cafes congested.

The Annual Meeting Satisfaction Survey is sent via e-mail to all AAR members (over 10,000 people) at the conclusion of each meeting and is offered online at the AAR Web site. The number of voluntary responses this year was 916. Not every question was answered by everyone, so the percentages were determined from the number who did respond. The survey is voluntary and open to all members.

The executive office staff would like to thank everyone who responded. The survey results continue to be valuable to the Annual Meeting process, for it provides the AAR’s Program Committee, Board of Directors, and executive office staff with an important measure of member satisfaction with the Annual Meeting. We value this opportunity to hear your comments and suggestions on how we can continue to meet your needs and to offer an excellent Annual Meeting experience.

SAN ANTONIO, Texas, gave a warm hand wasy Jan 36/9 to the 2004 Annual Meeting last November. Despite the rain, AAR members responded positively in the Annual Meeting survey. Survey results are listed at www.aarweb.org/annual/meet2004/survey/results.

The 2004 Annual Meeting was the largest ever in terms of programming. Over 900 sessions took place during the five-day period from Thursday, November 18 to Tuesday, November 23. AAR hosted 319 sessions — an increase of 38 over the previous record (2003: 281). The SBL and Additional Meetings sessions also grew in numbers. Survey respondents overwhelmingly approved, with 91 percent reporting their satisfaction with the overall quality of sessions. They also responded positively about the opportunity to network with friends and colleagues; that question about the opportunity to network with agreement among attendees. Large numbers also came from New York (470), Illinois (412), and Pennsylvania (361). International attendees visited from over 50 countries, with Canada, the United Kingdom, and Germany being represented in the largest numbers. AAR welcomed 14 Latin American scholars in response to the 2004 international focus. The 2005 Annual Meeting will focus on Eastern European scholars and scholarship.

Registration and housing, handled by the Conferton Registration & Housing Bureau, received high marks from survey respondents. The registration process earned an exceptional 98 percent satisfied or very satisfied rating. Some respondents expressed their frustration with the online housing system; there were problems with the software dropping them or not allowing them to return to registration. Conferton is aware of these issues and is working on solutions in preparation for the 2005 meeting. The online registration and housing system, however, remained the most popular mode of registration, accounting for 61 percent of all registrations. A record number of hotel rooms were occupied. Over 16,000 total room nights were used throughout the Annual Meeting, with almost 4,000 rooms occupied on the peak night of Saturday, November 20.

Overall, survey respondents gave positive reviews of San Antonio, although they did suggest that accessibility to food needs to be improved. Some commented on the long lines at venues or the scarcity of restaurants, especially vegetarian-friendly options. Other respondents noted that the signage for the cafes in the exhibit hall was unsatisfactory and that the Koffee Klatch shop in the convention center had limited hours. One of the major concerns when planning the Annual Meeting is the accessibility of food. In the meeting materials we try to list a range of restaurants for your convenience, including vegetarian and kosher options where available. AAR works each year with the city convention and tourism bureaus, as well as the meeting facilities, to make sure food will be handy to attendees. Some years this means providing “cash-and-carry” stations, such as the outlet in San Antonio’s exhibit hall, or convincing fast food outlets to remain open on a weekend, as we did in Atlanta. We make our best effort each year to warn local restaurants that we are coming. . . and that our attendees are hungry! The long lines at food venues in San Antonio were partially due to the unseasonably bad weather. The rain discouraged many meeting-goers from exploring the restaurants on the Riverwalk and kept the meeting facility restaurants and cafes congested.

The Annual Meeting Satisfaction Survey is sent via e-mail to all AAR members (over 10,000 people) at the conclusion of each meeting and is offered online at the AAR Web site. The number of voluntary responses this year was 916. Not every question was answered by everyone, so the percentages were determined from the number who did respond. The survey is voluntary and open to all members.

The executive office staff would like to thank everyone who responded. The survey results continue to be valuable to the Annual Meeting process, for it provides the AAR’s Program Committee, Board of Directors, and executive office staff with an important measure of member satisfaction with the Annual Meeting. We value this opportunity to hear your comments and suggestions on how we can continue to meet your needs and to offer an excellent Annual Meeting experience.
VER 30 CHAIRS attended the chairs workshop at the Annual Meeting in San Antonio last November. The workshop, developed under the guidance of the Academic Relations Task Force, was based on Richard Ohmann’s influential book The Politics of Knowledge: The Commercialization of the University, the Professions, & Print Culture (Wesleyan University Press, 2003).

The daylong workshop dealt with the increasing privatization of education and corporations at colleges and universities and how that has challenged the relative autonomy of all academic disciplines. It discussed the realignment of industrial capitalism (Fordism) into a society of flexible accumulation and the resultant disintegration of the professional managerial class. This phenomenon has occurred in order to manage a consumer and corporate economy that will be called on to educate the various sectors of our consumer society. “Increasingly, universities rank their internal colleges and departments on the basis of productivity schemes designed to measure activities that generate revenue even as they produce new knowledge,” (Ohmann, ix). Changes such as these have challenged the relative autonomy of all academic disciplines to determine what is worth investigating. The privatization of human knowledge for business profit has constrained professional knowledge workers, and threatens to de-skill them as well. The workshop focused on this commodification of knowledge, and how chairs can administer and promote their departments within such a culture.

Warren Friisna (Hofstra University), the Task Force chair, began the workshop by discussing the politics of knowledge. A morning panel then discussed the increasing commercialization of the profession and the university. The individual panelists and their topics were:

- Steve Friesen, University of Missouri, Columbia: “Religious Studies: Production, Reproduction, and Education”
- Carol S. Anderson, Kalamazoo College: “Faculty in Small Colleges Who Are Called Upon to Do Everything”
- Gerald S. Vigna, Alvernia College: “Teaching for Citizenship”

In the afternoon, another panel discussed the commodification of knowledge. The specific panelists and their topics were:

- William K. Mahony, Davidson College: “Accountability and Academic Freedom”
- Elizabeth A. Say, California State University, Northridge: “Institutional Development: Balancing State Support and State Assistance”
- Robert C. Neville, Boston University: “The Commercialization of Print Culture”

This Annual Meeting workshop was the latest in a series developed especially for chairs of departments. In past years the topics have been: Scholarship Service and Stress (Atlanta, 2003); The Tensions of Being a Chair (Atlanta, 2003); The Entrepreneurial Chair: Building and Managing Your Department in an Era of Shrinking Resources and Increasing Demands (Georgetown, Summer 2003); Running a Successful Faculty Search in the Religious Studies Department (Toronto, 2002); Evaluating and Advancing Teaching in the Religious Studies Department (Denver, 2001); and Assessing and Advancing the Religious Studies Department (Nashville, 2000).
EACH YEAR at the Annual Meeting, the AAR and the SBL jointly host the Employment Information Services Center (EIS). The center is designed to ease the communication process between candidates for academic positions and employers seeking to fill available positions. EIS features job postings, candidate credentials for review, a communication process between employers seeking to fill available positions and candidates for academic positions, and a message center, and an interview facility.

At the 2004 EIS Center, 115 institutions conducted interviews for a total of 140 positions. The total number of registered candidates was 442, and of 140 positions. The total number of registrants answered the optional EIS Questionnaire. The ratio of positions to candidates was 1:3.16. A record 29 percent of employers conducted interviews for a total 115 institutions registered candidates was 442, and of 140 positions.

Each year, EIS gathers data about job positions and candidates registered for the center. Each position and candidate is required to choose a primary classification from among the list shown at right. While they are also allowed to choose secondary and tertiary classifications, only the primary choices are shown here. Therefore, when drawing conclusions from this data, it is important to note that many jobs fall under classifications that candidates are less likely to use to describe their primary field, but might well select as a secondary or tertiary specialization (World Religions, for example).

Over time, data collected at EIS will enable one to identify trends in the field. In fact, the AAR has collected such information since 1990; however, we changed the method of collection in 2003, meaning the information shown here is not comparable to the data of the past.

Additional data, including secondary and tertiary classifications and job data from 1990–2004, are available upon request from Shelly Roberts at sroberts@aarweb.org.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYERS</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positions Registered</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Institutions Registered</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preregistered</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered On-site</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Positions to Candidates</td>
<td>1:3.35</td>
<td>1:3.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CANDIDATES</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Registered</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preregistered</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered On-site</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Participants</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Participants</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Report Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Female to Male</td>
<td>1:1.8</td>
<td>1:1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee on Teaching and Learning seeks nominations for the 2005 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.
T
his YEAR is an important one for planning for the AAR Annual Meeting in 2008. During the course of 2005, we are asking you to get engaged in the process of envisioning what our Annual Meeting in 2008 can be. We ask you to appreciate that some AAR members would have preferred to continue to meet with the SBL every year, but the decision to hold separate meetings has been finalized, and locations have been booked into 2011, and we are moving forward. There will be a thoroughgoing review of the independence of the Annual Meeting in 2014. In the next several years, we have the opportunity not only to increase the number of sessions, but also to revitalize and restructure our Annual Meeting to make it more reflective of the full range of our scholarly and professional interests, and more diverse and dynamic in presentation styles.

After years of working within a context of severe constraint, members of the Program Committee are excited by these opportunities for expansion and experimentation. But since AAR members, rather than the Program Committee, are the authors of the Annual Meeting Program through our program unit process, we need your active participation. If you are an AAR member you should have received in the mail a copy of the Report of the AAR Task Force on the Independent Meeting. The report is also available on our Web site in the “Of Note” box on the first page, www.aarweb.org. The report addresses the content of the Annual Meeting program, suggests some new areas of study and concentration, and proposes changes in the structure of the program. The Program Committee needs and actively solicits your ideas on these topics. We are asking all AAR members to discuss the report in as many venues as possible and to send your responses, suggestions, and proposals to the Program Committee for action.

It is important to note up front that the Task Force Report’s specific suggestions for new areas of study (pp. 8-9) are descriptive rather than prescriptive. Indeed, as the report concludes, “We strongly believe that the Academy will benefit from a broad conversation about the issues we have addressed. Our specific proposals and recommendations may have some merit, but we are convinced that they will be greatly improved by broad input from across the Academy, and that such input will give the membership a positive stake in the future of the Annual Meeting.”

To this end, the Program Committee is seeking proposals for new program units that address 1) areas of pent-up demand; 2) scholarly fields that are weakened or threatened by the separation of the AAR and SBL annual meetings; and 3) new and emerging fields that represent the future of the academic study of religion as a field.

We invite you to reflect on your own experience, have conversations with your friends and colleagues, and send your proposals for new units to the AAR Executive Office at annualmeeting@aarweb.org by August 15, 2005. The Program Committee will hold a special meeting in September devoted to the Task Force Report, addressing your suggestions and considering your proposals for new program units.

Yours,
AAR Program Committee:
John C. Cavadini, Notre Dame University
David S. Cunningham, Hope College
Barbara DeCancio, Chair, AAR
Michel Desjardins, Wilfrid Laurier University
Derek Eick, Harvard University
Mary McClintock Fulkerson, Duke
Divinity School
W. Clark Gilpin, University of Chicago
Divinity School

Components of the Meeting

- Specialized sessions for the constituents of a program unit
- Sessions focused on scholarship in a particular field, and they are not specifically designed with a broader constituency in mind.
- Sessions designed to attract an audience beyond the program unit
- These might be jointly sponsored sessions, book forums, sessions on topics or issues of appeal, topical sessions, sessions on teaching in the field, discussion of films, etc.
- Sessions that promote new intellectual conversations
- These new conversations might be promoted within existing program units by means of joint sessions, by developing new program units, by special topics forums, or by member-initiated sessions.
- Professional development sessions
- The AAR has been developing special programming for graduate students, new faculty, women, racial and ethnic minorities, teachers, program chairs, and others.
- As a professional organization, we need to continue to strengthen such services for our members.
- Socializing/Free time
- AAR members highly value the free time built into our program structure to meet with colleagues and friends, or to simply escape the frenetic pace of the meeting.
- Book exhibits and publishers
- AAR members relish the chance to see and interact with a broad range of publications in the field, and to order or buy at a bargain price those of special interest. The program needs time to carve out space for members to visit the exhibits and to converse with publishers.
- Employment Information Services
- There are many seminars or workshops for members to seek that job or seeking to hire a colleague.

Opportunities of the Independent Meeting

- While the losses are serious, the independent Annual Meeting also provides opportunities for the Annual Meeting program to address areas of pent-up demand and to foster important new conversations.
- In light of the increasingly global nature of the AAR and its intention to notice and include new areas in the study of religion, in particular in relation to living religious traditions and their theological and ethical dimensions, we identify five areas where new possibilities are particularly prominent, and under each we suggest possibilities of new initiatives that might emerge. We welcome the suggestion of other areas and examples.
- Religious and theological traditions
  - Catholic tradition and traditions
  - Rabbinc Judaism
  - Systematic theologies (Buddhist, Christian, Islamic, etc.)
  - Constructive theologies
- Pluralism and traditions
  - Religious hybridity
  - Multiple religious belonging
  - Religious diversity in America
  - Pluralism within single traditions
  - Interreligious dialogue as an academic practice
- Theories of interreligious learning
  - Comparative theology and ethics
- Religions in practice
  - Evangelical colleges and seminaries
  - The study of religions
- Moral development
  - Practical and pastoral theology
  - Religious education
- Connections with other disciplines
  - Race, gender, and the study of religion
  - Religion and immigration
  - Religion and politics
- Religion, society, and the study of theology
- Sociology of religion
- Other emergent themes

Losses in the Independent Meeting

We acknowledge that there will be losses because of the split of the annual meetings. Some of them can be wholly or partially addressed, and some of them cannot. We stand in solidarity with those who are adversely affected by this decision and commit to find ways to provide some remedy.

Some of the losses include, but are not limited to, networking, and the development of communities of discourse over the years within the structure of the joint meeting; the loss of an intellectual home for the formal work falls in between the AAR and the SBL; possibilities of generating new knowledge and developing new research avenues in these overlapping and in-between spaces; and opportunities to attend some SBL sessions.

For example, work on comparative texts and the Quran-Drive initiative were sponsored jointly by members of both organizations; the split annual meetings make their work more difficult. The Study of Islam Section has resisted embracing this comparative initiative because it goes beyond the field of Islamic studies. The field of Antiquity was already fragmented, and the split only exacerbates the situation. The split seriously impedes the work of collaborative groups, such as the editorial board of the Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion. We also want to recognize the loss of members who have dual citizenship in the AAR/SBL.

We will also lose the opportunity to learn from SBL scholars whose fields include interpreting biblical texts, history of the Greco-Roman world, Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity, and Ancient Near Eastern religions and cultures, and to discuss with them how sacred texts shape religious beliefs and practices and form religious communities. We understand that making meaningful of sacred texts is important in reinterpreting religious identities and projecting new moral visions in some religious traditions. Women and racial minorities will be especially affected because they are further marginalized because of the smaller number as a result of the split.

Moreover, feminist, ethnic, contextual, and postcolonial studies (often pursued by these groups) cut across all disciplines, including across biblical and religious studies.

We also recognize other losses and burdens, such as the loss of space in the same meeting and presentation halls schools will not be able to attend one concurrent meeting; the financial cost of attending two meetings, especially for graduate students, junior faculty, and international members; and the negative impact on book publishers and job searches. The split creates severe challenges for theological schools and seminaries whose faculties are split relatively evenly between the two organizations; the split makes it hard for students to attend annual breakfasts and recruitment programs.

To provide remedy for some of these losses, we suggest the development of new units to provide space for those conversations that have already begun and to enable new logics to happen. In creating these new units, we want to clearly indicate that AAR is not anti-Christian, anti-Bible, or anti-theology. But we also need to be careful that we are not moving from cooperation with the SBL to appropriating their ideas or programs. Such new units are both an invitation for those who work at the boundaries of the two organizations to find a home in AAR, and a reminder that AAR members need and will benefit from these areas of scholarly discourse.

- Biblical Hermeneutics
- The Bible in Racial and Ethnic Minority Communities
- Hebrew Bible and New Testament in Religious Studies Context
- Christian Origins and Early Christianity
- Rabbinic Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Hellenic World

As always, the task force makes these suggestions to stimulate conversation and encourages all members of the AAR to propose program unit initiatives that will help restore dialogues undermined or isolated in the split annual meetings.

Hans J. Hillenbrand, Duke University
Jane Dammen McAlister, Georgetown University
Micheline Pesantubbee, University of Iowa
Jeffrey L. Stout, Princeton University
Enrique M. Tompkins, Union Seminary
Nady Van Doorn-Harder, Valparaiso University
Glenn E. Yocum, Whittier College

At this time, AAR has contracted Annual Meeting locations and dates through 2011.

2005 – November 19–22, Philadelphia, PA
2006 – November 18–21, Washington, DC
2007 – November 17–20, San Diego, CA
2008 – October 25–28, Chicago, IL
2009 – November 7–10, Montreal, Quebec
2010 – October 29–November 2, Atlanta, GA
2011 – November 18–21, San Francisco, CA (same time and place as SBL)

After 2011, the AAR Annual Meeting will be held on the first full weekend of November. The AAR has expressed to SBL our desire that the two associations meet concurrently every four years.
Why Study Religion?

AAR Launches a New Web Site Promoting the Study of Religion: www.studyreligion.org

Brad Herling, Boston University

Undergraduates are under a lot of pressure these days to make the right choices. For most, the idea of college as a four-year moratorium that allows free-floating inquiry (and a lot of trial and error) is simply not an option: for many of the students we teach, every decision is intimately linked with a professional future.

With so much seemingly on the line, the study of religion often faces some rather direct questions from its potential “clients”: “I’m studying to be an engineer, so why should I take a religion course?” “I don’t want to become a priest or something, so why should I study religion?” “I’m religious, so I know all I need to know about religion, don’t I?” “I’m interested in religion, but what am I going to do with a religion major?” And so on. The examples proliferate.

For scholars in the field, brusquely pragmatic questions like these can be somewhat embarrassing. In the current cultural and geo-political climate, the importance of studying religion is self-evident, especially for young people. Isn’t it?

Students often don’t know just how important they are, especially when they present their teachers with fundamental intellectual challenges. When it comes to the life of a discipline like the study of religion, which is still a relatively new field, the fresh, youthful concerns of those who join in this enterprise keep our scholarly work very much in the present.

The opening page presents an initial statement on the content of the site, essentially previewing it. Indeed, why should we study religion? Why should an 18-year-old with an essentially secular worldview, or a prosaic science major, take a religion class? Why should a religiously committed student engage religion as an academic object of study? What does studying religion have to do with getting a well-rounded undergraduate education? A succinct opening answer: religion marks a set of powerful and persistent phenomena that have always been with us, and despite the power of Western secular and scientific worldviews, it seems to be getting more influential, not less. In many professions there’s every chance that religion will come into play. And for everyone, knowing about religion is simply an aspect of being an informed citizen and member of one’s community.

But this response to the “why” question needs further articulation. Anyone who has taught a religion course knows that students often come to the topic with a set of preconceived notions about what religion is. Thus the question “Why study religions?” immediately begs a definition. In a separate page, our site presents an array of possibilities both traditional and contemporary in a highly interactive context: Surfers can quickly get a sense of theories and positions on the matter, involving more in-depth dialogue and inquiry.

In addition, the site addresses the compelling nature of contemporary inquiry in the field in a subsection called “Pressing Concerns in the Study of Religion.” Here the reader finds a series of brief essays on influential themes and approaches, including: 1) the broad search for meaning and structure; 2) the social and ethical aspect of religion; 3) the interdisciplinary nature of the field; 4) the relation between religion and violence; 5) global/multicultural connections and study of surf religion; 6) the connection between religion and identity; 7) the pursuit of transcendent experience; 8) the study of ritual and practice; and 9) religion as aesthetically manifested in high art and popular culture. These themes echo the concerns that drive much scholarly work in the field and the subject matter often encountered in religion coursework.

Making her way through some of this content, the surfer starts to get a sense of what the study of religion is and why she might want to pursue it, but in the “Misconceptions” section, she finds out why that might not work. On this page, the surfer confronts one of the “greatest hits” of presumptions people sometimes make about the academic study of religion, including “Professors will try to make you become religious when you study religion,” “Studying religion will make you become less religious,” “Studying religion involves wild speculation and leads to muddy thinking,” and the oldie-but-goodie, “Studying religion is impractical.” This hit parade is certainly not exhaustive (we all have our personal favorites), but here it’s possible that some of the ground can be cleared for those who are new to the field.

In the second major section of the site, “What Will I Study?” students get a more detailed account of the work they might do in religion classes and what is expected of those who decide to become religion majors. The page offers links to directories of religion professors and surveys of course offerings at American colleges and universities, links to individual syllabi for religion courses, and a sampling of what representative departments require for the religion major. In addition, several testimonials from religion majors past and present are included, indicating (from the students’ perspective) how valuable work in the field has been to them.

Next the site faces that last, crucial misconception (“Studying religion is impractical”) in detail. In the “So What?” section, the reader finds information about the preparation studying religion offers for professional success. Naturally the site discusses the benefits that religion majors can bring to the workplace, including intercultural literacy, direct observation, analytical skills, original interpretation, critical intelligence, and empathetic imagination. The page outlines potential career choices, and some “Where are they now?” data from a variety of institutions is presented, giving our students a clear and concrete careers path students of religion have taken up.

Finally, the site also includes an extensive bibliography. Pertinent texts and Web sites are listed in a dozen different categories, offering surfers a “summer reading list” — and an immediate place to start in the study of religion.

This content is framed by an engaging, easy-to-use interface that opens up an attention-grabbing flash page. The clean design concept emphasizes clarity and straightforwardness; the presentation is intentionally simple and the text is easy to access and read. Often one simply rolls the cursor over the top of various labels to get the relevant information. When it comes to design, the site is a treat to view and, according to our early feedback, sends the right message: this is a savvy Web site, but the focus is on dispensing solid information that is helpful for students and faculty alike.

Overall, work on the Web site has been directed towards assisting undergraduates with their studies. The site has been designed to be significant pressure these days — for some of us, remembering less freer undergraduate days, it looks like too much pressure too early. But at the very least, many of our students are taking their educational decisions very seriously.

In response, our initial case to students should be just as earnest. No number of Web sites can replace the engaging argument for the academic study of religion made by a faculty member that first day in the classroom or the excited word-of-mouth passed by junior and senior religion majors to their younger colleagues. But the “Why Study Religion?” site adds to the resources available to faculty and students, offering yet another invitation to the field that will hopefully meet many of our prospective students where they are.

Editor’s Note:
The Web site is part of the AAR’s Strengthening College and University Religion & Theology Programs initiative, supported by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc. We encourage you to take a look at it. Why Study Religion? We were asked at every religion and theology department to link it to their departments site. We are especially interested in promoting the site to high school students. If you have suggestions regarding how to promote the Web site, please contact Carey J. Gifford in the Executive Offices at cgifford@aarweb.org.

Anyone who has taught a religion course knows that students often come to the topic with a set of preconceived notions about what religion is. Thus the question “Why study religion?” immediately begs for a definition.
Religious Studies News — AAR Edition

The New Religion Gap

Mark Silk, Trinity College
John C. Green, University of Akron

The New Religion Gap

Mark Silk is associate professor of religion and public life and director of the Leonard E. Greenberg Center for the Study of Religion and Public Life at Trinity College. He edits the center’s magazine, Religion in the News, which published accounts of the religion gap that formed the basis for this article. He is also co-editor of Religion Region, a series of nine volumes on religion and public life in America published by Oxford Press, and is joint recently author of “Numa Pompilius and the Idea of Civil Religion in the West,” which appeared in American Academy of Religion in 2004.

John C. Green is professor of political science and director of the Bay C. Bliss Institute of Applied Politics at the University of Akron. He is co-editor of Marching to the Millennium: The Christian Right in American Politics, 1980-2000, published by Georgetown University Press, among many other works.

Religion has long been a critical factor in American elections. But until recently it has made its impact by way of affiliation. Northern mainline Protestants have voted Democratic since the Civil War, for example, while since the New Deal, Jews have been solidly in the Democratic camp.

In recent years, however, another aspect of religion has become politically significant: commitment, or the extent to which citizens are actively engaged in their faith. Americans who say they attend worship at least once a week are now much more likely than those who attend less frequently, including those who claim to be nonreligious, gravitate toward Liberal values and Democratic candidates, regardless of attendance levels for Bush, showed an astonishing gender gap of 36 percentage points (92 percent for Bush among men versus 56 percent among women). Among regular-attending Catholics, who were less pro-Bush in general, the gender gap was by 11 percentage points less favorable.

Indeed, the most consistent voting pattern across these denominational lines occurred with less-attending women, among whom 90 percent of the evangelicals, 99 percent of the mainliners, and 69 percent of the Catholics gave their votes to Gore.

In order to understand the political dynamics of this complex system it is necessary to look at cultural attitudes that cut across differences of gender, attendance, and religious identity — and push voters into a partisan direction that is not always clear. These attitudes can be discerned from the survey data showing voters’ views of prominent interest groups.

Political groups dedicated to promoting “traditional family values” united men and women according to level of attendance. Thus, 58 percent of regular-attending men and 52 percent of regular-attending women had a favorable view of the Christian Right, favoring it by as much as one-fifth of the less-regular-attending men and women.

The same pattern held for views on pro- life and feminist groups, with some gender divergence: regular-attending women were modestly less “pro-life” than their male counterparts, while less-regular-attending men were less “feminists” than the comparable women.

On the other hand, roughly 40 percent of both regular- and less-attending men felt positively about the National Rifle Association. But for both regular- and less-attending women, the level of support was some 20 percentage points less. Similarly, more than half of each category of women held a favorable view of teachers’ organizations, while views from both groups of men were some 15 percentage points less favorable.

These competing axes of cultural conflict help explain the partisan breakdown of the four critical gender-and-religion categories. Regular-attending men voted strongly Republican on a large part because of their consistently conservative views on sexual morality, guns, and education. Their political opposites, the less-attending women, were just as strongly Democratic because of their consistently liberal views on abortion, guns, and public education.

The other categories were evenly divided at the ballot box precisely because of their crosscutting values. Regular-attending women were pulled in a Republican direction by traditional morality, but their wor ries about guns and education pushed them in a Democratic direction. For less-attending men, guns and schools led toward the GOP — but hostility to morals regulation pointed the Democratic way.

Because value conflicts create swing voters, regular-attending white Catholic and mainline Protestant women and less-attending white Catholic and evangelical men were up for grabs in last year’s election.

What can we say about what actually happened?

To the extent that it is now available, the news from the religion-gap front in 2004 was that George W. Bush was able to reach beyond his base of frequent worshipers to pick up a majority of voters who said they attend religious services “a few times a month.” This group, which he lost to Al Gore in 2000, emerged as the religion gap’s new swing vote.

Bush also made small gains among those who said they attend services a few times a year or not at all. Since those claiming to attend once a week or more voted for Bush at about the same rate as in 2000, the upshot was a slight decrease in the overall religion gap, as measured by the difference between the percentages of his vote coming from frequent as opposed to less frequent attenders.

Because these results derive from the now- notorious 2004 election-day exit polls, they must be viewed with some caution. But given how well they track the results from the earlier, more accurate exit polls, there is reason to believe they provide a
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AAR Expanding Government Relations Program

BEGINNING this year, the AAR will expand its efforts both to increase government funding of the field of religion and to enhance public officials’ understanding of religion and their appreciation of the work that religion scholars do. The decision to expand these efforts was made by the AAR Board of Directors at the November Annual Meeting.

For more than two decades, the AAR has joined the National Humanities Alliance in advocating increased federal funding of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Since the mid-1990s, the AAR has organized meetings to educate FBI officials and, more recently, directors of prison chaplaincy programs.

The AAR now aims to increase the number of our members actively advocating more government funding of the academic study of religion. The Academy also plans on expanding the focus of that effort to include not just the NEH but other government entities that can provide resources for religion scholars and teachers. In states with the largest concentrations of AAR members — such as California, Georgia, Indiana, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia — the AAR will encourage the formation of advocacy networks. In support of more government funding of the humanities and social sciences, including religion, participants in these networks will e-mail their members of Congress and participate in delegations that will meet annually with local congressional staff. In 2006, AAR members attending the Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., will be encouraged to meet congressional staff on Capitol Hill. In addition, the AAR plans to organize public forums in Washington, during the Annual Meeting and beyond, that will showcase religion scholarship while further educating those who help shape public policy. These forums will be designed to attract an audience that includes congressional and federal agency staff, think-tank staff, journalists, local academics, and the public.

The AAR will work in other ways to broaden the kinds of government entities for whom religion scholars serve as a resource. In November, for example, the AAR organized a set of briefings for directors of chaplaincy programs for federal and state prison systems. Prison officials’ lack of familiarity with particular religious practices has led to denial of religious rights for inmates, resulting in inmate lawsuits and sometimes violence. The topics of the four briefings were African-American Islam, Native American religion, neopaganism, and religious pluralism. The briefings were so well received that the AAR plans to brief prison chaplain officials again in 2005. In addition, the Academy is looking into holding briefings for other federal officials, such as Congressional staff and State Department staff whose areas of work include government policy regarding religion.

The AAR may also try to influence how religion is covered in secondary school textbooks. Because of the large populations of California and Texas, publishers tend to make the textbooks for those states the ones used nationwide. As these textbooks are produced by publishers and reviewed by state authorities, the AAR will look for ways to ensure that the perspectives of religion scholars are adequately included.

Regional Chairs Workshops

IN SPRING 2005 two regions will be offering workshops especially for chairs. These workshops are designed to support department chairs and other institutional leaders in managing and strengthening their academic units.

In conjunction with the Eastern International Regional meeting, a workshop will be offered on Sunday, May 8, 2005, at McGill University in Montreal, Quebec. The topic is “Tenured Professor or Temporary Instructor? Maintaining the Profession in a Wal-Mart Economy.” For further information on this workshop, contact G. Victor Hori, Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University, at victor.hori@McGill.ca.

In conjunction with the Rocky Mountain–Great Plains regional meeting, a workshop will be held on Thursday, April 7, 2005, at the Holiday Inn in Denver, Colorado. For further information, contact Frederick M. Denny, Department of Religious Studies, University of Colorado at Boulder, at Frederick.Denny@colorado.edu.
Langdon’s career as a teaching theologian lasted more than a half-century, beginning in the early 1950s. During his graduate studies in the joint doctoral program of Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University, he taught at Union Theological Seminary (1949–50) and Vassar College (1951–54). He was a frequent speaker and author on publication projects, and friend. I last visited with him in his home on December 3, 2001, when I interviewed him about his theological perspective on the events of September 11th.

Langdon’s career at the Chicago School. Langdon taught at Vanderbilt University (1954–62) and then at the University of Chicago (1963–89). Upon his retirement in 1989, Langdon and his spouse, Sonja, moved to Charlottesville, Virginia. Until quite recently, he continued to teach courses at both the University of Virginia and nearby Georgetown University. Many people who knew the work of Langdon will remember him as a constructed theologian, with a well-defined method. Indeed, he wrote his doctoral dissertation on the Christian doctrine of creation in critical dialogue with the philosophies of F. H. Bradley and A. N. Whitehead, which was published in an abbreviated form as his first book under the main title of his dissertation: Maker of Heaven and Earth (1959). He always conducted his work on Christian doctrines, however, as an apologete, theologian, with a constructed method developed from the work of Paul Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr, his own teachers — yet this was a method with the distinctive empirical character of the Chicago School. Langdon worked, therefore, as a philosopher of religion as much as a work of a constructed theologian. In this sense, he taught and published public theology, but theology that remained relevant and accountable to, even when critical of, the Christian traditions themselves.

During his career, Langdon published 15 books and several hundred articles, essays, and reviews. He delivered hundreds of lectures in a variety of academic institutions on many different topics about the intersection of religion and science in light of the creation-creationism debate. Langdon’s teaching of religious studies held him in high regard, as reflected in many of his invitations to speak and to be on the faculty or to teach courses, as well as his election to a term as president of the American Academy of Religion (1978–79). The media frequently recognized him as one of the leading experts on Christian faith and contemporary issues. Time magazine once listed Langdon as one of five “Pathfinding Protagonists” or “U.S. scientists of things divine” the other four being Jaroslav Pelikan, Robert McAfee Brown, Roger Shimin, and Schubert Ogden. (“Pathfinding Protagonists,” Time 79 (May 25, 1962); 84, 86).

If one knew Langdon, one also knew the importance of family to him. In dedications to various members of his family appear in many of his books. One of his most recent books, Blue Twilight, even carries the title of a song that one of his sons, Amos Gilkey, wrote and composed. In the mid-1950s, on the occasion of his mother’s death, Langdon wrote an anonymous letter to the editor of Christianity and Crisis, in which he confessed his own faith:

"I learned that there is inner respect and outer love, then outwardly. By the absolute freedom from “mouthing” and all its solemnity — the result can be that the language is laugh and stories, and all the good times that the family can create of itself. The deceased is there in loving spirit in the joke and the good times. Love and in what those we — this is a word, and its greatest with regard to the problem of death (Langdon Gilkey, "In Faith . . . Parting, Thanksgiving and Joy, Christianity and Crisis 16 (December 10, 1956), 169)."

At this time, when we remember this insightful theologian and good friend, Langdon’s own words invite us to go beyond our own sense of loss and to remember how much he has left with us, to remember “the good times,” to laugh, and to share our stories of this scholar, former colleague, and former teacher. In 1979, during a sabbatical leave in the Netherlands, where Langdon held a Fullbright Teaching Fellowship at the Catholic University of Nijmegen, he wrote a "theological reflection" or meditation on "life, laughter, and nonbeing," in which he identified both affirmative and negative roles of death in its role as "life." Laughter, according to Langdon, affirmatively, death as an essential dimension of life itself, both "establishes the possibility of the seriousness of life and thus for its inner reality and depth" ("the condition of seriousness" and "decision"), and serves as "the paradigm of the authentic self," by aiding us "to recognize our own finitude and live within its bounds" ("the condition of justice"). Langdon also argued that, in its negative role, death negates life in terms of the categories of finitude itself (space, time, causality, substance), the meaning of life, and the potential for realizing an authentic life or a life librated from its own guilt for sin. On this basis, he claimed that, in death, humans have three major needs: 1) "the presence of an unconditioned being in which we may participate both in life and death"; 2) "the presence of an unconditioned meaning in which we may participate both in life and death"; and 3) "an unconditioned forgiveness and acceptance in which we can participate alike in life and death." Langdon concluded his meditation by proposing "the notion of a theonomous death," wherein "theonomy points to finite being as essentially dependent on an unconditioned depth or ground beyond itself." Accordingly, "taken theonomously, however, death shows its reality, power, and meaning, but in pointing beyond itself to its own infinite ground, it is itself transcended, and its negative annihilating power is withdrawn. Through death we transcend both life and death. Death can, therefore, be transparaent to the transcendent, to a divine power and meaning that is neither simply life nor simply death" (Langdon Gilkey, Through the Tempest: Theological Voyages in a Pluralistic Culture, edited by Jeff B. Pool [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991], 233, 237, 238, 239, 240, 242, 243, 244, 245). During the initial years of his retirement, Langdon shared with me the importance that this particular meditation on death had grown to have for him. Appropriately, Langdon’s own words about the meaning of death for life being consolation, peace, insight, and joy, as we reflect on the life of this person for whom so many have so much respect, admiration, gratitude, intellectual and spiritual indebtedness, and affection. His own life, like his meditation on death, concluded theologically, insomuch as, by pointing to, the infinite and unconditioned depth and ground. In 1966, the cover of Time magazine contained in large letters only, "the good times, that the family can create of itself. Death has, therefore, as a theologian who has dedicated his life to the study of theology, therefore, as in this world filled with the distinctive empirical character of the Chicago School. Langdon worked, personally, eternally echoed in numerous ways on 85 years of history, lead me to suggest that time itself honors Langdon Brown Gilkey. As we recall the life and theological contributions of Langdon, who loved solving and often applied nautical metaphors to theological ideas in his publications, I speak for many who wish him the richest of meanings in the words adieu, bon voyage, and a Diesu var.
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2005 Survey of Undergraduate Programs in Religion and Theology in the U.S. and Canada

- Questionnaires to be mailed to all undergraduate departments in spring 2005
- Information will be gathered on faculty, students, departments, and programs of study
- A follow-up survey to the Academy’s 2000 survey
- Will provide data for longitudinal analysis of the field

2004 Theologos Awards Announced

THE THEOLOGOS AWARDS are given annually by the Association of Theological Bookstores. The awards represent the unique, professional evaluations of people who sell academic religious books. Only the bookseller members of the Association are eligible to vote. The 2004 winners in the five awards categories are:

Best General Interest Book
Whose Religion Is Christianity?: The Gospel beyond the West by Lamin Sanneh
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Best Academic Book
An Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon and Christian Imagination by Walter Brueggemann
Westminster John Knox Press

Best Children’s Book
Clare and Francis by Guido Visconti
illustated by Bimba Landmann
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Book of the Year
Credo by William Sloane Coffin
Westminster John Knox Press

Publishers of the Year
Brazos Press
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Best-Selling Religion Books of 2004

Oxford University Press
1. Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew by Bart D. Ehrman
2. Lost Scriptures: Books That Did Not Make It into the New Testament by Bart D. Ehrman
3. The New Anti-Catholicism: The Last Acceptable Prejudice by Philip Jenkins
4. Gond: The Seven Deadly Sins by Phyllis A. Tickle
5. God’s A Debate Between a Christian and an Atheist by William Lane Craig and Walter Sinnott-Armstrong

Liturgical
1. Who Is Jesus? An Introduction to Christology by Thomas J. Rausch, S.J.
2. Not by Bread Alone by Peter Feldmeier
3. Winning in Je$t and Hope by Mark G. Boyer
4. Living Liturgy by Joyce A. Zimmerman, et al.
5. Butler’s Lives of the Saints edited by Paul Burns

HarperSanFrancisco
1. The Heart of Christianity by Marcus Borg
2. Jesus in America by Richard Wurmbrand
3. To the Mountain: by Stewart Burns
4. American Jee$s by Eve LaPlante
5. A Faith Worth Believing by Tom Stella

Fortress
1. Power Surge by Michael W. Foss
2. Strength in Love by Martin Luther King Jr.
3. The Resurrection of the Son of God by N. T. Wright
4. Why Jesus Died by Gerard S. Sloyan
5. Aced to Heaven, Rooted to Earth by Walter Brueggemann

Pilgrim
1. Same-sex Marriage?: A Christian Ethical Analysis by Marvin M. Ellison
2. What Land? What Promise? What Christians Are Not Being Told about Israel and the Palestinians by Gary C. Burge
4. The Indispensable Guide for Smaller Churches by David R. Ray
5. The Essential Parish Nurse: ABCs for Congregational Health Ministry by Deborah L. Patterson

Abingdon
1. Why the Throat and New Songs: Black Women Proclaiming God’s Word by Teresa L. Fry Brown
2. Reading the Bible for the Sake of Our Children by Dena Nolan Fewell
3. Theology: An Introduction to Hispanic Theology by Luis G. Pedraja
4. Evolution from Creation to Recreation: Conflict, Conversation and Convergence by Ted Peters and Martine Hewlett
5. The Next Step: Leading Lasting Change in the Church by Lovett H. Weems Jr.

Eerdmans
1. Saved by Struggle, Transformed by Hope by Joan D. Chittister
2. My God and I: A Spiritual Memoir by Lewis B. Smedes
3. Christ on Trial: How the Gospel Unsettles Our Judgment by Rowan Williams

Westminster John Knox
1. Credo by William Sloane Coffin
2. The Gospel According to Tolkien: Visions beyond the West by C. S. Lewis
4. Beyond the Ordinary: Ten Strengths of U.S. Congregations by Cynthia Woolover and Deborah Bruce
5. Luke for Everyone by N. T. Wright

Paraclete
1. Madhouse Sabbath by Lauren Winner
2. The Road to Assisi: The Essential Lives of St. Francis by T. J. Green
4. The Monotheists: Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Conflict and Competition by F. E. Peters
5. Worship without Words: The Signs and Symbols of Our Faith by Patricia Klein

Princeton University Press
4. The Muslimah: Jews, Christians, and Muslims in Conflict and Competition by F. E. Peters

Yale University Press
1. Jonathan Edwards: A Life by George M. Marsden
2. One World by Peter Singet
3. Credo by Jaroslav Pelikan
4. An Introduction to Hispanic Theology by Louis G. Pedraja
5. Greek Gods, Human Lives by Mary Lekowitz

 Doubleday
1. God Has a Dream: A Vision of Hope for Our Time by Desmond Tutu
3. A Travel Guide to Heaven by Anthony DeStefano
4. Soul Survivor: How Thirteen Unlikely Mentors Helped My Faith Survive the Church by Philip Yancey

Religious Studies News — AAR Edition
I had enrolled in two courses — one by the theologian Paul Althaus on Martin Luther’s theology, the other by the religion scholar Hans Joachim Schoeps on “what does it mean to be human?” and the brilliance of their lectures and the excitement of the subject matter persuaded me that my vocation was not in law.

Hillerbrand: Currently, I am racing to meet a publisher’s deadline to finish a formidable history of the Reformation. I did such a history before in more youthful exuberance (in fact, at the time a reviewer observed that “having written a Reformation history at an early stage” of my career, I would not be able to say anything new for the remainder of it), but now I want to bring my mature insights to bear on the 16th century. In my AAR role this year, I want to do my part to stress the positives of the Annual Meeting decision, and in my ACLS involvement, to want to make my colleagues on the ACLS Board ever more aware of the pivotal place of the academic study of religion.

RSN: We understand that, as the AAR’s delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies, you have been elected by your peers to be their chair, and as such, will also serve on their board. This is quite an honor — in fact the AAR has never had a delegate serve on the ACLS board. Can you tell us more about your service with the ACLS and how you hope to represent the AAR?

Hillerbrand: Yes, my recent service on the AAR Board has been as delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies. This has been a rewarding experience since it has brought me into contact with representatives of other learned and professional societies. I suppose if you serve long enough on a committee you’ll get assignments, which in my case meant that I was elected chair of the executive committee of the delegates, and this in turn led to my membership on the ACLS Board of Directors. Together with Barbara DeConcini, I have the opportunity to make the case for the academic study of religion to our colleagues in other disciplines.

RSN: How did your parents or your extended family influence your career?

Hillerbrand: My father, I suspect, like most fathers of all times and places, had a definite idea about my vocation — and that was to follow in his professional footsteps. As a somewhat precocious teenager, I thought this seemed utterly pedestrian and philistine. My own notion was to combine the study of philosophy and law and then join the new German Foreign Service. And once I had become ambassador to Moscow or the Court of St. James, or even Washington, I would startle the world with my philosophical insights. I probably had read too much Plato at too young an age. Who knows?

RSN: At what point did you decide you wanted to become a scholar of religion?

Hillerbrand: So, I started out in law school at the University of Erlangen. But by the end of my first semester I had been converted to the study of theology and religion. This grew out of my following the widely prevalent practice at German universities, at least in those days, to enter ten courses or even more per semester, and then to be rather leisurely about which to attend, generally not more than half. I had enrolled in two courses — one by the theologian Paul Althaus on Martin Luther’s theology, the other by the religion scholar Hans Joachim Schoeps on “what does it mean to be human?” — and the brilliance of their lectures and the excitement of the subject matter persuaded me that my vocation was not in law. Then began a dual course of study in theology and religion, accompanied by work in intellectual history.

Hillerbrand’s field is the history of Christianity. He has been on the editorial board of such journals as the Journal for Medieval and Renaissance Studies and the Journal of the History of Ideas. He is currently co-editor of the journal Church History. He has published several books on the Protestant Reformation, most recently the four-volume Oxford Encyclopedia of Reformations (1996). An extensive service to the AAR has included Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee and Chair of the Association of Department Chairs, as well as membership on the Finance and the Teaching and Learning Committees. He presently serves on the AAR Executive Committee and is the AAR delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies, where he is also a member of the Executive Committee.

RSN: In what kind of religious life, if any, did you participate as a young man?

Hillerbrand: Well, in the Germany of my youth, you were either Catholic or Lutheran. Though I grew up in the culturally Catholic Bavaria, my family was Lutheran. It was self-evidently so, but the religious life in my family was rather conventional. The main point seemed to be to make sure that the difference between Lutherans and Catholics was never forgotten. So, in my family I learned mainly to value religious routine. The real religious influences came from my religion teacher in high school (religion was and is a major academic subject in German schools) who was willing to listen to a 14- and 15-year-old’s declaration that Sartre or Schopenhauer or Nietzsche had once and for all destroyed the philosophical viability of theism. He actually not only listened with seriousness, having been part of the anti-Nazi resistance, he demonstrated to me that Christian conviction had relevance for the world.

RSN: How did your parents or your extended family influence your career?

Hillerbrand: My father, I suspect, like most fathers of all times and places, had a definite idea about my vocation — and that was to follow in his professional footsteps. As a somewhat precocious teenager, I thought this seemed utterly pedestrian and philistine. My own notion was to combine the study of philosophy and law and then join the new German Foreign Service. And once I had become ambassador to Moscow or the Court of St. James, or even Washington, I would startle the world with my philosophical insights. I probably had read too much Plato at too young an age. Who knows?

RSN: At what point did you decide you wanted to become a scholar of religion?

Hillerbrand: So, I started out in law school at the University of Erlangen. But by the end of my first semester I had been converted to the study of theology and religion. This grew out of my following the widely prevalent practice at German universities, at least in those days, to enter ten courses or even more per semester, and then to be rather leisurely about which to attend, generally not more than half. I had enrolled in two courses — one by the theologian Paul Althaus on Martin Luther’s theology, the other by the religion scholar Hans Joachim Schoeps on “what does it mean to be human?” — and the brilliance of their lectures and the excitement of the subject matter persuaded me that my vocation was not in law. Then began a dual course of study in theology and religion, accompanied by work in intellectual history.

Hillerbrand’s field is the history of Christianity. He has been on the editorial board of such journals as the Journal for Medieval and Renaissance Studies and the Journal of the History of Ideas. He is currently co-editor of the journal Church History. He has published several books on the Protestant Reformation, most recently the four-volume Oxford Encyclopedia of Reformations (1996). An extensive service to the AAR has included Chair of the Long Range Planning Committee and Chair of the Association of Department Chairs, as well as membership on the Finance and the Teaching and Learning Committees. He presently serves on the AAR Executive Committee and is the AAR delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies, where he is also a member of the Executive Committee.

RSN: In what kind of religious life, if any, did you participate as a young man?

Hillerbrand: Well, in the Germany of my youth, you were either Catholic or Lutheran. Though I grew up in the culturally Catholic Bavaria, my family was Lutheran. It was self-evidently so, but the religious life in my family was rather conventional. The main point seemed to be to make sure that the difference between Lutherans and Catholics was never forgotten. So, in my family I learned mainly to value religious routine. The real religious influences came from my religion teacher in high school (religion was and is a major academic subject in German schools) who was willing to listen to a 14- and 15-year-old’s declaration that Sartre or Schopenhauer or Nietzsche had once and for all destroyed the philosophical viability of theism. He actually not only listened with seriousness, having been part of the anti-Nazi resistance, he demonstrated to me that Christian conviction had relevance for the world.

RSN: How did your parents or your extended family influence your career?

Hillerbrand: My father, I suspect, like most fathers of all times and places, had a definite idea about my vocation — and that was to follow in his professional footsteps. As a somewhat precocious
RSN: How long have you been at Wartburg, and how long have you been department chair?

Klienhans: I came to Wartburg in 1993, as the fourth member of a freestanding religion department. I was the “Lutheran heritage” hire, responsible for most of the theology and church history courses offered by the department. The next year, Religion and Philosophy combined into a single department. I became chair in 1999.

RSN: How large is the department now? How many full-time and adjunct faculty?

Klienhans: There are eight full-time faculty in the department: five in Bible, one in theology, one in ethics, and one in philosophy. The college pastor also teaches one course each term. Given our small town location, we haven’t had much luck finding and retaining qualified adjuncts. Unfortunately, that means our resources are spread pretty thin at times, especially when we need to cover sabbaticals.

RSN: What are your core courses?

Klienhans: All Wartburg students are required to take two “Faith and Reflection” courses as part of their general education requirement. The foundational course is RE 101, “Literature of the Old and New Testaments,” which covers biblical content from Genesis through Revelation. Interestingly enough, RE 101 also functions as part of the college’s Information Literacy Across the Curriculum emphasis, because of its focus on critical thinking skills and textual interpretation. All students are also required to take a second course from among a selection of philosophy and religion classes that deal with ultimate questions and ethical principles.

RSN: How do you attract majors?

Klienhans: In some ways, that’s easy for us. Wartburg’s identity as a college of the church naturally attracts students interested in religion. We currently have 21 students making religion the seventh-largest major at Wartburg. At any given time, about half of our majors are planning to enter some kind of church vocation, while the other half are students who’ve chosen religion as a second major to complement their primary course of study. Social work and religion is a popular combination, for example.

RSN: It must be nice to have a dependable stream of students interested in your department.

Klienhans: Well, yes and no. On the one hand, a lot of students come to Wartburg favorably disposed toward religion. But for a significant number of students, the concept of the academic study of religion is foreign. One of my colleagues in the art department once pointed out that students and religion classes have in common an expressivist orientation toward our courses: because of their personal investment in the material they resent being graded on something they consider subjective. The double majors are often not better students, simply since in their other major they have given them an appreciation for what a discipline is.

We’re constantly working to communicate that our identity and function as a college of the Lutheran church is quite different from the popular image of a “Christian” college or a Bible college. We make a point of emphasizing that Lutheranism was born in a university and has always promoted the value of education. Some of our students talk about “having faith like a child.” Our standard response is that Jesus instructed his followers to love God “with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind” (Matthew 22:37). We’re not interested in fostering religious beliefs that can’t stand up to intellectual scrutiny. To paraphrase Socrates, the unexamined faith is not worth believing.

RSN: Would you tell us something about the organization of knowledge in your department?

Klienhans: At the risk of oversimplifying, some days I describe the department as having two components: “Bible” and “everything else.” Certainly that’s the easiest way to categorize the faculty. Our three most recent hires have been devoted to staffing RE 101, the core Bible course, in the face of eight years of record-breaking student enrollment. That’s created a significant imbalance in the shape of the department.

Although we are a religion and philosophy department, it’s most accurate to say that our religion faculty is all trained in Christian theology, rather than in a religious studies model. Consequently, the shape of the major is overwhelmingly Christian. The religion major consists of eight courses, four of which are required: “Literature of Old and New Testaments,” “History of Christianity,” and the Fourth-year Seminar. Two other courses are electives.

We also offer a number of preprofessional concentrations that build on the basic right-course religion major. The Pre-seminary concentration requires philosophy, biblical languages, history, and literature. The Youth and Family Ministry concentration requires almost as many psychology and sociology courses as it does religion courses. Most of these concentrations require several internship experiences, which are intended both to provide real-world experience and to foster critical reflection on experience.

RSN: What are your strengths as a department?

Klienhans: We’re a fairly young department, which generates lots of creative energy. I’d point out that I replaced a retiring faculty member who’d been teaching at Wartburg since the year I was born! The next year we replaced someone who’d been here even longer. All in all, many of the department members have been hired since I came to Wartburg in 1993.

Although this is the first full-time teaching job for many of our colleagues, we’ve developed into strong teachers. Three of my colleagues have won the college-wide Student Award for Teaching Excellence in recent years, and another two of us have been finalists for that honor.

We also have a strong global awareness. One of my colleagues was a missionary who was raised in India as the child of a medical missionary. Two other members have extensive overseas teaching experience, one in Papua New Guinea and the other in Brazil. Not surprisingly, we encourage our students to study abroad in order to gain a wider understanding of the world. During the college’s May Terms, religion faculty frequently lead travel courses to Germany, Israel/Palestine, Honduras, and Tanzania.

RSN: What distinguishes your department from other departments on campus?

Klienhans: The largest majors on campus are in preprofessional programs: business, biology, communication arts, and education. As a result, we tend to be viewed by some of our colleagues as merely a service department, albeit a somewhat privatized one, given the college’s Lutheran identity. I don’t mind the “service department” designation, although there’s a lot more to it than just staffing the Faith and Reflection requirement.

I mentioned earlier that religion is the seventh-largest major at Wartburg. It’s actually the largest major among the humanities disciplines. That makes us natural bearers for the liberal arts, especially for the value of a liberal arts education for our preprofessional students. Our religion faculty have made significant contributions in many areas of the college’s general education program, including the design of our interdisciplinary first-year core course and the new honors program.

RSN: How would you like to expand the department’s offerings?

Klienhans: Obviously, our biggest need is to add a full-time faculty member with expertise in world religions. Such a colleague would strengthen our major and would also be positioned to make significant contributions toward the college’s Diversity Across the Curriculum emphasis. A world religions position has been part of the college’s long-range staffing plan for a decade, but unfortunately other priorities keep pushing it out of the way when it’s time to allocate limited resources for new faculty positions.

Currently I’m working on a proposal for a Challenge Grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities that would endow a distinguished professorship in world religious understanding. When I became department chair, I didn’t realize that fund-raising would be part of my job, but it is.

We expect that a world religions professor may bring new methodological approaches to the department, as well as content expertise. That something’s we’ve open to, but I’m sure there will be some growing pains for the faculty, as well as for our students, as the religion major becomes more diverse in its scope and content. Still, that’s a challenge I’m eager to face!

RSN: What other challenges will your department be facing in the near future?

Klienhans: During my decade-plus at Wartburg, the student body has grown from 1,400 to 1,775. If enrollment continues to grow, staffing general education courses, particularly RE 101, will become an even greater challenge. We just can’t keep hiring more Bible faculty whose primary responsibility will be teaching multiple sections of a single entry-level course. So we may need to reframe how we approach the Faith and Reflection requirement.

RSN: What gives you the greatest satisfaction as a chair?

Klienhans: Helping my colleagues and our students do the best work that they can do! I’m an adequate administrator, but I’m a passionate advocate. I want the best for my colleagues, our students, and for the institution as a whole. Often that means thinking outside the box and trying to broker win-win solutions with limited resources. On my best days, I feel a real sense of accomplishment in my work.
Beyond the Annual Meeting

Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession Committee

Kwok Pui lan, Episcopal Divinity School

RSN: Can you tell us the history of your committee?

Kwok: We became a standing committee in 2003, after eight years as an ad hoc committee. It was set up to study the problems of racial and ethnic scholars in religion and to propose remedies and initiatives for the Academy. The Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession Committee (RSN) was the first chair now that it is a standing committee.

RSN: What does your committee do?

Kwok: Our committee serves as a bridge between the Academy and its racial minority and ethnic members. In 2003 we had about 1,500 regular members (13 percent of total) and 500 student members (19 percent of students) who self-identified as racial and ethnic minorities. The actual figures must be higher because there are many Asian restaurants. It is important to understand religious life in these racial and ethnic communities and to develop leadership from their midst. When I first attended the Annual Meeting in 2003, I saw very few Asian and Asian-American members. Now there is a group on Asian-American religion and culture, and another on Latino/a religion. Black religious discourse, of course, is more developed and has a longer history. These voices not only have brought new scholarship to the Academy, but have also changed the way religious scholarship is done.

RSN: What do you mean by this?

Kwok: In the past, when we talked about Buddhism, few of us thought about Buddhists in Asian American communities. We are doing research on Catholicism in the United States, and we can’t overcome the fact that a significant portion of those attending the Catholic Church today are racial and ethnic minorities. I have noticed that in recent years, many of the books that received the AAR excellence awards have used methodologies that include race, class, gender, culture, and colonialism in their analysis. There is a paradigmatic change in our field in that religion can no more be studied as if it is universal, without taking into consideration how it is embedded in and influenced by culture and history. And speaking from the United States, scholars just can’t afford to ignore how race has shaped the construction of knowledge in the academy in general and the field of religious studies.

RSN: What has your committee done to promote these kinds of conversations?

Kwok: Since 1998, the committee has sponsored Special Topics Forums at the Annual Meeting. We think that we need to have public forums that bring white scholars and minority scholars together and facilitate conversations among diverse racial groups. We have discussed the impact of racial and ethnic minorities in the academy, the history of racial relations in the U.S., and how identity impacts our scholarship and teaching. These are quite well attended, and we have been able to attract a diverse crowd.

RSN: Did your committee sponsor a forum in San Antonio?

Kwok: I’m glad you ask the question. We did. We have been in conversation with racial and ethnic minority leaders on how the AAR independent Annual Meeting will affect our scholarship and leadership of the Academy. We sponsored a forum to discuss the relation between the study of religion and the study of scriptures from a racial and ethnic perspective. Speakers included Charles H. Long, Ria Daugaptra Sharam, Tahs Kasmaz, Vincent Wimbush, Nikky Sing, Stanley Burns, and myself. As I knew this was the first time we have addressed the topic, and we drew about 100 participants.

RSN: What other initiatives does your committee plan to take?

Kwok: We will publish a career guide for minority scholars, with support from the Luce Foundation. We have been talking about this for well over a decade. The Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession published a survival manual for women in religious studies 12 years ago and a a Guide for Women in Religion. Now there is a new group on Asian-American religion and culture, and another on Latino/a religion. Black religious discourse, of course, is more developed and has a longer history. These voices not only have brought new scholarship to the Academy, but have also changed the way religious scholarship is done.

RSN: Tell us more about this career guide.

Kwok: This is still in the planning stage. We want to get a general reference, covering the range of issues from being a student to the golden years of retirement. When I first got my job, I did not know how to negotiate my contract. Such a guide would have been very helpful for me. As a person moving along, some advice on how to balance the many commitments of a mid-career faculty member will be useful. We will have a group consisting of people of different races and religious traditions from universities, small colleges, and religious minority schools working on this. We also hope to solicit input from religious minority scholars through different channels.

RSN: I wonder to ask you to name one success of your committee, what would it be?

Kwok: I’ll begin by telling you a story. A few years ago, several AAR committees met concurrently during one weekend and we all had dinner together. A white colleague greeted me by saying, “You must be from the racial minority committee.” I didn’t get that to him that I might serve on some other committees. One successful thing our committee has done was to propose remedies to the Board of Directors to diversify the leadership of the Academy. The Board accepted our proposal unanimously last April. The committee has worked closely with the President, the Executive office, and the Nominations Committee to identify suitable minority candidates to fill vacant positions for the officers, committee chairs, and task forces. Unless racial minorities are represented in the leadership of the Academy, our voices and issues cannot be heard and our contributions will be limited.

Editor’s Note:

The Henry Luce Foundation has awarded a grant to the AAR’s Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Religion Committee. Grant funds will be used to publish an online career guide for minority scholars.
Revival of the Saiva and Sakta traditions at Srisailam in the postindependence years of India? Within a given Hindu pilgrimage center, both the devotional practices of pilgrims and the devotional pilgrimage literature focus on glorifying the splendors and spiritual power of the site, while also worshiping its patron deity. In Srisailam, it is Siva who has been the patron deity ever since the early centuries of the Common Era. The site is considered one of the 12 most important Saiva pilgrimage centers, and Srisailam is reflected in the medieval temple inscriptions, Telugu literary works, and in the temple narrative art traditions at Srisailam, all of which are dedicated to the glory of Siva and Saiva religious culture. However, when I started working on Srisailam, I discovered that although the site’s major Sanskrit text, the Srisaila Sthalapuranamu (Sri Kasikhandamu), provides a lively account of Srisailam, it is totally silent about the role of Srisailam in both Siva’s sacred history and religious developments in Saurashtra. In contrast, the Skanda Purana speaks abundantly about Bhramarambha, devoting 19 of its 64 chapters to her sacred history, religious practices, and Saiva sectarian schools in South India. The centrality of Siva to Srisailam is reflected in the titular deities of Bhramarambha temples in Saurashtra, in Telugu literary works, and in the temple narrative art traditions at Srisailam, all of which are dedicated to the glory of Siva and Saiva religious culture.

To explain my hypothesis, I must begin with the fact that a revolutionary Saiva movement called Virasaivasam developed in what are now the modern states of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh in South India between the 12th and 14th centuries. Founded on an egalitarian ideology, this movement was a protest against the Saiva orthodoxy, including its caste system and ritualistic religious practices. In Srisailam, the Virasaivas created a constant struggle over temple custodianship between the Saiva orthodox Brahmins and the Virasaivas. By the 14th century, the Virasaivas succeeded in taking over the management of Siva’s temple at Srisailam from the Saiva orthodox Brahmins. As the new patrons of Siva’s temple, the Virasaivas saw their influence grow immensely, and within a century or so, the ruling dynasties of Andhrapradesh and the Virasaivas took over the kingdoms of the region. Having lost control of the management of Siva’s temple, the orthodox Brahmins never ceased to be the custodians of Bhramarambha’s temple and her rituals. When they commissioned the composition of the Skanda Purana in the 15th century, the Brahmins elevated the status of Bhramarambha to be higher than that of Siva by dedicating 19 chapters to the glory of the goddess, while limiting references to her counterpart, Siva, to only a few passages. Through my study of current ritual practices in the Bhramarambha temple, I discovered that the medieval Brahmin authorities mandated to raise the status of Bhramarambha from that of a local goddess to that of a pan-Indian great goddess under Siva of Bhramarambha, by introducing a place for her within the Sri Vidya theology of the Virasaivas.

From medieval Telugu works and inscriptions, we learn that when taking possession of the management of Siva temple, the Virasaivas also found ways to heighten the fame and status of their chosen deity. In a radical departure from the rich Sanskrit legacy, the egalitarian Virasaivas commissioned poet to compose works in the vernacular Telugu language to glorify only Siva and Virasaivism. Today, the contrasting performance of the rituals is a reminder of Bhramarambha’s temple, which follow the Vedic and Agamic traditions, and the rituals in Siva’s temple, which follow the Agamic and Virasaiva traditions. This clearly shows how the earlier changes in the custodianship of the temples have altered the religious practices at Srisailam. In the process of arriving at my hypothesis above, the historical shifts, I followed a research program that included the application of interdisciplinary methodologies and the use of different kinds of sources or materials to explore the relationship between Saivas and Saktas at Srisailam. As mentioned earlier, the Saiva Brahmins and the Virasaivas distinguished themselves in their choice of languages (Sanskrit vs. Telugu), and in supporting literary compositional and textual imageries and cultic ideas; this methodical approach to compare these textual accounts with materials thus is essential to enable one to understand the underlying symbolic imageries and cultic ideas; this methodological approach also helps to create a textual account of the visual narratives, as well as to compare these textual accounts with similar visual narratives in the visual traditions. The Prakara art is especially important for the comparative study of Virasaiva cultic practices in textual and artistic narratives and for a better understanding of the position of Virasaivism within the socio-cultural context of Andhrapradesh. What we see today at Srisailam is the practice of two major theistic traditions of Hinduism: the Saiva and Sakta traditions. Between a period of more than 1,000 years, the Saiva and Sakta cults have developed into complex multilayered traditions through an amalgamation of beliefs and ideas that have been influenced by tribal, folk, regional, and sectarian cults. Written in Old Telugu and classical kavya style. In addition, there are more than 70 on-site Telugu inscriptions, some of which require not only English translations but also interpretation of their contents, especially in regard to the dating of temples and religious developments. In addition to the use of vernacular Telugu literature as a means of promoting Saiva legacy, the Virasaivas changed the patronage of the Siva temple through the dedication of an extraordinary art monumet, which I believe I wanted to serve as both a symbol of the Virasaivas’ victory over the Saiva Brahmins as well as an expression of their devotion to their patron deity. This art monument consists of approximately 2,000 bas-reliefs, which are carved on the outer surface of a gigantic Prakara enclosure that surrounds the temples of Siva and Bhramarambha. This enclosure, measuring 20 feet high by 500 feet wide by 600 feet long, depicts the stories of Siva and Srisailam, the hagiography of saints and devotees, and cultic images of the Saiva and Sakta traditions.
Debra L. Mason, Religion Newswriters Association

IKE IT OR NOT, the single biggest issue of concern about religion and faith outside of one’s own faith community is the secular news media. Much has been written and critiqued about the inadequacies of the media when it comes to reporting on religion, faith, and values — and scholars have responded in ways ranging from precipitating to nurturing participation from faith communities.

But two major realities in the news industry now threaten to move whatever coverage of religion has existed in the past — flawed as it may be — out of the public and into the private. The biggest factor is the news media’s quest for greatest profitability in an era of declining newspaper readership.

The Readership Institute says newspapers should enhance to “grow readership,” are in order:

1. Community Announcements/Obituaries/Ordinary People
2. Health/Home/Fashion/Food/Travel
3. Government/War/Politics/International
4. Natural Disasters/Accidents
5. Movies/TV/Weather
6. Business/Economy/Personal Finance
7. Science/Technology/Environment
8. Police/Crime/Courts/Legal
9. Sports

These top areas are promoted independent of the rest of the list, which does include religion as number 11 out of 14 categories. (The other five news content areas are: 10. Education; Parenting/Relationships/Religion; 12. Arts; 13. Automotive; and 14. Popular Music.)

Common sense tells us there is plenty of religion in news about ordinary lives, government, politics, and, really, every item on the “Top Nine” list. But having largely segregated religion news to Saturday sections for more than 100 years, editors now have a hard time recognizing that faith and values are woven in all aspects of life.

So despite fleeting and superficial attention to coverage of religion last fall in the wake of the U.S. presidential elections — in which morals and values ranked as a top motivating factor among many voters — the Readership Institute strategy is impacting the religion beat in concrete ways.

Stephen Scott, former religion editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press, became the latest to suffer from a divesting of the religion beat directly related to the Readership Institute’s strategies. The Pioneer Press eliminated a religion position effective September 11, making it among the largest newspapers in the country without a faith specialist. Now the Pioneer Press’s competition, the Minneapolis Star Tribune, is in no rush to replace its longtime religion editor who retired. At the Boston Globe, weekly spiritual life column was killed last summer. In Raleigh, a thoughtful Q&A religion column about diverse theological and religious questions of scripture died.

At other papers, too, longtime religion journalists are having their hours spent on religion cut from fulltime to one day a week. And longtime religion specialists at a trio of major U.S. news magazines have never been replaced — a topic of December religion blog mutterings and complaints about Newsweek and Time’s story selections for their 2004 Christmas religion cover stories.

What’s wrong with this picture?

Clearly, despite sophisticated and generally well-researched, the Readership Institute misses the mark in its assessment of the importance of religion in newspaper readers’ lives and readers’ desire to see it in the mass media.

A number of indicators show that readers care — and care passionately — about presentations of religion in the mainstream media.

• Cover stories on religion in the major newswEEKlies routinely are among the biggest newstand sellers;
• The People magazine cover with Mel Gibson and "The Passion of the Christ" sold more issues than any other in the first half of 2004;
• Nearly one in five consumer books bought last year dealt with religion or spirituality;
• A survey by the Pew Internet and American Life Project last year found that 64 percent of 128 million Internet surfers — or 82 million adult Americans — used the Internet for some form of spiritual or religious activity;
• Seventeen magazine started a faith section that includes verses from spiritual texts;
• A documentary on the historical Jesus last spring received CNN’s all-time biggest audience for non-news programming.

“Quiet campaign” undercuts press freedoms, public’s right to know

The second threat to reporting about religion in the public square is perhaps closer to the religion scholar’s heart: the legal threats to interpretations of the First Amendment and state statutes that protect the media from prosecution when shield- ing confidential sources. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and AAR members’ academic freedom, at the very least, philosophical and legislative siblings that require the issue of religion and the media stay in the public and not just the private realm.

Washington Post columnist E. J. Dionne, in December 16 column, writes of a quiet campaign being waged against your right to know things. God forbid that ordinary folks should learn more about what govern- ment officials do and others among the powerful might be up to it.

Like many in the media, Dionne was sounding the alarm about a pattern in 2004 — expected to continue in 2005 — of cases in which traditionally protected actions by journalists, including reports about the U.S. Army and the shielding of confidential sources, are now leading to government investigations of journalists and, more surprisingly, convictions.

“All these cases are too often cast as instances in which journalists and ‘media organizations’ are protecting themselves and their friends. But newspapers and network news will keep making money whether inside information flows like a mighty river or trickles like a sad little creek. Who is hurt most when citizens fail to learn about bribe-taking, disloyal soldiers or out-of-control intelligence programs? You know the answer, and it’s chilling,” Dionne writes.

In addition to legal threats to state shield laws, the Patriot Act has compounded the problem, allowing the government to justify the removal of thousands of pages of formerly public information from public view. Protected documents include investi- gations of mosques and religious institutions, peace activists and scholars.

Uneasy partners

Like scholars, the media play an important role in informing the public about religious pluralism and diversity in our country. The press can apprise us of the role of faith in the lives of our politicians — and the role it plays in the development of public policy. The media serve as watchdogs against hubris, greed, and abuses of power in religious institutions — human flaws that can cause lasting emotional and spiritual pain to the faithful. And the media can inspire us with examples of the everyday saints and servants of God.

If you have to ask what all this has to do with religion scholars, think about the U.S. visa revocation case of scholar Tariq Ramadan. Think about concerns about academic freedom and the intertwining of press and religious freedoms enshrined in the First Amendment. It’s messy and complicated but scholars, at a minimum, pay attention to clampdowns on the press by state and federal governments.

Ideally, it means the media and scholars should consider each other reluctant partners, for a media without religion both hurts the credibility of the press and reduces public validation for the study, funding, and discourse of religion in the public life.
When I started a master’s program years ago, I had a circle of friends who met weekly to meditate and talk. Most of these friends were married or in committed relationships, but by the time we finished the program three years later, not a single one of those relationships had survived. A few years later, on orientation day for the doctoral program, incoming students were invited to speak of their goals. While my classmates focused on research and publication ambitions, I remember voicing much more mundane desires. I had just gotten married, and I wanted to still be married—to the same person—when I finished my PhD.

The high percentage of relationship failures in graduate school isn’t surprising when you look at the stresses involved. Long hours, lack of money, and unrelenting pressure take their toll. Since most of us academic types base our worth on our intellectual skills, the doctoral program becomes the ultimate survivor test. Gone are the days of breezing through at the top of the class when everyone else is brainy, too. In the beginning, no matter how much I prepared, it was never enough. Every spare minute was committed. No matter what I was doing, I was always aware that I should be doing something else, something more. Time off was an illicit luxury, and the idea of going away for a weekend was inconceivable.

It took a while for me to realize how damaging my compulsive work habits were. Home life deteriorated to a litany of complaints about how tired I was and how lonely he was. But eventually we figured out a few things that worked and I’d like to share them.

The first thing I learned was that I could not work all the time. It’s important to learn to ignore the voice that tells you that you can’t stop. Just on research and anxiety and set it aside, or you’ll go crazy. For one thing, brains need rest in order to operate efficiently. For another, relationships can’t be put on ice for years. My spouse and I learned to set a regular date every week to relax together and talk. Even if we were broke, we went out for a meal. (So what if it was McDonald’s? I also took summers completely off from studies. [Okay, one summer I took intensive Latin for eight weeks. But we still had a vacation together.]

Second, be prepared for changes. My problem wasn’t just a lack of time; I was also being fundamentally altered. Doctoral work transforms one from student to teacher, and I needed to claim a new level of personal authority. At the same time, my husband was also changing. He didn’t stand still in his work life or self-assessment, so we needed to talk together about what we were learning and feeling, what was exciting or scary. This wasn’t easy, and at times we needed help. If you think you don’t have the time or money for therapy, just sit down and figure out what a divorce is going to cost you. Lots more, I promise.

There’s one more thing that was illustrated in that circle of friends so long ago. I mentioned that all my married associates got divorced during the master’s program—but did I also mention that everyone who was single ended up in a committed relationship? The little secret of academia is that all this ‘mind stuff’ is sexy. Connecting with someone who is your intellectual peer is an aphrodisiac. Even if nothing overtly sexual ever happens, it’s easy to get more intimately connected to your classmates than your partner. Your fascinating academic thoughts may take too long to explain to your spouse, or your partner may not get the point, or maybe they aren’t even interested.

So point three is that we need to acknowledge and accept that there’s a seductive change to intellectual pursuits! Don’t have all your fun with your colleagues on lunch and study dates and then drag your raggedy ass home too tired to talk to your partner. In case you’re wondering, yes, it took longer for me to graduate than my compatriots. Yes, I got a “B” in one class. (I wrote “Good Enough” in big red letters on the grade printout, taped it over my computer, and used it as an exercise in humility.) Yes, we went to therapy and sometimes I resented the time it took. Yes, I have been single. Who knows? In the future, whom I might fascinate and who would have looked pretty good if I’d been single. And finally, yes, when I got my PhD this past spring, I was still married to my dear husband who supported, loved, listened to, challenged, and grew with me through these hard years.

Passages: Life in Retirement

Eugene TeSelle

Eugene TeSelle is a graduate of the University of Colorado, Princeton Theological Seminary, and Yale University. After teaching in Yale’s Department of Religious Studies, he spent 30 years at Vanderbilt Divinity School, retiring in 1999 as Oberlin Alumnus Professor of Church History and Theology. His writings have been in the history of theology, mostly on Augustine and Aquinas, and also on the Reformed tradition. As Vanderbilt he has been chair of the Graduate Department of Religion, the Graduate Faculty Council, and the Faculty Senate.

RSN: What types of activities are you enjoying in your retirement?

TeSelle: When I retired in 1999, I didn’t experience the sudden change that can cause problems. I phased it out slowly. The year after retirement I was on the search committee for a new dean, and we’re all glad that James Hudson-James could come. There has been a wave of retirements from the Divinity School over the last ten years, just as the demographics predicted. This fall the Divinity School had more new faculty members joining the school than in my own “class of 1969,” which had held the previous record.

It’s hard to believe, but the school can thrive without us. Perhaps it shows that the post-moderns are winning and there is objective reality. Very soon I came to appreciate the wisdom of a retired French professor who said he had learned not to comment on any issues before the department, since he no longer knew the full story or who was on what side. Retirement inevitably requires letting go. It may be a shock, but soon it is comforting.

RSN: If you could design your perfect retirement, what would it look like?

TeSelle: It may indicate a lack of imagination, but I don’t have anything for different. For starters, Vanderbilt is wise in giving its retirees free parking permits and maintaining access to its Web site and its library system. For one reason or another, I got to the library almost every day. Occasionally I read books that I always wanted to know more about, but between scholarship and politics there is usually an immediate motive for checking them out.

And then Penny and I are fortunate to be in a place where we have many attachments, we can’t imagine wanting to live somewhere else. That kind of more would be the real disruption, we think. Of course there are some faculty members who have established a second home somewhere else during their teaching years and are ready to move there.

RSN: If you could give advice to younger colleagues who are still teaching, what would it be?

TeSelle: I guess I would emphasize the value of putting down roots somewhere, either where you have been teaching or in a pied à terre in a place where you would like to move. But we in academic have an advantage over most people in the business world, since we can stay active in retirement. And in the humanities we don’t even need laboratories like colleagues in the sciences. We can still enjoy what we have spent our careers studying.
Lessons in Time Management

For New Assistant Professors, the Most Difficult Challenge Is Learning How to Set Priorities

Lee Tobin McClain, Seton Hill University

When new faculty members cross paths on campus, there's a shorthand they share: “You making it?” “Busy. You?” “Swamped.” Sometimes, there’s just time for an exchange of eye rolls.

I thought I was busy as a graduate student, and I was. But writing a dissertation, teaching a class, and working a night-shift job to pay the bills didn’t have the same feel as becoming an assistant professor. The former took a lot of hours, but they were hours in becoming an assistant professor. The former were fully prepared, but it’s something for which few new faculty members are prepared.

Managing time as an assistant professor is crucial to your long-term success. Having blundered for an exchange of eye rolls.

Be cautious in accepting committee work. You don’t want to say no to everything, or to guard your time in a miserly way, implying that it’s more precious than anyone else’s. At the same time, there are duties that everyone tries to dump on junior faculty members. I spent years advising the student honor society, without interest, joy, or thanks, before working up the courage to ask my dean to put someone else in charge. Her response: “I didn’t know you were doing that. Why are you doing that? Sure, I’ll find someone else.”

It’s smart to consult with a senior faculty member before accepting any committee assignments — especially those that feel dumped on you. Your standard line, delivered with appropriate humility, should be: “That sounds really interesting, but my department chair asked me to talk with her before taking on any committee assignments.” Such a line does two things: It alerts the dumper that you have someone in your corner who will protect you, and it buys you time to think and consult about whether the assignment will be worthwhile.

If it’s your department head who’s imposing the new responsibility, you may need to take a different approach. “If I join the accreditation review committee, I might say, ‘Which do you think I should focus on?’ If your chair urges you to take on her pet committee, then enlist her help in getting you off another committee.

It’s up to you to make sure you don’t get overloaded. When they stop to think about it, administrators don’t want junior faculty members to burn out on committee work. But they do want to get the institution’s work accomplished. If you get the administrators on your side and keep them informed, they can help you manage the limited time you have for college service. Make time to write. Research and writing are part of your job, but they are the part that initially seems least pressing. At a small university like mine, where the priorities are teaching and service, it’s easy to forget for months on end about your scholarly work. A few years down the road, at promotion time, everyone will suddenly remember that scholarly work matters as much as teaching and service. And if you haven’t established some record of scholarly productivity at that point, time management will be the least of your problems.

Getting scholarly articles and books published is maddeningly slow, so you have to send things out years in advance of when you need them to appear on your vita. When you take the long view, writing a page a day is a high priority. In my first years as an assistant professor, I had started each new academic year with great intentions to write that page each day, and more. But by October, when things got busy, writing would fall off my radar. The one thing I did right was to apply to speak at several academic conferences a year. That way, the impending conference paper (and the attendant humiliation if I didn’t finish) became as important as class prep, and I did it.

But conference papers aren’t the same as finished articles or books. For those, you need a consistent plan. Scholars who schedule a specific time in their day to write tend to get the work done. When I finally started entering “read two journal articles” or “draft introduction” into my daily planner — ahead of “grade papers” or “prepare lecture” — I got productive.

One assistant professor I work with doesn’t come to the campus until 11 AM each day; he devotes his mornings to writing. Another lets her research go for weeks, then gets into a frenzy and works long, late hours to complete a project. Although their styles differ, they’re both getting the research done. And both are show-offs for promotion.

Be canny about class preparation. When I started as a new assistant professor, I had to prepare four new courses in my first semester. I knew it was an emergency situation, especially given my tendency to overprepare. I had to cut myself a few breaks.

See McClain p. 23
While textual and art historical approaches have helped me to reconstruct the broad structural frameworks for the Saiva and Sakta traditions, I chose to turn to anthropological methods and ethnographic field research to help me understand the inner mechanisms of their cultic practices and multiple symbolic variants. I conducted fieldwork at Srisailam three times over a period of ten years, focusing on the various aspects of the site, ranging from the sacred geography to the annual festivals. The AAR grant enabled me to conduct ethnographic fieldwork and research during the annual rituals and festivals of Srisailam’s Night (aava ram). The study of these rituals and festivals helped me immensely in tracing different layers of Saiva tradition, just as an archaeologist studies the stratigraphic layers of earth formations and their contents from an excavated trench. This field research further expanded my notion of ritual in general, and made me aware that a ritual not only reflects a social structure, but can also “[become] at times of major crises an instrument for adjusting new norms and values to potentially potent symbolic forms.” I also have come to see how the Siva Night ritual represents a continuity of traditional forms of Saivism while embracing new forms of religious, liturgical, ritual, cultural, social, and contemporary nuances of Hindu society.

To sum up, the change of custodianship over the temples of Siva and Bhramaramba not only brought about a transformation in the religious and cultural landscape of Srisailam but also contributed to changing how the site was viewed in the larger society. Even today, Srisailam continues to serve as an all-India pilgrimage site for Siva, as well as a famous Shakti shrine for the Goddess Bhramaramba. It would be interesting to see, however, what aspects of popular Hinduism have been contributing to the growing popularity of Srisailam in recent decades, especially under the cunodianship of Andhita Prades Endowment Department.

Endnotes
1 This book will contain some revised versions of my dissertation chapters (Reddy, 2000). I would like to thank my advisor, Dana L. Eek at Harvard University, whose comments and criticism have benefited me greatly in writing my thesis.
2 I would like to thank Richard Kieckhefer, Christina Truax, Barbara Newman, and George Bond for their support and encouragement during my Mellon years at Northwestern University.
3 The SKS is an unpublished manuscript which forms one of the 25 sections of the Smatamuously Samhita of the Skanda Purana. The surviving manuscrit has 64 chapters and 3,500 verses.
4 The only exceptions are two inscriptions dated to the early 15th century, which each make only a passing reference to the goddess Bhramaramba.
6 Except for the Kollaree Pura, all the other cited works have not yet been translated into English.
7 Most of the inscriptions from Srisailam are published in South Indian Inscriptions, Vols. 10 and 16. A few are published in Elyseehraphia Indica, 10. A large number of inscriptions from other parts of Andhra, which are useful sources for the religious history of Srisailam, have been published under the series Inscriptions of Andhra Pradeh (4A).
8 For the study of iconology, a branch of art history, I drew on the methodology of Panofsky (1962).
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broadly dependable portrait of the impact of religion on the election.

The first part of the accompanying table presents the two-party vote in terms of frequent (weekly or better) and less-than-weekly worship attenders. These figures show a now-common pattern: Bush won the former and Kerry the latter. Specifically, Bush’s margin in 2004 among the frequent attenders increased by so small an amount that it is hidden in rounding the figures, while among less frequent attenders Kerry fell 1 percent behind Gore’s performance in 2000. The second part of the table unpacks this attendance dichotomy into each of its component parts. It shows that the “few times a month” attenders shifted their support from 6 percentage points in favor of Gore over Bush to 2 percentage points in favor of Bush over Kerry.

Representing 15 percent of 2004 voters, the monthly attenders would have given Kerry more than 2.5 million extra votes nationwide had they voted for him at the same rate they voted for Gore in 2000 — enough to have brought him within 1 million votes of the president. But to have won, Kerry would have had to have found some additional support elsewhere.

What about the dramatic expansion of turnout in 2004? That increase occurred quite evenly up and down the levels of worship attendance, with just a few minor fluctuations. So the big turnout in 2004 did not result from a change in the relative distribution of worship attenders. Because the electorate was so much bigger in 2004, the actual number of ballots at each level of attendance expanded considerably.

As in 2000, the 2004 religion gap extended across the largest religious traditions, with Bush doing best among regularly attending white Christians. But in most cases, Bush gained more among the less frequent attenders. In the case of white Catholics, for example, the Bush vote increased from 64 percent to 66 percent among those who went to church more than once a week, but from 51 percent to 59 percent among those who turned up a few times a month. The Catholic swing vote swung in Bush’s direction.

A change in the wording of exit poll questions between 2000 and 2004 renders comparisons among white Protestants imprecise, but a similar pattern appears to have held there as well. Bush gained slightly among the most active evangelicals (80 percent to 81 percent), but improved more among the monthly attenders (64 percent to 79 percent). He also experienced a small improvement among Latino Catholics and African-American Protestants.

There were a few offsets to the Bush gains. Not surprisingly, the president appears to have lost a little ground among voters who said they were unaffiliated or secular. And although Bush once again won a majority of the mainline Protestant vote, it looks as though he made only a tiny gain among the less frequent attenders (from 52 percent to 53 percent) and, most significantly, lost substantial ground among their frequent-attending counterparts (from 62 percent to 54 percent). Mainline Protestants may be the faith group to watch in the future.

Until the exit poll data are released in their entirety, it will be hard to be any more specific about the extent to which the 2004 religion gap was affected by factors like gender, region, and turnout among particular religious groups. But the published reports offer some suggestions. Most important, the Bush campaign’s extensive mobilization of religious communities maintained the support of regular attenders and expanded their turnout in line with the rest of the country. The greater prominence of social issues, especially same-sex marriage, surely facilitated these efforts.

It is possible that this mobilization of voters on religious lines — through an appeal to their “moral values” — should be credited with enabling the president to gather in more few-times-a-month attenders and minorities. It is, of course, also possible that those groups voted for Bush in higher numbers for other reasons, such as the war on terror.

At least for this election, the monthly attenders voted more like the weekly attenders, and their shift narrowed the religion gap so as to give Bush a decisive advantage in a very tight election. Closely divided between Republican and Democrat, these pretty regular churchgoers may be the swing vote that determines the outcome of future national elections. Under the circumstances, the Democrats would be well advised to listen to those urging them to do a better job connecting with people in the pews.

### Worshippers Attendance and the Two-Party Presidential Vote, 2004 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less regular</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than weekly</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Regular attenders: weekly or more; Less regular attenders: monthly or less.

Source: 2004 and 2000 Exit Polls

1 In 2004, the exit polls were run by Edison Research and released as the National Election Pool.

2 In 2000, it asked, “Are you a member of the religious right?” In 2004, it asked, “Are you an evangelical or born-again Christian?” To compare the two, it was necessary to estimate what the “born-again” measure would have been in 2000 based on past surveys that asked both questions.

3 The “unaffiliateds” and “seculars” need to be differentiated from those who say they never attend religious services. The latter, who trended slightly towards Bush in 2004, include those who, despite their lack of attendance, nonetheless profess a religious identity. 
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Paula Arai, Carleton College
Healing Buddhist Women: Japanese Rituals of Transformation

Robert M. Baum, Iowa State University
Messengers of God: Diola Women Prophets in a West African Religious Tradition

Gudrun Buhnemann, University of Wisconsin–Madison
Tantric Iconology of Nepal

Jacob Paul Dalton, McMaster University
Beyond Anonymity: Paleographic Analyses of the Dunhuang Manuscripts

Nicola Denzey, Harvard Divinity School and York University, Toronto
Gendering the Journey: Women’s Lives and Deaths from the Catacombs of Rome 200–400 CE

Paul C. Kemeny, Grove City College
The First Moral Majority: The New England Watch and Ward Society and Moral Reform Politics in Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century America

Lance D. Laird, Boston University School of Medicine
The Profession of Islam and the Health Care Profession in Boston

Charles William Mills, University of North Dakota
The Bible in the Pacific: Ideology, Interpretation, and Colonialism in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii

Vijaya Ramakrishnagaraj, University of San Francisco
Trees in Temples and Temples in Trees: Sacred Groves and the Commons in Tamil Nadu, India

Dina Wals-Pasulka, University of North Carolina, Wilmington
Child Immortality in the Nineteenth-Century United States

Gender Distribution by Faculty Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity Distribution by Faculty Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Caucasian or Euro-American</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Latino or Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Academy of Religion, 2002 Survey of Graduate Programs in Religion and Theology, Report on Students and Faculty. The full survey and analysis can be found at www.aarweb.org/department/census/graduate.

Note: The faculty section of the survey collected information on 1,414 faculty members from 53 academic doctoral programs in the United States.
McCLAIN, from p.19

In each of the four courses, I found an excuse to show a movie once during the semester, which freed me from a week’s worth of class prep. I also built in research days in the library, guest speakers, and a few out-of-class trips that took me off the stage. (I later learned that out-of-class trips and guest speakers are not necessarily time-savers.)

If there was going to be a big batch of papers or tests coming in, I tried hard to make the next class day a no-prep day, using class time for small-group projects is one good way to do that. Then I could use my usual prep time to grade.

Some research actually indicates that teachers who spend less time preparing (in order to write) end up with better teaching evaluations. For me, that has held true. When I had a class prepared to the minute, with gorgeous PowerPoint presentations, film clips, and carefully orchestrated discussions, the students could be overwhelmed into passivity. If something interesting did happen in discussion, I often cut it off in order to get to the next planned event. When I have to wing it, I take more time to follow a discussion in the classroom to its conclusion — and the class is more interesting for all concerned.

At first I felt guilty about all my little tricks, but to my surprise, neither my students nor my bosses noticed my “slacker days.” It was a bit of a blow to my ego, but a boon to my workload. I still show a movie during the semester in each of my courses.

Prioritize early and often. I resisted doing careful planning for years because I feared life would become rigid and dull. But in fact, I find that planning my priorities and controlling my time frees me to think creatively and have more fun.

This year, before I leave the university on Fridays, I’ve started planning for the following week, which lets me enjoy my weekends more. I found a fabulous scheduling grid in Richard Bolles’s What Color Is Your Parachute? that I’ve adapted to my daily schedule, so that I always know what’s the most important thing I need to do next.

I’ve also started scheduling in lunch dates and jogs with my colleagues, which has pushed away burnout as well as put me back in the gossip loop. The flexible schedule of a faculty member conceals to the general public the fact that it’s a demanding career. It’s up to you to harness and control your schedule to make it a productive and joyous one, as well.