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Dates are subject to change. Check www.aarweb.org for the latest information.

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

November
November 1. Research grant awards announced.
November 16. Executive Committee meeting, Washington, D.C.
November 17. Fall Board of Directors meeting, Washington, D.C.
November 17. Chair Workshop at the Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.

December
December 1. New program unit proposals due.
December 8–9. Program Committee meeting, Atlanta, GA.

And keep in mind throughout the year...

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

Information about AAR publications can be found at www.aarweb.org/publications/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/inthefield/submit.asp.

Openings: Employment Opportunities for Scholars of Religion. Openings is a members-only online publication listing job announcements in areas of interest to members; issues are viewable online from the first through the last day of each month. Submit announcements online, and review policies and pricing, at www.aarweb.org/openings/submit.asp.

Religious Studies News 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 in January, March, May, and October. Letters to the editor and feature examining professional issues in the field are welcome from all readers. Final and editorial pieces in electronic uncompressed file format only (MS Word is preferred) to: rsneditor@aarweb.org

Subscriptions for individuals and institutions are available. See www.aarweb.org/publications/inthefield/subm it.asp for more information.
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January 15
March 15
May 15
October 15
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Religious Studies News 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 and by libraries at colleges and universities across North America and abroad. Religious Studies News 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.
FROM THE EDITOR

Dear Readers,

Last month, Religious Studies News successfully launched a new emphasis with the introduction of the Focus section, an in-depth look at vital issues confronting religion/theology academe. In this issue, we discuss academic freedom for religion and theology scholars. We’ve asked several authors to address the problems, concerns, and solutions for the discipline.

Many of our colleagues are facing pressure from inside and outside their departments — from students, adherents, administrators, and donors. At the business meeting of the 2005 AAR Annual Meeting, a draft resolution on academic freedom was tabled for further discussion. Crafting such a resolution is complicated, having to take into consideration the various institutional contexts in which religion and theology are being taught. This issue of Focus lays out the challenges facing the Academy as it continues its efforts to craft a meaningful resolution, implicitly articulating the urgency of such a resolution.

The section kicks off with four authors who participated in a panel at last year’s Annual Meeting — Responding to Political Targeting of Religious Scholars in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education. June Marie Law, who presided, begins with an outline of the problems confronting our colleagues, setting the tone for the three following authors, Carol Anderson, Mary McGee, and Linda A. Moody. Anderson focuses on the complex strategies used in attacking academic freedom; McGee writes about challenges to scholars from believers; and Moody details the pressure groups that target individual scholars and departments.

Daniel Golden of the Wall Street Journal follows with his article concerning donors’ influence in hiring faculty members. He takes the specific case of D. Michael Quinn and his journey from respected Mormon scholar to unemployment to illustrate how those who fund endowed chairs and scholarships are influencing whom departments hire.

Leah Bowman, a pseudonym of a scholar of Islam, details the pressures facing those who teach Islam courses. A brief comment she made about the humanitarian costs of Palestinians landed on the Internet, leading to e-mail threats — and to her realization of the challenge facing the liberal arts when exposing students to alternative ideas in post-9/11 America.

Laurie Patton and Chakravarthi Ram-Prasad conclude the section by articulating ways adherents and scholars can enter into constructive and collegial relationships, focusing on Hindu and non-Hindu “interlogue.”

I hope you enjoy this issue of Religious Studies News, and find this Focus section informative. We invite you to submit any thoughts, letters to the editor, comments, and criticisms to me at kcole@aarweb.org. We will publish feedback from readers in subsequent issues. Our next Focus topic will be “Publishing in Religious Studies and Theology.”

Also in this issue, new AAR Executive Director Jack Fitzmier is interviewed and Spotlight on Teaching dovetails nicely with the Focus section as it examines “Teaching Difficult Subjects.” Spotlight editor Tasim Kassam, Syracuse University, and guest editor Cynthia Hume, Claremont McKenna College, have produced an in-depth look at this topic. [23]

Kyle Cole
Executive Editor, Religious Studies News

A Message from the AAR Nominations Committee

The Nominations Committee is pleased to place two excellent names on the ballot this year for Vice President. We are grateful to both of them for their willingness to serve the Academy in this way.

Once again, AAR members will be able to vote by electronic ballot. A paper ballot will be mailed to members whose e-mail addresses are not on file. Please know that we guarantee the privacy of your vote.

We expect a large number of our members to vote in this election. Please be among them.

Hans Hillerbrand, Chair
Nominations Committee

Call for Nominations

The Nominations Committee will continue its practice of consultations during the Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., to begin the process for selecting nominees for Vice President to take office in November 2007. The committee takes seriously all recommendations by AAR members.

The following characteristics regularly surface in discussions of candidates for Vice President:

(a) Scholarship: “represents the mind of the Academy,” “international reputation,” “breadth of knowledge of the field,” “widely known.”

(b) Service to the Academy: “serves the Academy broadly conceived,” “gives papers regularly,” “leads sections,” “chairs committees,” “supports regional work.”

(c) General: “electable,” “one the average member of the Academy will look upon with respect,” “one whose scholarship and manner is inclusive rather than narrow, sectarian, and/or exclusive.”

How to Vote

All members of the Academy are entitled to vote for all officers. The elected candidates will take office at the end of the 2006 Annual Meeting.

Please vote online at www.aarweb.org. Paper ballots are sent only to those without e-mail addresses on file or by special request (please call 404-727-3049). Vote by November 1, 2006, to exercise this important membership right.

Vice President

The Vice President serves on the Executive and Program Committees, as well as on the Board of Directors. He will be in line to be confirmed president-elect in 2007 and president in 2008. During his tenure, the Vice President will have the opportunity to affect AAR policy in powerful ways; in particular, during the presidential year, the incumbent makes all appointments of members to openings on committees.

Don’t Let Time Get Away from You!

Register for the Employment Information Services Center by October 25. The EIS Center at the Annual Meeting is an efficient way for candidates and employers to communicate and participate in job interviews. Those who register by the deadline will receive the following benefits.

EMPLOYERS:

Unlimited use of the interview hall

Placement of job advertisement in the Annual Meeting edition of Openings

Seven months of online access to candidate CVs organized by specialization

Ability to use the message center to communicate with registered candidates

CANDIDATES:

Opportunity to place CV online for employer review

Personal copy of registered job advertisements and employers’ interview plans

Ability to use the message center to communicate with employers

For more information about the Employment Information Services Center, and to register, see www.aarweb.org/eis.

Spotlight on Teaching

Highlighting the Academy’s Best Practices in Undergraduate Teaching

Spotlight on Teaching dovetails nicely with the Focus section as it examines “Teaching Difficult Subjects.” Spotlight editor Tasim Kassam, Syracuse University, and guest editor Cynthia Hume, Claremont McKenna College, have produced an in-depth look at this topic.

From the Employment Information Services Center

See page 4 for candidates’ statements
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Mark Juergensmeyer

Mark Juergensmeyer is Director of the Orfala Center for Global and International Studies, Professor of Sociology, and affiliate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He has written on global religion, religious violence, conflict resolution, and South Asian religion and politics, and has published more than 200 articles and a dozen books, including Gandhi’s Way, Religion in Global Civil Society and the widely read Terror in the Mind of God, which is based on his interviews with violent religious activists around the world. He has a BA in philosophy from the University of Illinois, an MA from Union Theological Seminary in New York, and an MA and PhD in political science from the University of California, Berkeley. For many years he taught in a joint position in comparative religion at UC-Berkeley and the Graduate Theological Union. He also served as Dean of Humanities, Asian, and Pacific studies at the University of Hawaii. He has received Wilson, Guggenheim, U.S. Institute of Peace, and ACLS fellowships; the Graeme McAskill Award in religion; the Silver Award of the Queen Sofia Center in Spain; and an honorary doctorate from Lehigh University. Since the event of September 11, he has been a frequent commentator in the news media, including CNN, BBC, ABC, Politically Incorrect, and CNBC’s Dennis Miller. He has been a member of the Academy for over 30 years. He participated in panels at a dozen AAR national conferences, served on the AAR editorial board and several AAR task forces and committees, chaired the Committee for the Public Understanding of Religion, and served as President of the Western region.

Statement on the AAR

THERE IS MUCH about the AAR that should not be changed. It supports our profession, it provides a public face for the academic study of religion, and perhaps most wondrous of all, each year it hosts what has to be one of the biggest family reunions on earth. At a time when extraordinary global social forces have been unleashed and religion is both the symbol and agent of change, the Academy helps to keep us grounded. Its publications, projects, and events remind us that the questions raised about religion today are enduring ones and reach to the heart of what we are as social and spiritual beings.

So let the AAR flourish. At its essence it is what its many members want it to be, and that cannot and should not be changed. Still there are some things that can be enhanced, and in which its officers can make a difference, such as the following.

• Funding. As a professional academic field we compete with other disciplines for financial support, both for research and institutional growth. These opportunities are not just for the already institutionally well-endowed — there is a great diversity of funding possibilities for all shapes and sizes of academic programs. But religious studies is one of the newer and smaller of academic fields clamoring for money, and we need to be in touch with potential funding agencies to let our presence be known.

• Academic viability. Whether we are part of an established religious studies or theology program or lone wolves in some other department, we know what it can mean to be marginalized. I have been in both situations and I know that we need support in our efforts to make clear to our institutions and our colleagues that the study of religion is as intellectually credible as the study of politics, literature, or the economy. And it is just as vital to intellectual inquiry and sound education.

• Public visibility. The remarkable resurgence of religion in public life is an opportunity for us to demonstrate the relevance of what we do, and allow us to join in the public conversation about what religion is and what role it should play in the public order. Whether it is al Qa’eda or The Da Vinci Code, there are aspects of religion in the spotlight that need to be better understood. Policy and media professionals would profit from the information and insights that our expertise can provide in a world where religion is paraded through the public square.

These are some of the areas in which the AAR officers can help to be a vehicle for its members’ concerns. I also thought of another — global connections — which is relevant to more than just those of us who have made global religion our domain. I think that the transnational dimensions of our academic community enrich us all, regardless of how grand or parochial we think our intellectual interests may be. Somewhere on the planet there are scholars with concerns similar to ours whose association could vastly reward what we do, and for whom the AAR could provide intellectual channels of communication and facilitate international exchanges.

Finally, a personal note. There is an overused phrase that one often hears from nomi­nees in that other academy — the one that hands out the Oscars — that “it was an honor just to be nominated.” But in my case I feel that this is so. The AAR has been such a presence in my academic career — it was as a graduate student at a regional AAR meeting that I nervously presented my first academic paper — and it has provided affilia­tions of such familiar camaraderie, that the notion that I could be useful to its leadership comes as an added honor. Yet it also brings the sober hope that this good could come of it, and the consolation that one way or another the AAR will, as it always has, survive.

Peter Ochs

Peter Ochs is Edgar Bronfman Professor of Modern Jewish Thought in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Virginia. He received his BA in Anthropology from Yale University (1971), his MA in Rabbinics from the Jewish Theological Seminary (1975), and his PhD in Philosophy from Yale University (1980). He has taught and researched in Israel, Turkey, France, Germany, Judaism, pragmatism, semiotics, and scriptural reasoning in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.

Ochs co-founded the Societies for Textual Reasoning and for Scriptural Reasoning, and he co-directs the Center of Theological Inquiry “Scriptural Reasoning Research Group” in Princeton. He co-edits, with Stanley Hauerwas, the series “Radical Traditions: Theology in a Postcritical Key” (Eerdmans/SCM) and serves on the editorial boards of Modern Theology, Theology Today, the Journal of Culture and Religion, and Crosscurrents. His books include Pragmatism and the Logic of Scripture (1998), Reasoning after Revelation (with Gibbs and Kephes, 1998), Reviewing the Covenant (with Bornwitz, 2000), and the forthcoming titles Another Reformation: Postliberal Christianity and the Jews and Learning Scriptural Reasoning. His edited or co-edited books include Textual Reasonings; The Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity; Understanding the Rabbinic Mind; Christianity in Jewish Terms; and The Jewish-Christian Schism Revisited.

In the AAR, Ochs has co-chaired the Study of Judaism Section and the Scriptural Reasoning Group and served as reviewer for several AAR sections. The Societies of Textual Reasoning (1991) and Scriptural Reasoning (1994) were both nurtured at AAR Annual Meetings, as were the e-journals that serve each society.

Statement on the AAR

IT IS AN EXTRAORDINARY TIME to teach religious studies. For both fortunate and unfortunate reasons, the phenomena of religion are receiving unprecedented attention worldwide; with increased media coverage and public activism on behalf of individuals and groups who fear religion or love it and who want to promote religion or suppress it. Beyond that, religious studies courses and programs appear to play an increasingly central role as places where students can ask about the whole picture while also scrutinizing some particular part of it — and where, without abandoning disciplinary rigor, faculty can provide hospitality to more than one style of inquiry at a time. The reason, I trust, is our subject matter: “religion” and religious traditions are deep and complex enough to display the limits of any single frame of scholarly reference; they are close enough to streams of wisdom than students and readers can demand attention to some of the bigger questions even while we attend to the smaller ones within our special purview; and they are of sufficient public urgency that we are soon called to speak both to our more technical specialties and to broader and more worldly topics. At a time like this, the AAR becomes all the more important as a source of professional support and advocacy.

Linking our work to public needs. Over the next few years, the work of the Committee on the Public Understanding of Religion will merit increased attention. It is increasingly important to link AAR scholars to public agencies and NGOs who want help in addressing various issues of religion in public life — and special attention should be paid to what junior scholars and retirees can offer.

Addressing other disciplines in the academy. As it fosters more publicly oriented studies, the AAR should also continue to foster innovative approaches to religious studies more generally, and to foster work within the more traditional disciplines. AAR programs should help interested scholars improve the way they address issues of religion within the discourses of any and all of the major disciplines of the arts and sciences.

Funding sources for our departments. An increasing number of religious studies departments face reduced budgets, as college and university funds are diverted, often to compensate for reduced federal support for the humanities in general as well as the sciences. In addition to its lobbying efforts against such reductions, the AAR should continue to seek out alternate sources of funding for research and teaching in religious studies. Increased public interest in our research suggests that more private and charitable foundations should be open to our funding proposals.

Resourcing the international reach of the AAR. Supporting and extending the work of the International Connections Committee, the AAR should continue to nurture programs on specific regions of the world, establish links with international conferences, engage international scholars in AAR sessions, and seek ways of helping visitors travel to the U.S. for AAR meetings. This work should complement and extend the AAR’s continued efforts at greater inclusivity.

The issue of scriptural study. The AAR needs to continue current efforts to add sessions related to the study of scriptural practices, religions, and texts. Some of these additions might address topics of regional conflicts and theo-politics: how, for example, scriptural sources are summoned as both warrants for conflict and resources for peace. In the context of this work, the AAR cannot afford to foster competition among theological, historical, literary, anthropological, and culture-critical approaches to scriptural studies. We need the resources of all these approaches.

Disseminating the fruits of scholarship. The AAR journal, newsletter, and book publications are in good hands. It is an appropriate time to offer more resources for electronic publishing, such as more peer-reviewed e-journals for new areas of religious studies and for the work of younger scholars. And AAR members continue to seek more venues for publishing books and more help in working with the public media.
**Important Dates**

- Mailing of the Annual Meeting badge materials to all preregistered attendees began in mid-September. Materials include your name badge and drink ticket. Contact Conferon Registration & Housing at aarblg@conferon.com if you did not receive your materials.
- Third-tier (“regular”) registration rates go into effect on October 16, so register early to get the best rate.
- November 10 is the pre-Annual Meeting registration deadline. All registrations after this date must take place onsite at the Washington Convention Center. No badge mailings will occur after this date.
- November 18-21 is the Annual Meeting in Washington! Check www.aarweb.org/meetme for up-to-date information about the meeting.

**Checklist for when you arrive at the Annual Meeting**

- **Name Badge Holders.** If you received your name badge by mail, all you need to do is swing by the Registration area in the Washington Convention Center to pick up a name badge holder. Then you are ready to attend sessions and visit the Exhibit Hall.
- **Onsite Registration.** If you did not receive your badge materials or need to register, visit the AAR & SBL Meeting Registration counter.
- **Annual Meetings At-A-Glance.** Pick up a copy of the Annual Meetings At-A-Glance booklet. This booklet shows the updated program and room locations for all sessions. Updates or changes will be marked by gray shading. This is an invaluable addition to your Program Book!
- **Book of Abstracts.** Interested in a session’s topic? Want to learn more before heading to the session? Check out the Book of Abstracts, located in the bins near registration, for more information.
- **Tote Bag.** Tote bag tickets were mailed with the name badge materials. Tote bags are available while supplies last.
- **Find-A-Friend.** Visit the Find-A-Friend boards in the Registration area to find whether your colleagues are attending.
- **AAR Member Services.** Visit the AAR Member Services desk if you have any other questions.
- **Enjoy the meeting!**

**Annual Meeting Countdown**

**Plenary Addresses**

**Religion after September 11 (A18-134)**

Saturday, 11:45 AM–1:00 PM
Karen Armstrong, Birmingham, UK

A former Roman Catholic nun and instructor at London’s prestigious Leo Baeck College for the Training of Rabbis, Karen Armstrong is the author of the international bestseller *The History of God* and participated in Bill Moyers’ PBS series on religion. She is also the author of *The Gospel According to Woman*, *Muhammad*, *The Battle for God*, *Fundamentalism in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, and *Islam: A Short History*. In her new book, *The Great Transformation: The Beginning of Our Religious Traditions*, Armstrong returns to the ninth century BCE to examine the roots of four of the world’s major spiritual traditions: Confucianism and Daoism in China, Hinduism and Buddhism in India, monotheism in Israel, and philosophical rationalism in Greece. Despite some differences, there was a remarkable consensus in these religions’ call for an abandonment of selfishness and a spirituality of compassion. Armstrong urges us to consider how these spiritualities challenge the way we are religious today.

**Tariq Ramadan (A19-126)**

Sunday, 7:15–8:15 PM
Tariq Ramadan, Oxford University

Appearance Subject to Outcome of AAR Lawsuit against the U.S. Government

Tariq Ramadan holds a PhD in Arabic and Islamic Studies from the University of Geneva. Ramadan taught at Fribourg University in Switzerland for many years. He held the post of Professor of Islamic Studies in the Classics Department and Luce Professor of Religion, Conflict and Peacebuilding at the Kroc Institute in 2004 at the University of Notre Dame, but had to resign due to visa revocation by the U.S. administration. This resulted in a lawsuit brought against the U.S. government by the AAR, the American Association of University Professors, and the PEN American Center. Ramadan is the author of more than 20 books and several hundred articles on topics such as democracy and Islam, the practice of Islam in Europe, and Islamic law. A Swiss national and consistent critic of terrorism, Ramadan has also been a frequent critic of U.S. policy toward the Muslim world.

**Karen McCarthy Brown, a sociologist of religion, is one of the foremost scholars on Haitian religious traditions, and particularly on the role of women in these traditions. She is best known for her book *Mama Lola*, and for her work as the Director of the Newark Project. She plays a particularly important role as an advisor in Haitian approaches to healing, and about broader project design based on her experience leading a large urban ethnographic study over an extended period. Her other important contribution has been to add significant theoretical sophistication to ethnographic data analysis.**

**Religion in Documentary Film: The Work of Helen Whitney (A19-128)**

Sunday, 8:30–9:30 PM
A local institution based out of Washington, D.C., KanKouran West African Dance Company has been an integral part of the dance community for over 20 years. The company was founded in 1983 by Artistic Director Assane Konte, and former Director of Music, Abdou Kounta, both from Senegal, West Africa. KanKouran, whose members were born in the United States, Africa, and the Caribbean, is dedicated to preserving and sharing the culture of Africa. KanKouran functions much like a traditional African community, where given the communal nature of African culture, each individual understands his or her role in maintaining the oneness of the community to the benefit of the entire community, and each individual is encouraged to contribute and participate to the extent of that person’s talents and abilities.

**AAR Presidential Address and Awards Ceremony (A18-134)**

Saturday, 8:00–9:30 PM
Diana Eck, Harvard University

“Prospects for Pluralism: Voice and Vision in the Study of Religion”

Diana Eck is interested in the challenges of religious pluralism in a multireligious society. Her work on India includes the book *Durbar: Seeing the Divine Image in India*, she is currently working on a book entitled *India: Myth on Earth*. Since 1991, she has headed the Pluralism Project, which includes a network of some 60 affiliates exploring the religious dimensions of America’s new immigration. Her book *A New Religious America* investigates the growth of Hindu, Buddhist, and Muslim communities in the United States and the issues of religious pluralism in American civil society. In 1998, Eck received the National Humanities Medal from President Clinton and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

**An Interview with Madeleine Albright (A20-36)**

Monday, 11:30 AM–1:00 PM
Madeleine Albright, Georgetown University

Madeleine Albright was nominated in 1996 by President Clinton as the first female Secretary of State. Prior to her appointment, Secretary Albright served as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, as a member of President Clinton’s Cabinet and National Security Council, and as the President of the nonprofit Center for National Policy. She earned a doctorate in public law and government from Columbia University and is the Morra Distinguished Professor of Diplomacy at Georgetown University, where she teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in international affairs, U.S. foreign policy, Russian foreign policy, and Central and Eastern European politics, and is responsible for developing and implementing programs designed to enhance women’s professional opportunities in international affairs. Her most recent book is *The Mighty and the Almighty: Reflections on America, God, and World Affairs* (HarperCollins, 2006) which focuses on religion and foreign affairs.

**Telling My Stories: Race, Responsibility, and Historical Consciousness (A20-130)**

Monday, 7:15–8:15 PM
Karen McCarthy Brown, Brown University

Karen McCarthy Brown, a sociologist of religion, is one of the foremost scholars on Haitian religious traditions, and particularly on the role of women in these traditions. She is best known for her book *Mama Lola*, and for her work as the Director of the Newark Project. She plays a particularly important role as an advisor in Haitian approaches to healing, and about broader project design based on her experience leading a large urban ethnographic study over an extended period. Her other important contribution has been to add significant theoretical sophistication to ethnographic data analysis.

**Annual Meeting Performances and Exhibitions**

The AAR is showcasing the following performances and exhibitions during this year’s Annual Meeting.

**Art Series Event: KanKouran West African Dance Company (A19–127)**

Sunday, 8:30-9:30 PM
A local institution based out of Washington, D.C., KanKouran West African Dance Company has been an integral part of the dance community for over 20 years. The company was founded in 1983 by Artistic Director Assane Konte, and former Director of Music, Abdou Kounta, both from Senegal, West Africa. KanKouran, whose members were born in the United States, Africa, and the Caribbean, is dedicated to preserving and sharing the culture of Africa. KanKouran functions much like a traditional African community, where given the communal nature of African culture, each individual understands his or her role in maintaining the oneness of the community to the benefit of the entire community, and each individual is encouraged to contribute and participate to the extent of that person’s talents and abilities.


Sunday, 8:30–10:30 PM
Helen Whitney's documentary films have received an Emmy award, six Emmy nominations, an Academy Award nomination, and two Peabody awards. Whitney will discuss and show excerpts from her films, *Faith and Doubt at Ground Zero* and *John Paul II: The Millennium Pope*, as well as talk about her forthcoming six-hour PBS series, *The Future of Faith*. AAR President Diana Eck, Director of the Pluralism Project at Harvard University, will preside.
Engaging Africa: Reflections on the Study of Religions of Africa and the African Diaspora

Jacob Olupona, University of California, Davis

African Scholar and African Scholarship in Religion is the international focus of the 2006 AAR Annual Meeting. Listed below are some sessions with such a focus.

Les Maitres Fous (A17–101)
Africa in Latin America and the Caribbean (A18–25)
“African Voices” Exhibit at the National Museum of Natural History Tour (A18–32)
Roundtable Discussion on HIV/AIDS in Africa with Dr. Peter Piot, UN Secretary on HIV/AIDS in Africa (A18–50)
Looking for the Way Forward: Black Church Studies and the African Diaspora (A18–60)
African Indigenous Religions in the Twenty-first Century (A18–110)
Guédioua (A18–137)
Women Speaking to Religion and Leadership: Honoring the Work of Mercy Odoye (A19–7)
African Religions, Healing, and HIV/AIDS (A19–17)
From Africa to New Orleans: Healing Racial and Urban Divides (A19–55)
Africana Phenomenology and the Study of Religion (A19–57)
Religious and Theological Reflections on Environmental Issues in Africa (A19–68)
Religion, International Collaboration, and Social Change in Africa (A19–84)
African Religion and Women’s Agency (A19–87)
God’s African Households (A19–107)
Making Again: Rites to Heal New Challenges in African Contexts (A19–112)
Religion and Human Rights in Africa (A19–116)
KanKouran West African Dance Company (A19–127)
Excerpts from Toward a New Christianity: Stories of African Christians in Ghana and Zimbabwe (A19–130)
Religion and Public Life in Africa: Politics, Human Rights, and Peacemaking (A20–13)
Tour of the National Museum of African Art (A20–33)
Comparative Religious Approaches to Species Depletion, with Emphasis on Africa (A20–106)
African Christianity (A20–112)
Moula’ (A20–131)
Africa’s Changing Religious Media Scene (A21–10)

AAS THE AMERICAN Academy of Religion focuses on the international theme, “Africa and African Scholarship in Religion,” I will share these thoughts on the evolving nexus between African religious traditions and their transatlantic counterparts in the diaspora. This nexus compellingly suggests an agenda for advancing the study of religion in general as many issues central to the work of Africanists—such as globalization, immigration, ethnicity, identity, and religious market places—are of increasing concern to scholars of a wide variety of religions. The relative neglect of Africa and its diaspora in the disarray of broader religious studies is as regrettable as it is instructive. Africa’s 50 continental nations and five island countries are vast, with the majority of its 840 million people participating in at least one of three general forms of religion: the religious heritages of indigenous African ethnic groups, Islam, and Christianity. Responding to the Western media’s image of the African continent in disarray— the majority of its people impoverished and despondent about their present and their future — scholars of African religion present a robust and creative Africa of deep religious sensibilities, the home of a cultural renaissance and an array of spiritual traditions reflecting complex hierarchies of power, agency, and authority.

It is high time the broader academy took earnest notice, not merely to soothe the conscience of its racist past but to gain a truly holistic and balanced perspective about humanity’s religious heritage. Virtually every story of importance in the study of religion can and should begin with Africa — the cradle of humanity.

African Religion and Its Study

From the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, formal West African scholarship in the sciences, arts, and medicine began, as Islamic universities were instituted in the medieval empires of Mali, Songhai, and Kanem-Borno. In the fifteenth century, Catholic missionaries arrived in Warri, Kongo, and the Benin Kingdom while European adventurers, most lacking scholarly training, visited Africa and returned to Europe to record their findings in what amounted to the first known studies of indigenous African religious traditions. Their research contributed directly to Europe’s plunder of Africa by providing “evidence” of the supposed inferiority of African culture and of Africa’s need for Europeans to lead them forcefully toward “civilization.” This ideology was captured succinctly in Belgium’s motto for its murderous reign in the Congo, “Domine pour Servir” ("Domine in ordere to Serve"). Many early European scholars viewed African indigenous religions as “primitive” compared to Christianity, and promoted the idea of an African mind and thought system inferior to the European. False claims ran amok (1) that Africans were incapable of producing authentic religious traditions; (2) that Africans “lacked true knowledge” of a Supreme God; (3) that African civilizations and religious belief systems must have originated “elsewhere” and were “transported” to the African continent; and (4) that religious philosophy and thought must have “diffused” throughout Africa after European “contact.” Thus, early scholarship on Africa and African religions reflected a pernicious racism that rendered impossible the kinds of sensitivity to human spirituality that would lead to a genuine appreciation of Africa’s profound and inspiring religious culture — the kind of sensitivity that is foundational to some of the best work produced in religious studies in general.

In the 1960s, African universities encouraged a revitalized study of African religious, reflecting Africa’s new nation-state and reemergent spirit of freedom and pride. African institutions of higher learning acknowledged the religious pluralism characteristic of most countries and emphasized Islamic studies and African traditional religions alongside dominant Christian studies. Inspired by political independence, a religiously pluralistic national identity emerged in many regions, anchored in belief of a Supreme God in each of the three dominant religions, and fostered by a unifying civil faith. This religious vitality also served to resist oppression. From the 1960s onward, the study of African religions developed as an autonomous field of comparative history of religion; African traditional religions, language, and literature were required, enhancing the study of local religious traditions even in cognate disciplines. Indigenous epistemology emphasized traditional theology and religious studies scholarship as research on African religions increased dramatically. Unlike nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Christian missions in Africa — which wed the notion of conversion to the development of “Westernized” individuals through...
Personnel Issues: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly

Front of the Department of Religion and Philosophy at the University of Northern Iowa, and Chester Gillis, chair of the Department of Theology at Georgetown University, will lead the workshop. Daniel Aleshire, executive director of the Association of Theological Schools (ATS), will join DeBerg and Gillis as a panelist. Additionally, attorney Lisa Krim from the Georgetown University’s Counsel Office will address participants. Krim specializes in employment law, in multiple areas of law specific to higher education.

To strengthen the interactive nature of the workshops and to develop effective conversation among participants, members of the Academic Relations Committee will facilitate small group discussions following each panel presentation. In addition to Q&A sessions at the end of the panels, these sessions allow for an exchange of ideas from the department members in attendance. This year’s topic was developed in response to questions solicited at last year’s event, in which many participants cited that a workshop addressing difficult personnel issues would be beneficial and timely. Colleagues in your institution, such as chairs, other faculty members, faculty being developed to assume leadership responsibilities, and deans, may be interested in attending this workshop. Chairs may want to bring a team of faculty or send a designated faculty person.

Registration is limited to the first 75 participants. The cost for the workshop is $75, which includes the entire day of sessions, lunch, and a complimentary book on the subject of personnel issues.

The topics for past chairs workshops have been:

- 2005 Annual Meeting – Enlarging the Pie: Strategies for Managing and Growing Departmental Resources
- 2004 Annual Meeting – Being a Chair in Today’s Consumer Culture: Navigating in the Knowledge Factory
- 2003 Annual Meeting – Scholarship, Service, and Stress: The Tensions of Being a Chair
- Summer 2003 – The Entrepreneurial Chair: Building and Sustaining Your Department in an Era of Shrinking Resources and Increasing Demands
- 2002 Annual Meeting – Running a Successful Faculty Search in the Religious Studies Department
- 2001 Annual Meeting – Evaluating and Advancing Teaching in the Religious Studies Department
- 2000 Annual Meeting – Assessing and Advancing the Religious Studies Department

We look forward to seeing you in Washington, D.C.!
Things to do in Washington, D.C.

**Down of the Dead** (A17–100)
Friday, 7:00–9:00 PM
Through its witty and pointed criticism of consumerism, materialism, and other ills such as racism, sexism, and violence, George Romero’s Dawn of the Dead rises above the average horror movie, or Hollywood movies in general, to become one of the classic of social criticism and theatrical effect.

**Les Maîtres Fous** (A17–101)
Friday, 7:00–9:00 PM
Les Maîtres Fous (“The Masters of Madness”) is a documentary film produced by the prominent French anthropologist and ethnographic filmmaker Jean Rouch on the possession ritual of the Haulua movement, which was practiced by Sognghay migrants from Niger in Accra, Ghana, during the time of French colonialism.

**Crash** (A18–136)
Saturday, 9:00–11:00 PM
In the film, a number of characters collide over two days in Los Angeles. Hence family, culture, love comes an invitation to feel, to care, and to think about race and responsibility in the twenty-first century.

**Guelwaar** (A18–137)
Saturday, 9:00–11:00 PM
The funeral of an outspoken Senegalese political activist and subsequent disappearance of his corpse provides the backdrop for Sembène’s incisive feature. This bold film tackles the conflict between Muslims and Christians, dependence on foreign aid, and the elusive nature of independence itself.

**Gattaca** (A19–129)
Sunday, 8:30–10:30 PM
Gattaca, the 1997 film depicting life in a genetic dystopia in the not-distant future, illustrates why it is important to understand the ways in which genetics lends itself to an alliance with religious ideas and ways of thinking.

**Excerpts from Toward a New Christianity: Stories of African Christians in Ghana and Zimbabwe** (A19–130)
Sunday, 8:30–10:30 PM
Director James Ault will show excerpts from his documentary that feature a range of churches in Ghana and Zimbabwe, from mission-founded to “old independent” to new Pentecostal churches. Dr. Ault will provide and entertain a session after the screening.

**Moolade** (A20–131)
Monday, 8:30–10:30 PM
Directed by Africa’s renowned filmmaker Ousmane Sembène, this movie explores the controversial practice of female genital mutilation, highlighting the way, protective spiritual forces are invoked in the course of the conflict.

**Hedwig and the Angry Inch** (A20–132)
Monday, 8:30–10:30 PM
Hedwig and the Angry Inch is not a film about the “plight” of transgendered people. Instead, Hedwig is represented in all her gender-neutral glory as a little boy, an androgynous young man, a transsexual woman, an overweight drag queen, and lastly as a genderambiguous — but, it is implied — truly authentic self.

**Eating and Drinking in D.C.**

**A. V. Ristorante Italiano**
607 New York AVE NW
Unlike some of those Italian-flavored chains that attempt to recreate yesteryear with boat-size portions and kitschy props, A. V. is the real deal. $$

**Butterfield**
600 14th ST NW
New American fusion cuisine subscribes to the “more is more” sensibility. $$$

**Cafe Atlantic**
405 8th ST NW
Mexican, Latin American, and Spanish cuisines come together in a zizzling three-level restaurant. $$

**California Tortilla**
728 7th ST NW
Cheap, bountiful, and tasty burritos. California Tortilla won the Washington Post’s 2005 Readers’ Choice Award for Best Cheap Eats. $

**Capital Q**
707 H ST NW
Texas-style barbecue may seem out of place in Chinatown, but for a break from fried rice, try the beef brisket, pork ribs, or pulled chicken. $$

**Charlie Palmer Steak**
101 Constitution AVE NW
In addition to the expected filet mignon and dry-aged rib-eye, the kitchen sends out fine seafood and dishes that surpass routine steakhouse items. $$$$

**Emilly's**
509 H ST NW
Quality soups and dumplings as well as expert fish make dining here worthwhile. $$

**IndieBites**
707 G ST NW
This Penn Quarter restaurant/lounge mixes India with America, noise with calm, and serious fun with seriously trained service. $$

**Kaz Sushi Bistro**
1915 1ST ST NW
Chef Kaz Okochi has long created Japanese food that goes beyond the familiar and frequently dips into the fabulous. $$

**Komi**
1507 17th ST NW
Let your server steer you to their favorites, maybe the very nice chicken-pistachio pâté or the poached lamb loin enhanced by black lentils and a tart cherry glaze. The narrow room is free of art on its soft green walls, the better to focus on what’s on your plate. $$

**La Tasca**
722 7th ST NW
Spanish tapas, wine, sangria, and sherry across from the MCI Center. $$

**Lei Garden Restaurant**
629-631 H ST NW
The dim sum is moderately priced and delicious, served up while fresh. $$

**Marvelous Market**
1511 Connecticut AVE
A pleasant tin-ceilinged delicatessen with a slightly old-world European feel. Come here for a wide selection of cheeses, cookies, crosants, pasta, sauces, oils, vinegars, and more. $-

**Teasim - Penn Quarter**
406 8th ST NW
The closest fine teahouse to the FBI headquarters, Teasim offers light lunches and fast food. $$

**The Brickskeller Saloon**
1523 22nd ST NW
More than 1,000 varieties of beer await you at this legendary Dupont bar. No, that's not a typo.

**Clyde's of Gallery Place**
707 7th ST NW
A gigantic new restaurant that invokes an opulent Gilded Age hotel, this Clyde’s contains three bars over two floors, each with its own personality.

**Shelly's Back Room**
1331 F ST NW
This cozy cigar lounge and restaurant is popular with young professionals.

**Price Guide:**
$ = up to $10
$$ = $21–30
$$$ = $31–over

Reel Religion
Please see the Annual Meeting Program book or the Program Highlights page at www.aarweb.org for more information.

**While Washington, D.C., is renowned as our nation’s capital and the home to many monuments to both its founding fathers and war heroes, the city is also a treasure trove of some of the country’s best museums, performing arts, and shopping.**

The Smithsonian Institution is a national educational facility with a total of 18 museums, including the African Art Museum, the Air and Space Museum, the American Art Museum, the American Indian Museum, the Anacostia Museum & Center for African-American History & Culture, and the Natural History Museum. Most of these museums are located along the mall between the Capitol and the Washington Monument. The Smithsonian museums are open daily from 10:00 AM–5:30 PM, and best of all, admission is free!

The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, located on F Street near the Lincoln Memorial, produces and presents an unmatched variety of theater and musicals, dance, and ballet, orchestral, chamber, jazz, popular, and folk music, and multimedia performances for all ages. During the Annual Meeting, the Kennedy Center will be hosting several theatrical and musical performances, including the Washington National Opera’s performance of Madama Butterfly. Please check www.kennedy-center.org for more information.

R.F.D.
810 7th ST NW
Outside of the salads and the two or three pastas, it’s hard to find a recipe in the bunch that isn’t fortified with a little lager, ale, or porter. $$

Sushi Go Round & Tapas
705 7th ST NW
Sushi as it shuttles around the dining room or try entrees like coffee-crusted lamb and grilled lobster from the menu. $$

Teasim - Penn Quarter
406 8th ST NW
The closest fine teahouse to the FBI headquarters, Teasim offers light lunches and fast food. $$

The Brickseller Saloon
1523 22nd ST NW
More than 1,000 varieties of beer await you at this legendary Dupont bar. No, that’s not a typo.

Clyde's of Gallery Place
707 7th ST NW
A gigantic new restaurant that invokes an opulent Gilded Age hotel, this Clyde’s contains three bars over two floors, each with its own personality.

Shelly's Back Room
1331 F ST NW
This cozy cigar lounge and restaurant is popular with young professionals.

**Price Guide:**
$ = up to $10
$$ = $21–30
$$$ = $31–over

The University of Maryland’s Post-Classical Ensemble will be holding three special performances at the Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center on Sunday afternoon. The theme is Beyond Flamenco: Finding Spain in Music. This will include a performance of Isaac Albeniz’s Iberia, a multimedia exploration titled Redefining Spain, and a performance of Manuel de Fallas Harpaichold Concertos. For more information and tickets, call 301-405-2787 or visit claricesmithcenter.umd.edu/2006. To reach the Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center via the Metro, take the Green Line train (toward Greenbelt) and get off at the College Park/University of Maryland station. While most tourist visit Washington, D.C., for the history, shopping is plentiful as well. The Shops at Georgetown Park is a historic site that once housed hounded omnibuses. In the 1960s, it was selected by the White House as the location of the Situation Room and housed equipment for the first hotline to Moscow. Now it is a Victorian style, multiple-level shopping center housing over 100 shops and boutiques. The Shops at National Place is a festive retail complex featuring 60 uncommon shops, boutiques, and eating establishments, located in the heart of downtown. For nearly 100 years, Union Station has been the gateway to the nation’s capital. But every year, 29 million visitors also enjoy shopping, entertainment, and an international variety of food in this Beaux Arts transportation hub.

**National Museum of African Art**
950 Independence AVE SW
**National Air and Space Museum**
6th ST & G ST NW
**Smithsonian American Art Museum**
8th St & G ST NW
**National Museum of the American Indian**
6th ST & Independence AVE SW
**Anacostia Museum & Center for African-American History & Culture**
1991 Fort Pl SE
**National Museum of Natural History**
10th ST & Constitution Ave NW
**Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center**
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742
**The Shops at Georgetown Park**
3222 M ST NW #140
**Shops at National Place & National Press**
1331 Pennsylvania AVE NW
**Union Station**
60 Massachusetts AVE NE
Five Groups Become AAR Related Scholarly Organizations, Including the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies

At the AAR board’s spring 2006 meeting, five new organizations were approved to become AAR Related Scholarly Organizations: the African Association for the Study of Religion, the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, the European Society of Women in Theological Research, the Polanyi Society, and the Society for Buddhist–Christian Studies. This edition of RSN highlights the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies. Future editions will feature other Related Scholarly Organizations.

Related Scholarly Organizations are independent, academic, nonprofit organizations with a national or international constituency whose missions are similar to the AAR’s. More information on Related Scholarly Organizations and the process for an organization applying to become one is available at www.aarweb.org/governcouncil/related.

The Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies is a part of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Among its programs and services are public programs, fellowships, and seminars and workshops for faculty. Its staff director for faith relations, its legacy for the involvement of the Jewish and ethical topics such as the Holocaust’s impact on interfaith relations, its legacy for the involvement of the Jewish community in the U.S. civil rights movement, the interfaith story behind Nos tra Aetate, the response of churches in Eastern Europe, and the ways in which the Holocaust has shaped ethical discourses on forgiveness and guilt.

Fellowships are for candidates working on their dissertations (ABD), postdoctoral researchers, and senior scholars. Awards are for three to nine months of residency, with stipends ranging up to $3,000 per month. Several seminars and workshops are offered, including an annual seminar for professors of religion and seminary faculty. Information about other seminars and workshops is available at www.ushmm.org/research/center/seminars.

Fellows and researchers have access to the museum archives, which hold more than 35 million pages of material, including personal papers, memoirs, and testimonies of Holocaust survivors, victims, liberators, historians, artists, and International Military Tribunal staff; video and audio oral histories; and photographs and music. The archives include microform reproductions of materials held by state and private archival institutions in virtually every European country and also materials from many other countries. The archives have 60,000 microfilmed pages from the documentation released by the Vatican archives in February 2003, as well as thousands of pages of archival material from Europe pertaining to the history of the Protestant and Catholic churches. In addition, there is material on anti-Jewish policy in Nazi Germany and Nazi-occupied or Nazi-allied Europe, and on ghettos, concentration camps, mass executions, deportations, refugees, resistance activities, war crimes trials, and restitution. The catalogue is online and can be searched at www.ushmm.org/research/collections.

AAR member Victoria Barnett is the center’s director of church relations. For AAR Annual Meeting attendees who have already preregistered for the tour of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, she will offer a brief introduction to the center and to the museum exhibits. Although that tour is now fully subscribed, anyone is welcome to tour the museum. The permanent exhibit is open daily, from 10:00 AM to 5:30 PM. Because admission requires a timed pass, which are limited in number, it’s recommended you reserve a pass in advance. When visiting the exhibit, allow at least two hours. Also open to the public is the museum’s library (10:00 AM–5:00 PM daily) and archives (10:00 AM–5:00 PM weekdays). For more information, go to www.ushmm.org.

11 Wildcard Sessions This Year

Wildcard Sessions are one-time sessions proposed by individual AAR members on topics outside of the Annual Meeting program unit structure. This year, the AAR is pleased to add 11 wildcard sessions to our program.

A Korean Shamanic Ritual for Healing the Comfort Women (A19–51)
Publishing with a Denominational (Church-Owned) Press: Possibilities and Realities (A19–52)
Three Western Perspectives on the Re-valuation of Sacred Space: Wyoming, Kansas, and Colorado (A19–53)
Religion and Abuse: Proclamation, Disclosure, and “Hearing to Speech” (A19–76)
Educational Strategies to Develop Clergy Leadership of Congregations for Justice Engagement in the Public Square (A19–77)
Critical Reflections on Cornel West’s Democracy Matters (A19–42)
Epistemic Violence in the Study of Religion (A19–79)
Pedagogy and Theology: Crossing the Multifaith Divide toward Access and Inclusion (A19–80)
The Role of Secular Viewpoints in Scriptural Studies: Past, Present, and Future (A19–105)
Radical Life Extension: What Religions Have to Say (A20–4)

AAR Announces Call for Wildcard Sessions

Do you have a great idea for a session at the Annual Meeting that is experimental, is on a topic that doesn’t fit into an existing program unit? Consider submitting a call for a wildcard session! Wildcard sessions are independently initiated by members to allow for new conversations, or for conversations that fall between the established program units.

Conveners are invited to submit wildcard calls for papers for the 2007 Annual Meeting in San Diego. Calls will be reviewed by the Program Committee in December, approved calls will be published in the January issue of Religious Studies News. Conveners will be notified in mid-December of the Program Committee’s decision. Conveners are responsible for receiving submissions to the call and developing a wildcard session proposal.Wildcard session proposals are submitted during the AAR Call for Papers process in January and February and are evaluated by the Program Committee for inclusion on the program. Approval of the call for papers for a wildcard session does not guarantee the session’s acceptance to the program.

To submit a call, please send a brief 100 word or less description of the session topic in a Word attachment to annualmeeting@aarweb.org. Please list the contact information for people to send their proposals.
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Exciting sessions are on offer at the Annual Meeting by the following new program units.

**Buddhist Critical–Constructive Reflection Group**
- Buddhist Critical–Constructive Reflection: Theoretical Concerns and Practical Applications (A18–62)
- Saturday, 1:00–3:30 PM

**Buddhist Philosophy Group**
- Re-Thinking Reason, Re-Viewing Buddhist View (A19–20)
- Sunday, 9:00–11:30 AM

**Comparative Religious Ethics Group**
- Authority, Justice, and Compassion in Comparative Perspective (A18–63)
- Saturday, 1:00–3:30 PM

**Comparative Theology Group**
- The State of Comparative Enterprise in the Study of Religions (A18–105)
- Saturday, 4:00–6:30 PM

**Ecclesiastical Investigations Group**
- Saturday, 1:00–3:30 PM

**Practical Theology Group**
- Sunday, 9:00–11:30 AM

**Political Aspects of Practical Theology (A20–74)**
- Monday, 1:00–3:30 PM

**Signifying (on) Scriptures Group**
- Scriptures and Race, Roundtable Discussion 1 (A18–71)
- Saturday, 1:00–3:30 PM

**World Christianity Group**
- A Vision for Coptic Studies: “Coptic Christianity” from Late Antique Egypt to the “Coptic Diaspora” (A19–72)
- Sunday, 1:00–2:30 PM

**Religious Studies News**

**Future AAR Annual Meeting Dates and Sites**

**2007**
- November 17–20
  - San Diego, CA

**2008**
- October 25–28
  - Chicago, IL
- November 7–10
  - Montreal, QC

**2009**
- October 30–November 2
  - Atlanta, GA

**2011**
- November 18–21
  - San Francisco, CA

Please renew your membership now, and consider making an additional contribution to the AAR’s Academy Fund. Membership dues cover less than 30 percent of programs and services.

Or contact us at

TEL: 404-727-3049
E-MAIL: membership@aarweb.org

Please see the membership page,

www.aarweb.org/membership
An Interview with Jack Fitzmier, Executive Director

Jack Fitzmier became the Executive Director of the AAR on July 1, 2006. He comes to the Academy’s Atlanta offices from Claremont, California, where he served as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean at the Claremont School of Theology and Professor of Religion at the Claremont Graduate University. Prior to his work at Claremont, he was a member of the faculty at the Vanderbilt University Divinity School. Fitzmier was trained at the University of Pittsburgh, Gordon Conwell Seminary, and Princeton University. He is the author of two books — The Presbyterians, with Randall Balmer, and New England’s Moral Legislator: Timothy Dwight, 1752 –1817. He is currently pursuing research for a third book on Samuel Miller (1769 –1850), one of the founders of Princeton Theological Seminary.

**RSN:** Have you served as a dean, a vice president for academic affairs, and a professor. How is the transition to executive director of the AAR coming along?

**Fitzmier:** The transition is coming along quite well. My new colleagues at the AAR’s executive office have welcomed me warmly and have been patient with my unending list of questions. Barbara DeConcini, in particular, has been a superb guide in these early weeks, helping me navigate new administrative waters and work hard to provide me with a thorough orientation to the job. In some respects, this new job seems quite different from being immersed in the life of a school. Whereas I used to be up-close and hands-on, I now stand at a bit of a remove from the front lines of education. But in other, more profound ways, much seems the same. Over the years I have been privileged to work closely with faculty colleagues in several settings, and that privilege continues. I am committed to bringing institutional resources to bear on teaching, learning, and research, and my new position not only allows for this, but requires it.

**RSN:** How was it that you came to seek the position at AAR? What attracted you to the position?

**Fitzmier:** The consideration of this opportunity was something of a push-pull affair. At some points during the search process, I sought the position, but at other points, it seemed to seek me. A number of close friends urged me to throw my hat into the ring, thinking, I suppose, that my background in administration, theological education, and religious studies would make for a good fit. I was not sure of the fit at first; indeed, it took me some time to imagine myself in the post. When I finally did, it was on the basis of problems and challenges that I found intriguing. As it turns out, in retrospect I think I have tended to steer my professional life from one problem set to another. And the Academy has some nice ones to work on — the challenge of mutuality and partnership with our related organizations alongside our need to develop our own identity; the need to foster an appreciation for the study of religion in an increasingly violent world; and the task of identifying and implementing vital programs for our members. Work on these sorts of things really excites me.

**RSN:** And tell us about your educational experiences. You have degrees from Pitt, Gordon Conwell Seminary, and Princeton University.

**Fitzmier:** My education, not unlike my vocation, has seemed to develop with a mind of its own. For family reasons I needed to stay close to home during college, so Pitt seemed an obvious choice. I was a math major and a religion minor, but truth be told, I was largely asleep academically. Five years out of college, while doing youth ministry, things began to change. In those days my theological implications were evangelical, so Gordon Conwell was a good fit. And as I woke up, as it were, I felt the need for more education. I entered the academy with a passion for learning and for teaching. For many others in higher education, the preparation for the teaching enterprise put me into proximity with other educational goods — like research, scholarship, publication, professional guild, and in my case, administrative work. I never intentionally set out to become an academic administrator; it sort of crept up on me. And it captured my imagination. My own religious commitments energized and underwrote much of this journey, and the further I went along — from college to theological school to graduate work, and from administration to deaning — the more comfortable I felt in religious and theological settings. My vocation as an educator has seemed, at least to me, to develop rather naturally over time.

**RSN:** How are you navigating new administrativewaters along quite well. My new colleagues at the AAR offices from Claremont, California, where he served as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean at the Claremont School of Theology and Professor of Religion at the Claremont Graduate University. Prior to his work at Claremont, he was a member of the faculty at the Vanderbilt University Divinity School. Fitzmier was trained at the University of Pittsburgh, Gordon Conwell Seminary, and Princeton University. He is the author of two books — The Presbyterians, with Randall Balmer, and New England’s Moral Legislator: Timothy Dwight, 1752 –1817. He is currently pursuing research for a third book on Samuel Miller (1769 –1850), one of the founders of Princeton Theological Seminary.

**Fitzmier:** The transition is coming along quite well. My new colleagues at the AAR’s executive office have welcomed me warmly and have been patient with my unending list of questions. Barbara DeConcini, in particular, has been a superb guide in these early weeks, helping me navigate new administrative waters and work hard to provide me with a thorough orientation to the job. In some respects, this new job seems quite different from being immersed in the life of a school. Whereas I used to be up-close and hands-on, I now stand at a bit of a remove from the front lines of education. But in other, more profound ways, much seems the same. Over the years I have been privileged to work closely with faculty colleagues in several settings, and that privilege continues. I am committed to bringing institutional resources to bear on teaching, learning, and research, and my new position not only allows for this, but requires it.

**RSN:** How was it that you came to seek the position at AAR? What attracted you to the position?

**Fitzmier:** The consideration of this opportunity was something of a push-pull affair. At some points during the search process, I sought the position, but at other points, it seemed to seek me. A number of close friends urged me to throw my hat into the ring, thinking, I suppose, that my background in administration, theological education, and religious studies would make for a good fit. I was not sure of the fit at first; indeed, it took me some time to imagine myself in the post. When I finally did, it was on the basis of problems and challenges that I found intriguing. As it turns out, in retrospect I think I have tended to steer my professional life from one problem set to another. And the Academy has some nice ones to work on — the challenge of mutuality and partnership with our related organizations alongside our need to develop our own identity; the need to foster an appreciation for the study of religion in an increasingly violent world; and the task of identifying and implementing vital programs for our members. Work on these sorts of things really excites me.

**RSN:** And tell us about your educational experiences. You have degrees from Pitt, Gordon Conwell Seminary, and Princeton University.

**Fitzmier:** My education, not unlike my vocation, has seemed to develop with a mind of its own. For family reasons I needed to stay close to home during college, so Pitt seemed an obvious choice. I was a math major and a religion minor, but truth be told, I was largely asleep academically. Five years out of college, while doing youth ministry, things began to change. In those days my theological implications were evangelical, so Gordon Conwell was a good fit. And as I woke up, as it were, I felt the need for more education. I entered the academy with a passion for learning and for teaching. For many others in higher education, the preparation for the teaching enterprise put me into proximity with other educational goods — like research, scholarship, publication, professional guild, and in my case, administrative work. I never intentionally set out to become an academic administrator; it sort of crept up on me. And it captured my imagination. My own religious commitments energized and underwrote much of this journey, and the further I went along — from college to theological school to graduate work, and from administration to deaning — the more comfortable I felt in religious and theological settings. My vocation as an educator has seemed, at least to me, to develop rather naturally over time.

**RSN:** How are you navigating new administrativewaters along quite well. My new colleagues at the AAR offices from Claremont, California, where he served as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean at the Claremont School of Theology and Professor of Religion at the Claremont Graduate University. Prior to his work at Claremont, he was a member of the faculty at the Vanderbilt University Divinity School. Fitzmier was trained at the University of Pittsburgh, Gordon Conwell Seminary, and Princeton University. He is the author of two books — The Presbyterians, with Randall Balmer, and New England’s Moral Legislator: Timothy Dwight, 1752 –1817. He is currently pursuing research for a third book on Samuel Miller (1769 –1850), one of the founders of Princeton Theological Seminary.

**Fitzmier:** The transition is coming along quite well. My new colleagues at the AAR’s executive office have welcomed me warmly and have been patient with my unending list of questions. Barbara DeConcini, in particular, has been a superb guide in these early weeks, helping me navigate new administrative waters and work hard to provide me with a thorough orientation to the job. In some respects, this new job seems quite different from being immersed in the life of a school. Whereas I used to be up-close and hands-on, I now stand at a bit of a remove from the front lines of education. But in other, more profound ways, much seems the same. Over the years I have been privileged to work closely with faculty colleagues in several settings, and that privilege continues. I am committed to bringing institutional resources to bear on teaching, learning, and research, and my new position not only allows for this, but requires it. And I am passionate about the pursuit of administrative excellence, and the Academy, in all its nuanced complexity, presents a wonderful set of puzzles and challenges. So, while there has been transition, some things dear to me remain the same.

**RSN:** What attracted you to a career in academia? What attracted you to the field of religion?

**Fitzmier:** I entered the academy with a teaching career in mind. But, I suspect like many others in higher education, the preparation for the teaching enterprise put me into proximity with other educational goods — like research, scholarship, publication, professional guild, and in my case, administrative work. I never intentionally set out to become an academic administrator; it sort of crept up on me. And it captured my imagination. My own religious commitments energized and underwrote much of this journey, and the further I went along — from college to theological school to graduate work, and from administration to deaning — the more comfortable I felt in religious and theological settings. My vocation as an educator has seemed, at least to me, to develop rather naturally over time.

**Fitzmier:** I entered the academy with a teaching career in mind. But, I suspect like many others in higher education, the preparation for the teaching enterprise put me into proximity with other educational goods — like research, scholarship, publication, professional guild, and in my case, administrative work. I never intentionally set out to become an academic administrator; it sort of crept up on me. And it captured my imagination. My own religious commitments energized and underwrote much of this journey, and the further I went along — from college to theological school to graduate work, and from administration to deaning — the more comfortable I felt in religious and theological settings. My vocation as an educator has seemed, at least to me, to develop rather naturally over time.

**Fitzmier:** I entered the academy with a teaching career in mind. But, I suspect like many others in higher education, the preparation for the teaching enterprise put me into proximity with other educational goods — like research, scholarship, publication, professional guild, and in my case, administrative work. I never intentionally set out to become an academic administrator; it sort of crept up on me. And it captured my imagination. My own religious commitments energized and underwrote much of this journey, and the further I went along — from college to theological school to graduate work, and from administration to deaning — the more comfortable I felt in religious and theological settings. My vocation as an educator has seemed, at least to me, to develop rather naturally over time.
Marking the Time, Shaping the Future

Davina C. Lopez, Eckerd College

Davina C. Lopez is AAR Students Director through 2007. She received a PhD in New Testament Studies from Union Theological Seminary in New York City in May 2006, and currently serves as Assistant Professor of Religious Studies at Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, Florida.

THIS IS INDEED a time to be marked. 2006 is the decennial year for the American Academy of Religion’s Student Liaison Group. For ten years, there has been a growing institutional presence and space for attention to issues and programming specific to students — who not only comprise about a third of the AAR’s membership but are also the future teachers, scholars, community organizers, and leaders, and public spokespersons on matters related to religion. As I reflect on a felicitous entrance into the second decade of sustained consideration of student affairs, the idea and practice of formation strikes me as central to our work together.

Broadly conceived, formation is more than assimilation into the larger whole, all the while engaging questions of who we need/want to be and what kind of world we envision. Over the past ten years, we have seen signs of this kind of formation — not only in the “formation” of new groups and initiatives to address immediate student needs, but also in the raising of consciousness about how students are shaped by and shaping the future of the fields in which they become senior cultivators.

How is this present, 1996’s “future,” shaping up for students? I submit it is a bountiful season! During this milestone year, several projects germinated in the service of enhancing the formative period that is studenthood. Several of these initiatives are beginning to bear fruit. Most significantly, the ad hoc group known as the Graduate Student Task Force, which was assembled in 2004 and has assumed primary responsibility for duties related to student-centered professional development, became the Graduate Student Committee (GSC) by decision of the AAR’s Board of Directors this past spring. More than simply a name change, what this means in practical terms is that organizational work on behalf of student formation has moved from "ad hoc" to “standing” committee status in relation to the AAR’s governing body, making the possibility of more expansive and solid long-term planning for students a reality.

One such project the GSC is currently exploring is the organization of a published guide tailored to the needs of graduate students in religion and theology. Additionally, revisions of the student portion of the AAR’s Web site are well underway, and we are at work on the creation of a printed brochure for students. Speaking of long-term planning, another major decision directly affecting students is the lengthening of the time limitation on AAR student membership from seven to ten years. This extension signifies a recognition of two concrete realities in the lives of students today: First, due at least in part to a distinct erosion of viable funding for graduate studies, students are taking on more financial burdens for their education and, by having to work multiple jobs and face increasing amounts of debt, are often taking longer to finish their degrees. Second, students are choosing to join the largest organization serving scholars and teachers of religion and theology earlier in their careers, many at the master’s level and some while undergraduates. A ten-year student membership period allows for a more accurate reflection of these circumstances.

At the 2006 Annual Meeting, the GSC will again offer a roster of student-focused programming of various formats that should not be missed. In addition to yearly events and options such as the Student Lounge, the Student Liaison Group Business Meeting, and the Student Mentor’s Reception, the ten-year anniversary of the Student Liaison Group will be celebrated with a lively discussion on the past decade and the shape of future student endeavors. This time will offer an ample opportunity for reflection and conversation, followed by a reception honoring the achievements of this last decade and anticipating all that is to come.

Several Annual Meeting sessions will be devoted to topics of special interest to students in various stages of their careers. The "Behind the Scenes" series continues with an in-depth look at the on-campus interview. A panel of seasoned interviewers and interviewees will provide candid information on all aspects of the job-search process at this most sensitive stage, including tips for what works... and what doesn’t. Bring any and all questions and concerns you have to what is sure to be an invaluable gathering. There will also be a Special Topics Forum dedicated to learning and improving upon pedagogical techniques for the effective use of technology in the classroom. "Rethinking the Field,” a new program unit dedicated to fostering informal conversation among senior and junior scholars concerning various subfields within theology and religion, will offer occasion for stimulating discussions of liberal theology as well as religion and ecology.

Two luncheons especially for students will again enhance the Annual Meeting program. The ATLA Career Alternatives Luncheon for Doctoral Students in Religion and Theology will expose participants to exciting opportunities for using skills and expertise developed for that PhD beyond the confines of the traditional academic classroom. The Wabash Student—Teacher Luncheon, sponsored by the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion, will provide yet another setting for informal mentoring among scholars at different points along the career spectrum. Students are invited to consult the Annual Meeting program listing for a complete overview and details of these and other student-related sessions.

At the threshold of this second decade, I am grateful for the paths already forged during the past ten years. Such imroads have made possible the present ongoing work of intentional formation by and with students, such as that conducted by the Graduate Student Committee. Special appreciation is due to its members: Rich Amesbury, Brad Herling, Melissa Johnston-Barrett, Maurice Lee, and Chair Kimberly Breeder, as well as AAR Staff Liaison Myesha D. Jenkins. The Student Liaison Group, composed of members from PhD-granting institutions, is also instrumental in keeping our “ears to the ground” for student concerns, feedback, initiatives, and innovations. I hope you will join us in marking this time by celebrating what has been achieved. I also hope you will find ways to contribute to envisioning and shaping an even brighter future for student participation in the Academy — which constitutes, in a wider view, a very bright future for the academy as a whole.

---

Student Liaison Group, Fall 2006

- Baylor University, Cameron Jorgenson
- Boston College, Bede Billack
- Boston University, Robert Smid
- Brown University, Daniel Ubacci
- Catholic University of America, Monica Pokius Fernie
- Chicago Theological Seminary, Adam Konko
- Claremont Graduate University, Brent Smith
- Columbia University, Rosemary Hicks
- Concordia Theological Seminary, Saneta Malick
- Concordia University, Laurie Lamoreaux Schoes
- Dallas Theological Seminary, Jeff Webster
- Duke University, Saussana L. Drake
- Emory University, Matthew Bergsagel Brealey
- Florida State University, Elizabeth Barre
- Fordham University, Ann M. Michael
- Fuller Theological Seminary, Kimber Ol
- Graduate Theological Union, Whitney Bauman
- Harvard University, Ryan Overey
- Iliff School of Theology/University of Denver, Stephanie Yulas
- Jewish Theological Seminary, Emily Katz
- Loyola University, Chicago, Brock Bengaman
- McGill University, Jeremy Wiebe
- McMaster University, Sherry A. Smith
- Pacifica Graduate Institute, Anais Spitzer
- Princeton Theological Seminary, Elias Ortega-Aponte
- Southern Methodist University, Tammie Day
- Stanford University, Josh Petkin
- Syracuse University, Holly White
- Temple University, Ro Ruffin
- Trinity College, University of Toronto, Mariam Mana
- Union Theological Seminary & Presbyterian School of Christian Education, Angela Simis
- Union Theological Seminary, New York, Claudio Carvalho
- University of Calgary, Christo Lakusta
- University of Cambridge, Jeffrey Bailey
- University of Chicago, Bernard Dorsey
- University of Florida, Samuel Snyder
- University of Iowa, Nathan Eric Dickman
- University of Missouri–Kansas City, Day Lane
- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Annie Blakeney-Glazer
- University of Notre Dame, Damon McGraw
- University of Pennsylvania, Grant H. Pott
- University of St. Michael’s College, Toronto School of Theology, Darren Joas
- University of Toronto, Christina Reimer
- University of Virginia, Laura Hartman
- University of Washington, Jay Laughlin
- Vanderbilt University, Nicholas Phillips
- Wheaton College, Michael Allen

---

Celebrating Ten Years of Student Service

You are cordially invited to attend the Student Liaison Group Decennial Celebration special topics forum at this year’s Annual Meeting. Panelists will explore student involvement, past, present, and future, in the American Academy of Religion.

A reception for past and present Student Directors and Student Liaisons will be held directly following the session.

Saturday, November 18
4:00 PM – 6:30 PM
Washington Convention Center, Room 305
(Location subject to change. Confirm onsite)

Featured Panelists:
- Richard Amesbury, Valdosta State University
- Warren G. Frisina, Hofstra University
- Davina C. Lopez, Eckerd College
- John Thatamanil, Vanderbilt University
- Deanna A. Thompson, Hamline University

Sponsored by the AAR Graduate Student Committee

---
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In Memoriam

In Memory of a Living Legend, Jaroslav Pelikan, 1923–2006

John H. Erickson, St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary

Father John H. Erickson is Dean and Peter N. Grunewald Professor of Church History at St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary in Crestwood, New York. His friendship with Jaroslav Pelikan goes back to his days as a graduate student at Yale. Pelikan recalls with particular gratitude Jary’s encouragement on a term paper that subsequently became his first published article, which Jary later was to cite with his customary grace in volume II of The Christian Tradition. In 1998 their relationship took a new turn, as Jary, then a layman, served as Jary’s sponsor for entrance into the Orthodox Church.

I

N 2000, IN THE COURSE of celebrations for the 200th anniversary of the Library of Congress, Jaroslav Pelikan received an honor unusual for a professor of historical theology. In recognition of his unique contributions to American life, Jary — as he liked to be called — was officially named a “Living Legend,” along with such notables as General Colin Powell, publisher Katherine Graham, violinist Isaac Stern, and — as he noted with a twinkle in his eye — Barbara Streisand, Gloria Steinem, and Big Bird. That “Living Legend” is with us no longer. On May 13, 2006, after a long bout with cancer, Jary passed away at his home in Hamden, Connecticut, at the age of 82. His funeral services were held in the chapel of St. Vladimir’s Orthodox Theological Seminary, where he and his wife had regularly worshiped since his reception into the Orthodox Church in 1998.

Jary traced many of his academic and religious interests to his Slovak background. His grandfather, Jan Pelikan, was born in Slovakia — that remarkable meeting-place of cultures and religious traditions — and after graduating from a Lutheran seminary in 1884 became one of the founding fathers of the Slovak Synod of Lutherans. Jary’s father, also a Slovak Lutheran pastor, once told him he combined German Lutheran scholarship and Slavic Orthodox piety — and fortunately not the vice-versa. One result of this happy coincidence of qualities was Jary’s remarkable scholarly career. The list of his publications goes on for over 40 pages in the Festschrift marking his 80th birthday (Orthodoxy and Western Culture, ed. Valerie Horchlks and Paul Pauker, SVS Press 2005, pp. 185–228). But interwoven with his scholarship, and virtually inseparable from it, was a Christian faith as simple and endearing childlike as it was profound. This is what Jary had to say in a brief autobiographical essay written just a few years before his death: “I was quite out of step with many in my generation, especially among theological scholars at universities, in never having had fundamental doubts about the essential rightness of the Christian faith. But having retained a continuing, if often quite unostentatious, Slavic piety.”

Jary received his MDiv and PhD degrees — and also married his beloved wife Sylvia — in 1946, at the ripe old age of 22. He went on to teach at Valparaiso University (1946–49), Constanța Theological Seminary (1949–53), the University of Chicago (1953–70), and Yale University (1970–96), where he also served as Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (1973–78) and Chairman of the Publications Committee of Yale University Press. Jary retired from his responsibilities at Yale in 1996, his title changing from Sterling Professor of History to Sterling Professor of History Emeritus, but this did not mean an end to academic appointments. He went on to hold a succession of chairs at Boston College, the University of Pennsylvania’s Annenbgerg School for Communication, the Library of Congress, where he inaugurated the John W. Klage Chair for Countries and Societies of the North, and the Annenberg Foundation Trust at Sunnylands.

By his own admission, Jary was, first of all, a historian. In one of his typically pungent one-liners, he put it this way: ‘Everybody else is an expert on the present. I wish to file a minority report on behalf of the past.’

In 1975 he was invited to give the commencement address. In introducing him, Father Schimmann noted, ‘The hardest thing for me to say about Professor Pelikan is why he is not Orthodox.’ This was to change. Given Jary’s “continuing, if often quite unostentatious, Slavic piety” and his appreciation for Eastern Orthodox theology, his entrance into the Orthodox Church in 1998 came as no surprise to his friends. They only wondered why it had taken so long. In a conversation shortly thereafter, Jary likened his path to Orthodoxy to that of a pilot who kept circling the airport, looking for a way to land. We Orthodox Christians are thankful that he landed before running out of fuel.

In addition to recalling his debt to Father Florovsky, Jary often spoke of his friendship with two of Florovsky’s successors as dean of St. Vladimir’s Seminary, Father Alexander Schimmann and Father John Meyendorff. Over the years Jary visited the seminary on many occasions, and in 1975 he was invited to give the commencement address. In introducing him, Father Schimmann noted, ‘The hardest thing for me to say about Professor Pelikan is why he is not Orthodox.’ This was to change. Given Jary’s “continuing, if often quite unostentatious, Slavic piety” and his appreciation for Eastern Orthodox theology, his entrance into the Orthodox Church in 1998 came as no surprise to his friends. They only wondered why it had taken so long. In a conversation shortly thereafter, Jary likened his path to Orthodoxy to that of a pilot who kept circling the airport, looking for a way to land. We Orthodox Christians are thankful that he landed before running out of fuel.
CHARLES RADIN of the Boston Globe, Jean Gordon of the Clarion-Ledger in Jackson, Mississippi, and Naomi Schaefer Riley of the Wall Street Journal have won the 2006 American Academy of Religion Awards for Best In-Depth Reporting on Religion.

Radin won the contest for journalists writing on the Web or at news outlets with more than 100,000 circulation; Gordon, for journalists at news outlets with less than 100,000 circulation; and Riley, for opinion writing. The awards recognize well-written and researched newswriting that enhances the public understanding of religion.

Radin submitted stories on Christian and Jewish debates over gay clergy, changes in the celebration of Hanukkah, and a three-part series on moderate Muslims in countries ranging from Indonesia and Malaysia to Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. “The writer takes his readers inside mosques, coffee houses and homes from Egypt to Southeast Asia. These Muslims voice no passion to support global jihad, to follow the Qur’an literally or veil and cloister their women, something that is overlooked in some stories on Muslims outside the United States,” said one judge, while another called the series “a remarkable piece of work.”

Gordon submitted stories on adult bar and bat mitzvah classes, racial diversity in Mormonism, the growth of Christian Orthodox churches in the South, the shortage of Catholic priests in the United States and its effect on local communities, and the role religious beliefs play in the economy, which included an in-depth look at economists who pursue the economic study of religion. While covering “a diversity of topics, the writer strikes a good balance between popular writing and use of statistics and scholarship,” commented one judge. Riley submitted opinion articles discussing religious identity at a prominent university, 350 years of Jewish life in America, Christian schools and accreditation difficulties, faith-based groups’ support of immigration reform, and Conservative Judaism and a campaign to convert the non-Jewish spouses of Jews. According to one judge, “The writer has an elegant style that has used history, facts, and . . . scholarship to support the editorial’s arguments. The editorials show original reporting and are well designed.”

Robert Sibley of the Ottawa Citizen placed second in the contest for news outlets with more than 100,000 circulation. “In a beautifully written, heartfelt series the writer transports readers along a 700-mile pilgrimage . . . deep into the heart of Japan’s Buddhist faith, symbolism and cultural traditions, a world that few North American newspapers present,” one judge noted. “The reader can’t wait to read the next page, thanks to superb storytelling.”

Brett Buckner of the Anniston Star in Anniston, Alabama, won second place in the contest for news outlets with less than 100,000 circulation. Said one judge, “A very informative set of articles with a strong emphasis on history and scholarly interpretation of religious topics and strong reporting as well. The writer has done the homework.”

Tracey O’Shaughnessy of the Republican-American in Waterbury, Connecticut, who placed second in last year’s opinion-writing contest, placed second again in the category this year. “This series of articles stands out for its popular style in opinion writing and the writer’s familiarity with theological and historical topics,” said a judge, noting that O’Shaughnessy’s articles are “enjoyable to read.”

John Blake of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution placed third in the contest for news outlets with more than 100,000 circulation. One judge commented, “This reporter used a lot of journalistic tools to cover the beat — and used them well.” Another judge admired Blake’s “energetic research.”

Tori Jo Ryan of the Water Tribune-Herald placed third in the contest for news outlets with less than 100,000 circulation. “This writer has given us five fascinating cameos, usually focusing on a particular scholar’s work in ways that tell a story and explain an interesting aspect of history,” remarked one judge.

Douglas Todd of the Vancouver Sun placed third in this year’s opinion-writing contest. Todd also placed third in the same contest last year. One judge said of his work, “The writer takes us on an extensive journey into world religions and multiculturalism, and the local applications and first-person accounts add to the reporting, which is well written and researched.”

Each contestant submitted five articles published in North America during 2005. Names of contestants and their news outlets were removed from submissions prior to judging. Each of the first-place winners receives $1,000. The judges for the contest for news outlets with over 100,000 circulation were Paul Moses, a professor of journalism at Brooklyn College and a former Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist for Newsday, and Patricia Riley, a freelance journalist and former religion reporter for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The judges for both the contest for news outlets with less than 100,000 circulation and for opinion-writing were Gayle White, a reporter for the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, and Lary Witham, an author and former religion reporter for the Washington Times. Shaun Casey, assistant professor of Christian ethics at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, D.C., served as one of the judges for all three contests. Casey is a member of the AAR’s Committee for the Public Understanding of Religion.

Committee Names Killen Winner of 2006 Teaching Award

EUGENE V. GALLAGHER, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

PATRICIA O’CONNELL KILLEN, former chair of the Department of Religion and current acting provost at Pacific Lutheran University, will receive the Excellence in Teaching Award at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion. A scholar of American religious history, she teaches courses on “American Church History,” “American Catholicism,” “Religion among American Minorities,” and “Religion in the Pacific Northwest,” among others.

At this year’s Annual Meeting, participants will again have the opportunity to engage in conversation with the Excellence in Teaching Award winner during a special session, scheduled for 5 p.m. Sunday, November 19. The session is sponsored by the Committee on Teaching and Learning and will be chaired by Eugene V. Gallagher. Prior to the Annual Meeting, Killen will post some of her teaching materials on the Web site of the AAR’s Virtual Teaching and Learning Center (www.aarweb.org/teaching) and they will serve as the basis for the session.

Students have expressed their appreciation for Killen’s “endless patience, gentle honesty, and sincere respect for students.” They note that her combination of “incredible knowledge in her specific area of scholarship” and her impressive ability “to convey and explain complex ideas and histories.” One remarked that “close to two years after I graduated, I still daily draw on Dr. Killen’s knowledge and wisdom.”

Colleagues observe that Killen “has achieved excellence in all the levels that teaching includes, even demands: teaching in the classroom, mentoring individual students, mentoring her faculty as a department chair, and mentoring young faculty in workshops.” They attest to her mastery of the “nuts and bolts” of teaching, from designing individual assignments to making a course a coherent intellectual experience, and they also express admiration for the depth and sensitivity of her understanding of how the nuances of context shape the experiences of learning for both students and teachers.

In addition to her own scholarship, Killen has published several essays on teaching, including “Making Thinking Real Enough to Make it Better” and “Gracious Play, Discipline, Learning and the Common Good” (both in Teaching Theology and Religion), and “Encountering Religious Commitments in the Classrooms” (in Washington Center News). She frequently makes presentations and leads workshops on teaching, including a Special Topics Forum on “Design of Intellectual Experience” for the 2005 AAR and SBL Annual Meetings and several Washab Center workshops. She currently serves as co-editor of Teaching Theology and Religion.

Killen is a wonderful example of dedication to the craft of teaching, especially for her intense commitment to making teaching an object of intellectual investigation and for cultivating in students and colleagues alike a passion for discovery.

Along with the previous winners of the AAR Excellence in Teaching Award — Tina Pippin, Eugene V. Gallagher, William Placher, Janet Walon, Timothy Berge, and Zayn Kassam — she demonstrates the resourceful, creative, and fully engaged teaching found among so many members of the Academy. The Committee on Teaching and Learning greatly appreciates the opportunity to review and learn from the materials submitted by the candidates for consideration and acknowledges the commitment, ingenuity, and energy that they devote to teaching about religion.

The Committee on Teaching and Learning encourages colleagues to send letters of nomination for this significant award to Kyle Cole, Director of College Programs at the American Academy of Religion, kcole@aarweb.org. The guidelines for this award are on the AAR Web site at www.aarweb.org/awards/teaching.
AAR Honors Four Authors in its Annual Book Awards

The American Academy of Religion offers Awards for Excellence in order to recognize new scholarly publications that make significant contributions to the study of religion. These awards honor works of distinctive originality, intelligence, creativity, and importance — books that have a decisive effect on how religion is examined, understood, and interpreted.

Awards for Excellence are given in three categories: Analytical–Descriptive, Constructive–Reflective, and Historical Studies. Not all awards are given every year. In addition, there is a separate competition and prize for the Best First Book in the History of Religions. For eligibility requirements, awards processes, and a list of current jurors, please see the Book Awards rules on the AAR Web page, www.aarweb.org/awards/bookrules.asp.

The AAR is pleased to announce this year’s recipients of the Awards for Excellence in Religion and the Best First Book in the History of Religions:

Analytical–Descriptive


Constructive–Reflective


Best First Book in the History of Religions


Greeley Wins Marty Award

Andrew M. Greeley — sociologist, priest, novelist, and commentator — will be honored at the Annual Meeting as the recipient of the 2006 Martin E. Marty Award for the Public Understanding of Religion.

As winner of the award, Greeley will be featured at the Marty Forum, from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., November 19, where he will be interviewed about his work by Robert A. Orsi, professor of the history of religion in America, Harvard University.

The Committee on the Public Understanding of Religion chose Greeley from nominations submitted earlier this year. Annually since 1996, the Marty Award recognizes outstanding contributions to the public understanding of religion. The award goes to those whose work has a relevance and eloquence that speaks not just to scholars but to the broader public as well.

Greeley is a professor of sociology at the University of Arizona and a research associate with the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. Poci of his research have included Catholic education, ethnicity, and clergy.

He has written more than 100 books. His academic works include Prions: A Calling in Crisis (2004); The Catholic Myth: The Behavior and Beliefs of American Catholics (1990); Religious Change in America (1989); and Unseasonal Man: The Persistence of Religion (1972). Speaking more directly to the broader public, he has written books such as Making of the Pope, 1978: The Politics of Intrigue in the Vatican (1979) and The Jesus Myth (1971). He also has written a frequent guest on talk shows and written numerous articles for the media. He continues to write a weekly column for the Chicago Sun-Times.

Recent winners of the Marty Award include John Esposito (2005), Huston Smith (2004), Robert Wuthnow (2003), Diana Eck (2002), and David Knipe (2001).

The Committee on the Public Understanding of Religion enthusiastically solicits nominations from the membership for future recipients. Nominations need not be AAR members or academics. Nominations can be made online at www.aarweb.org/awards/marty/default.asp.

Creative Visions

Jesus and Creativity
GORDON D. KAUFMAN
In the light of the contemporary scientific worldview, Kaufman sees the creative figure of the historic Jesus having a vital role in the development of human history and the ultimate meaning of our lives.

0-8006-3799-2 256 pp  hardcover  $25.00

The Immanent Divine
God, Creation, and the Human Predicament
JOHN J. THAMANIL
This East-West conversation “vividly demonstrates how comparative theology is able to engage fundamental and wide-reaching human and religious issues.”

Francis X. Clooney, S.J., Harvard Divinity School
0-8006-3796-8 256 pp  paper  $16.00

Cross Examinations
Readings on the Meaning of the Cross Today
Edited by MARIT TRELSTAD
Major thinkers address the Christian symbol of the cross in the contest of current theological, sociological, political, or environmental issues.

0-8006-2046-1 256 pp  paper  $20.00

The Living Spirit of the Crone
Turning Aging Inside Out
SALLY PALMER THOMASON
Thomason “gives us a view of aging that is sane, scientific, and sensible. We would well to listen to her wisdom.”

0-8006-3799-9 160 pp  paper  $17.00
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An imprint of Augsburg Fortress
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LAST MAY, the American Academy of Religion participated with leaders from more than a dozen national disciplinary associations in a stimulating meeting about creating a better future via sustainability education. Sustainability education produces graduates who are knowledgeable about and engaged in the solutions to society’s social, economic, and environmental challenges.

The U.S. Partnership for the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development organized the meeting, which was sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education, and University Leaders for a Sustainable Future. The partnership formed following the void left when the Bush administration decided not to participate in the United Nations’ Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), which began January 1, 2005. ESD emerged from a series of international conferences, declarations, and initiatives beginning with the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and culminating in the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development.

The United Nations’ Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the ESD lead agency, has described the four major thrusts of education for sustainable development in a “Framework for a Draft International Implementation Scheme”:

- The promotion and improvement of high-quality, relevant, basic education;
- The reorienting of existing education policies and programs to address the social, environmental, and economic knowledge, skills, and values inherent to sustainability in a holistic and interdisciplinary manner;
- The development of public understanding and awareness of the principles of sustainable development;
- The development of specialized training programs to ensure that all sectors of society have the skills necessary to perform their work in a sustainable manner.

The meeting of the U.S. Partnership was to stimulate ideas from disciplinary associations on ways to get its members involved in ESD. AAR staff members Kyle Cole, director of college programs, and Cynthia Walsh, director of development, attended the meeting, coming away with opportunities for the Academy to explore.

“There are many areas upon which we can focus,” Cole said. “From creating new textbook opportunities, editing existing textbooks, and teaching workshops, to statements of support for the Decade and finding ways to have environmentally friendly meetings, the AAR can contribute quite a bit.”

The AAR offices currently find many avenues for helping reduce its impact on the environment, from recycling, encouraging alternative transportation, and taking advantage of the many opportunities available at Emory University, where the AAR offices are located. Emory is a leader in sustainable campuses in the United States. It recently named Atlanta environmental lawyer Ciannat Howett as director for sustainability initiatives, and it has a commitment on the environment, which Cole will participate in this fall.

As the AAR moves forward with both exploring engagement in education for a sustainable future and in interdisciplinary collaborations, we want to hear from you. If you are engaged in teaching and researching in areas related to sustainability, please share a summary of what you are doing by e-mailing Kyle Cole at kcole@aarweb.org. Also let us know if you are interested in working on sustainability initiatives with us. If you want more information on education for a sustainable future, including resources and professional development for educators, visit the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (www.aashe.org) and the Association of University Leaders for a Sustainable Future (www.ulsf.org).
Interview with JAAR Editor Charles Mathewes

Charles T. Mathewes is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Virginia. Educated at Georgetown University and the University of Chicago, he specializes in Christian theology and ethics, comparative religious ethics, and religion, politics, and society. His first book, Evil and the Augustinian Tradition, published by Cambridge University Press, explores the challenge of tragedy and the Augustinian tradition. His second book, A Theology of Public Life, also with Cambridge, explores the promise and peril of public engagement for religious believers in modern democracies. He has edited several books, and is Associate Editor of the forthcoming third edition of the Westminster Dictionary of Christian Ethics. He is currently working on two books: one on comparative religious ethics, and one detailing an Augustinian interpretation of life after 9/11.

**RSN:** As the new JAAR editor, what is your vision for the journal? What have been some of your major initiatives?

**Mathewes:** As I said in my first issue, the JAAR's primary task is to publish the most insightful, profound, provocative, and groundbreaking scholarship concerning the study of all things that go under the capacious conceptual category of "religion." JAAR is the journal of record in religious studies, and it should be the indispensable journal in the field. Given the ample coverage offered by more focused journals in most subfields in religious studies, however, it seems unlikely and undesirable that the JAAR will compete directly with subfield journals. So I hope that we can complement these subfields, by being a forum in which the various subfields can be put in conversation with one another.

After all, the JAAR embodies something of a wager — the wager that there is such a field as "religious studies." Stylistically, I hope that we can use the JAAR to advance a distinct (and underrepresented) style of writing in religious studies — a style that remains responsible to the best standards of a particular subfield, while taking as (but not the) central goal the demonstration of that subfield's value to other scholars in religious studies but outside that subfield. Hence the ideal JAAR paper will advance the discussion on a particular issue — normally an issue under study and debate in a subfield — while doing something more: using that moment as an opportunity to make the case for the relevance of the subfield for religious studies as a whole, and the relevance of religious studies for the subfield in particular. I think we've been offering a fine selection of just such papers. Beyond the individual papers we publish, in every volume we plan on offering one or two "focus issues." These focus issues will bring together scholars in different areas and with different methodological approaches around a common topic, in the hope that rather than offering another within the pages of the journal will uncover interesting affiliations, parallels, divergences, and disagreements among the essays. From that point of view, we hope that an ensemble will offer a richer and deeper approach to the topic under study than a squadron of methodologically lockstep papers can do. We recently offered essays on "the future of religious studies" and on the topic of "secrecy," and I think both of them have been successful.

There's obviously a great deal of overlap between these programs and the overall goals of the JAAR. I am immediately drawn to these matters out of professional interest and a problematically undisciplined curiosity; but even if I didn't find these things interesting in themselves, I still suspect that the JAAR would need to pursue such an agenda, if only for purely strategic reasons.

**RSN:** Tell us, what do the JAAR editorial board, your associate editors, and your book review editor do?

**Mathewes:** How much time you get? Each of these positions is quite different, but they all share one thing in common: none of them are thanked by me, or appreciated by the "outside world," nearly enough for the work they do. (The same goes triple for the graduate assistant staff here at UVA, all of whom do exemplary work for long hours at low pay. But this is not my place to thank-you's to any work- ers, as much as they deserve it.)

Each member of the editorial board has two very concrete obligations: to read two to three paper submissions per year for the JAAR, and offer a thoughtful and constructive assessment of each. Effectively each assessment turns out to be a mini-essay, often involving secondary research on the assessment of the submission, and typically providing quite constructive advice on how to improve the paper. More vaguely, I ask all editorial board members to serve the JAAR as "talent scouts," always staying on the lookout for good work to encourage — wherever they find papers that are good, or authors who seem to have something worth doing, I urge them to encourage both to submit paper submissions to the JAAR, and to encourage authors who might submit in the future to be in contact with us on possible future projects.

The associate editors have it worse. I promised them, when they signed on for this thing, that they wouldn't have to read and offer assessments of submissions. But in fact we send them a lot of requests of the sort, "don't read this, just look it over" for an hour or so and tell us what you think." They invariably send back really quite solid assessments of what we sent them. Also I send them a lot of e-mails that say, "We have a paper that deals with this sort of matter and seems to be using this literature a lot to deal with it. Who would be good — or interested — to assess it?" Addition- ally — to read this?" And sometimes they know right away who would be good, and sometimes they have to think about it, or ask the person to read the whole thing. No matter what they do, they have been far too effective at answering my questions to induce me to stop. But in fact all of this is secondary; their main job is more strategic: I use them to offer assessments of our pro- cesses, both our internal processes and our dealings with external readers, as well as a kind of "think tank" of people who are suited to elucidate some small part of their brain — say, 5 percent — to thinking about where the JAAR needs to go, and how it should get there — what topics we should be discussing that we are not. And I'm not writing for us and what can we do to induce them to write for us, that sort of thing. But of all these people the book review editor, Corey Walker, has it worst. When I took on the JAAR I did an informal survey and asked people how they read the jour- nal. Their reading habits in general were: they buy the books, read them on one or more of a dozen: everyone read the book reviews. And many people read the book reviews first. But this presents a problem. The JAAR gets about 1,000 books a year. And we can review something like 80–100 of them. And some of the books we send out for review never get reviewed, because the people we asked to review them never write back. And yet everyone in the world assumes that their work (1) is worthy of review, will be sent to (2) a responsible reviewer who will (3) assess it fairly. (That is, for the author, the book, the field, and quickly, and that it will then appear in the JAAR in the next issue. Only on the last point can we be even roughly promissory: we try to review books no later than a year after their publication date. But even that is hard to guarantee because of the vicissitudes of reviewers.

The good news in Corey's life is that this summer he has accepted a position at Brown University, and is (for him, happily) moving from book review editor to associ- ate editor. So while Corey is the book review editor for all four issues this year (Volume 74), after that we'll have a new editor, namely, my colleague Kurtis Schaeffer, a very well-regarded scholar of Thomas Aquinas, whose good common sense is taking a severe hit with the composition of this very sentence.

The work of all these people is essential to the well-being of the JAAR. They serve as critical members of the "ground crews" in the production of some of the groves of academe that is the home of the academic study of religion, tasked with weeding, pruning, and trimming the garden of research in matters regarding religion. And beyond the named staff, we have used scholars throughout the field and beyond to read and assess papers for us, but all of them must remain anonymous; at least till I write my tell-all memoir.

**RSN:** Why does the work of JAAR matter to you? What makes you willing to give so freely of your time and talent?

**Mathewes:** Most materially what made me willing was Bill Werpehoekis, who will one day pay dearly for his silver tongue in convincing me to apply for this position. More dispositional, there is my failure to heed my father's long-ago advice, which he learned from painful military experience, "Never volunteer. For any- thing." But the intellectual payoff for me, so far, has been substantial and superabun- dant. I get to read some of the best stuff written in religious studies, before almost anyone else has done so. We get many papers that are very good, but simply not suitable for the JAAR — so we recommend that they submit them to other journals. (I've already seen several articles appear in other journals because of that.) And then I get to work with the authors we do accept, to try to make their papers even better — so I get a second crack at understanding what they're trying to say and how they see the field and what it needs to hear about something important. And the comments of our submission-reviewers are in them- selves often mini-essays on the topic at hand, as well as on how to write well on these matters. So I learn a lot about writing papers. Finally, by and large the editor-ship means people are friendly and very receptive to my questions or suggestions, and who doesn't like that?

**RSN:** How has your service affected your understanding of the small "a" and capital "A" in "Academia."

**Mathewes:** It's certainly illuminating seeing the sausages made, both in the JAAR and in the AAR. Unsurprisingly it's made me more committed to the idea that the Academy, and the academy, for all their faults and limitations (and both they have them) remain viable sites for really solid work — but only if enough scholars com- mit themselves to the necessary conditions. (Now, how much of that is merely an efflo- rescence of my psychological investment in the JAAR? That I don't know.)

More intellectually, it's really quite remarkable to see the diversity of work in the field of religious studies (especially essays in to the JAAR office) — and also the woeful naively approaches to matters of "religion" in fields outside of religious studies. Quite often, scholars outside the field simply do not have the tools, nor it seems the patience, to understand the complexity of the role of religion in their topics of inquiry; but they think that using the word "religion" qualifies them to publish in the JAAR. Often the JAAR's reviewers offer such scholars a pedagogical service, in explaining how much and just what they must learn in order to do what they think they want to do.

**RSN:** What would you say to someone interested in working for the journal?

**Mathewes:** As I said above, the JAAR is a wager. It is a wager that there is such a field as "religious studies." I mean an artificial, ramshackle, at best semicompetent field of dubious genealogy. It is a wager made in a situation, today, of profound and fascinating challenge, from many perspectives and many institutional positions, about the future of the study of religion in the academy. And it is also, if paradoxically given what the previ- ous sentence said, a wager made in a global context where the role of religion seems more than ever urgently solicitous of intelligent investigation.

So, if you value the work you do, in teaching and researching and writing for your col- leagues in this field — even if you don't understand your primary audience to be con- stituted by this field, that is, even if you think of yourself as a scholar of China, of European history, or of the Middle East, or a critical theorist or philosopher or theologian committed to the intellectual service of a reli- gious community — you should want to do whatever you can to ensure that this wager is a winning one. I hope you do.
Bard College has received a $2 million gift for the creation of an endowed chair in honor of the internationally renowned scholar of religion and Bard faculty member Jacob Neusner. “The college is delighted to have received this generous gift in recognition of the historic contributions by Jacob Neusner. It has been an honor for us to have Professor Neusner on our faculty, and now to have his name associated with Bard,” said Bard College President Leon Botstein. “He sets a high standard of excellence in teaching and scholarship.” Neusner has held the chair since July 1. Upon his retirement, the holder of the endowed chair will be named the Jacob Neusner Professor of the History and Theology of Judaism.

Neusner, a leading figure in the American academic study and teaching of religion, revolutionized the study of Judaism and brought it into the field of religion. He built intellectual bridges between Judaism and other religions, and thereby laid the groundwork for durable understanding and respect among religions. Through his teaching and publication programs, he advanced the academic careers of younger scholars and teachers, from within and outside the study of Judaism.

Educated at Harvard, Jewish Theological Seminary, Oxford, and Columbia, Neusner began his career in the early 1960s, when religion was a minor field in American universities. His work transformed not only the study of Judaism, but also the field of religion studies. “He personifies our profession at its best: engaged with students, dedicated to advancing the intellectual disciplines involved in the subject, and concerned to help colleagues excel in teaching and learning,” said Bruce Chladek, professor of philosophy and religion at Bard and executive director of its Institute of Advanced Theology. “Our students have benefited as much from his deep appreciation of their creativity as they have from his demands on them to be lucid in writing and cogent in oral expression.”

Neusner began his career in the early 1960s, when religion was a minor field in American universities, largely limited to biblical studies and Christian (mostly Protestant) theology. Judaism was studied parochially, confined primarily to Jewish institutions. Neusner changed all that. He understood that the power of the study of religion is its capacity to generalize, to discern common structures across religions, and, through them, to understand the similarities and differences among the traditions. Neusner also knew that scholars cannot generalize about religions that are closed to them.

Neusner addressed these problems by establishing a curriculum agenda of bringing critical questions to the study of religion. “His success transformed not only the study of Judaism; it also affected the study of religion. Neusner was the first to see that the sources of those traditional Jewish traditions were not constructed to answer standard historical questions. He invented the documentary study of Judaism, through which he showed, relentlessly and incontrovertibly, that each document of the rabbinic canon has a discrete focus and agenda, and that the history of ancient Judaism has to be told in terms of texts rather than personalities or events. His Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah (Wipf & Stock Publishers 1981; translated into Hebrew and Italian) is the classic statement of his work and the first of many comparable volumes on the other documents of the rabbinic canon.

Neusner’s discovery of the centrality of documents led him to an even more decisive perception of Judaism as a system: an integrated network of beliefs, practices, and values that yields a coherent worldview and picture of reality for its adherents. This approach led to a series of very important studies on the way Judaism categorizes categories of understanding and how those categories relate to one another, even as they emerge diversely in discrete rabbinic documents.

Neusner’s work shows, for instance, how deeply Judaism is integrated with the system of the Pentateuch, how such categories as “merit” and “purity” work in Judaism, and how classical Judaism absorbed and transcended the destruction of the second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE. His work defines rabbinic Judaism as the result of human labor responding to what its adherents believe is God’s call, and demonstrates its persistent vitality and imagination.

In the process of producing his scholarship, Neusner translated, analyzed, and explained virtually the entire rabbinic canon — a massive compendium of texts — into English. The Mishnah, the Tosefta, the Palestinian Talmud, the Babylonian Talmud, and nearly every work of rabbinic Bible interpretation are available to scholars of all backgrounds because of Neusner’s scholarship. In the study of Judaism, no one in history can match his work.

Neusner’s discovery of the centrality of documents led him to an even more decisive perception of Judaism as a system: an integrated network of beliefs, practices, and values that yields a coherent worldview and picture of reality for its adherents. This approach led to a series of very important studies on the way Judaism categorizes categories of understanding and how those categories relate to one another, even as they emerge diversely in discrete rabbinic documents.

Neusner’s work shows, for instance, how deeply Judaism is integrated with the system of the Pentateuch, how such categories as “merit” and “purity” work in Judaism, and how classical Judaism absorbed and transcended the destruction of the second Temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE. His work defines rabbinic Judaism as the result of human labor responding to what its adherents believe is God’s call, and demonstrates its persistent vitality and imagination.

In the process of producing his scholarship, Neusner translated, analyzed, and explained virtually the entire rabbinic canon — a massive compendium of texts — into English. The Mishnah, the Tosefta, the Palestinian Talmud, the Babylonian Talmud, and nearly every work of rabbinic Bible interpretation are available to scholars of all backgrounds because of Neusner’s scholarship. In the study of Judaism, no one in history can match his work.

He strives to inculcate in his students the desire to pursue active and engaged scholarship, an effort that has had a lasting impact on a new generation of current Bard College students alike. Engaging with Neusner in the classroom, whether on the subject of religion or another field altogether, has animated his students for a lifetime.

“Since he joined the faculty of Bard College,” Professor Neusner has shown that the academic which brings progress in scholarship can also contribute to advances in teaching,” said Bruce Chladek, professor of philosophy and religion at Bard and executive director of its Institute of Advanced Theology. “Our students have benefited as much from his deep appreciation of their creativity as they have from his demands on them to be lucid in writing and cogent in oral expression.”

“Especially because Professor Neusner has pioneered seminars that bring students together with established academics from Bard and elsewhere in collaborative projects, he has established himself not only as an exceptional instructor, but as the center of an innovative environment of learning. He personifies our profession at its best: engaged with students, dedicated to advancing the intellectual disciplines involved in the subject, and concerned to help colleagues excel in teaching and learning.”

Neusner’s scholarship did not stop with his exposition — in translation, description, and interpretation — of Judaism alone. To the contrary, unlike any other scholar of his generation, Neusner deliberately built outward from Judaism to other religions. He sponsored a number of very important conferences and collaborative projects that drew different religions into conversation on common themes and problems.

Neusner’s efforts have produced conferences and books among other topics, the problem of difference in religion, religion and society, religion and material culture, religion and economics, religion and altruism, and religion and tolerance. These collaborations build on Neusner’s intellectual vision, his notion of a religion as a system, and would not have been possible otherwise. By working toward general questions from the perspective of a discrete religion, he produced results of durable consequence for understanding other religions as well.

In addition to these efforts, Neusner has written a number of works exploring the relationship of Judaism to other religions with regard to difficult issues of understanding and misunderstanding. For instance, A Rabbi Talks with Jesus (McGill-Queen’s University Press 1993; translated into German, Italian, and Swedish), establishes a religiously sound framework for Judaism-Christian interchange and earned the praise of Pope John Paul II. He also has collaborated with other scholars to produce comparisons of Judaism and Christianity, as in The Bible and Us: A Priest and a Rabbi Read Scripture Together (Warner Books 1990; translated into Spanish and Portuguese). He has collaborated with scholars of Islam, conceiving World Religions in America: An Introduction (Westminster John Knox Press 2004, 3rd ed.), which explores how diverse religions have developed in the distinctive American context.

He has also composed numerous textbooks and general trade books on Judaism. The two best-known examples are The Way of Torah: An Introduction to Judaism (Wadsworth Publishing 2003) and Judaism: An Introduction (Penguin 2002; translated into Portuguese and Japanese)

Throughout his career, Neusner has established publication programs and series with various academic publishers. Through these series, as well as the reference works he conceived and edited and the conferences he has sponsored, Neusner has advanced the careers of dozens of younger scholars around the globe. Few others in the American study of religion have had this kind of impact on students of so many approaches and interests.

Neusner has written or edited more than 900 books. He has taught at Columbia University, University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee, Brandeis University, Dominican College, Brown University, University of South Florida, and Bard College. He is a member of the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, and a life member of Clare Hall, Cambridge University. He is the only scholar to serve both with the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts. He has also received scores of academic awards, honorary and otherwise.

In addition to his positions as research professor of religion and theology and Bard Center Fellow, Neusner is Senior Fellow of Bard’s Institute of Advanced Theology. He has taught at Bard College since 1994.

""
Employment Indicators

Student Placement after Completion of Academic Doctoral Programs in Religion and Theology in the United States in 2001–2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACEMENT IN TYPE OF INSTITUTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF GRADUATES PLACED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts colleges</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive four-year colleges</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity schools or seminaries</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research universities</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still seeking employment</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches, chaplaincies, and pastores</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral programs</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic administrations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other business</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing projects</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other positions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives and libraries</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community colleges</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in law school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AAR Survey of Graduate Programs in Religion and Theology, 2002

The reference period is the academic year 2001–2002. Forty-three (43) academic doctoral programs responded to these questions. Each category is broken down by public, private, Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant institutions in the full report, which can be found on pp. 59–66 at: www.aarweb.org/department/census/gradu ate/crosstab-inst.pdf.

NRC to rank doctoral programs

The National Research Council has launched a project to assess research doctoral programs in the United States that will rate and rank doctoral programs, including those in religion. NRC reported the study collects quantitative data through questionnaires administered to institutions, programs, faculty, and admitted to candidacy students. Additional program data on publications, citations, and dissertation keywords also will be collected. NRC will then design and construct program ratings using the data.

Data collection should end by February; and results will be announced in December 2007.

The NRC last ranked such programs in its 1995 study. For more information on the study, go to www7.nationalacademies.org/reus/about.html.

Final volume of Encyclopaedia of the Qur’an published

The fifth and final volume of the Encyclopaedia of the Qur’an, edited by past AAR president Jane Dammann McAuliffe, has been published by Brill Academic Publishers. The first volume of the English language encyclopedia was published in 2001.

The encyclopedia combines alphabetically arranged articles about the contents of the Qur’an. It is an encyclopedic dictionary of qur’anic terms, concepts, personalities, place names, cultural history, and exegesis extended with essays on the most important themes and subjects within Qur’anic studies. With nearly 1,000 entries in 5 volumes, the encyclopedia is the first comprehensive, multilingual reference work on the Qur’an to appear in a Western language.

Frequent cross-references direct readers to related entries and each article will conclude with a citation of relevant bibliography. This final volume contains indices of transliterated terms, of qur’anic references, and of the authors and exegetes cited in the entries and essays. It will also include a synoptic outline of the full contents of the EQ.

The EQ is supported by an international board of advisors. Scholars from many nations have written articles for the encyclopedia.

Calvin College opens World Christianity institute

Former Calvin College provost Joel Carpenter stepped down from his post this summer to become the first director of the new Nagel Institute for the Study of World Christianity at Calvin. The institute was established at Calvin this year for reflection, research, and communication regarding Christianity in the global south and east.

Carpenter said the Nagel Institute will encourage scholars in the north to reorient their scholarly work to the global south and east, and will examine the role of the diaspora Christian communities: northern diaspora faith communities such as African-American churches, U.S.-Latio catolic churches, and Catholic renewal movements, Caribbean congregations in Canada, African Christians in Europe, and Asian-American churches.

He noted that 40 percent of the world’s Christians live in the North Atlantic quadrant, and the faith is declining numerically in that region. About 60 percent of the world’s Christians reside elsewhere, in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Pacific.

Carpenter says that these developments, which have been happening beneath the radar for over three decades, led to the development of the Nagel Institute.

Iliff names 13th president

David G. Trickett has been unanimously elected by the Iliff School of Theology Board of Trustees to serve as the school’s 13th president. He will also serve as professor of ethics and leadership.

Trickett was chairperson of the board and senior fellow at the Center for World Religions, Diplomacy, and Conflict Resolution, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University.

“The change to have someone of Dr. Trickett’s caliber join the Iliff community,” said Suzy Iliff Wittler, chairperson, Iliff Board of Trustees. “His depth of experience — as a pastor, faculty member, transformational leader, and administrator — will serve the school well.”

Trickett succeeded the interim president, J. Philip Wogaman, on July 1.

Trickett has served as a member of the American Academy of Religion, Society for Values in Higher Education, Society of Christian Ethics, North American Academy of Examiners, American Society of Church History, and National Association of College and University Chaplains. He has published more than 100 articles, reports, chapters in books, and other writings.

Trickett holds a doctorate from Southern Methodist University, a master of theology from Southern Methodist University, and a bachelor’s from Louisiana State University.

AAR receives $50,000 grant

The Pew Charitable Trusts has awarded a one-year $50,000 grant in support of Religionsource, an AAR program aimed at improving news coverage of religion. When covering a topic related to religion, journalists can turn to Religionsource to identify scholars with relevant expertise.

Since going online in fall 2002, Religionsource has responded to more than 7,000 queries from nearly 1,100 journalists. These represent 500 news outlets in 14 countries and 47 U.S. states. Following two previous grants from The Trusts, the new funding runs from July 2006 through June 2007.
Pence Named New Director of Wabash Center

PRESIDENT Andrew T. Ford of Wabash College is pleased to announce the appointment of Nadine (Dena) S. Pence as the third director of the Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion, beginning January 1, 2007.

Pence is currently professor of theology at Bethany Theological Seminary in Richmond, Indiana, where she has taught since 1991, has served as acting dean, and has been director of the master of arts in theology program since 1995. She is also executive director of the Council of Societies for the Study of Religion (CSSR), the umbrella organization for professional societies among those who teach in the field of religion in college, universities, and seminaries throughout the United States and Canada.

“Throughout her distinguished career, Dena has shown a broad engagement with contemporary religion and theology, a deep commitment to exploring issues of teaching and learning, and a leadership style that is collaborative and empowering,” said Wabash College President Patrick White, who was part of the search committee. “Her gifts of mind and spirit will enable her to build on the excellent work of her distinguished predecessor and guide the Wabash Center to new heights.”

Before becoming executive director of CSSR, Pence served as editorial chair of the Religious Studies Review editorial board; she continues to be that journal’s area editor for the Arts, Literature, Culture, and Religion section. CSSR publishes three periodicals, Religious Studies Review, the CSSR Bulletin, and the annual Directory of Departments and Programs of Religious Studies in North America.

Pence is a lifelong member of the Church of the Brethren. She received her bachelor’s degree from Manchester College, her master of divinity degree from Bethany Seminary, and her PhD in theology from the University of Chicago. She has written and spoken widely on the relation of theology and media, and is co-editor of “Hope Deferred: Theological Reflections on Reproductive Loss”, published by Pilgrim Press in 2005.

The Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion recently received an $8 million grant from Lilly Endowment Inc. to support the next three years of work encouraging the improvement of teaching and learning in seminaries, university divinity schools, and college and university religion departments throughout North America. Although founded only ten years ago, under the outstanding leadership of its first two directors, Raymond B. Williams and Lucinda Huffaker, the Wabash Center has already established an important national reputation. More than 700 faculty members, representing schools from Harvard and Yale in New England to Fuller and Claremont in southern California, have participated in its workshops and conferences. The center publishes Teaching Theology and Religion, an internationally recognized journal, and hosts a widely used Web site for source material in theology, religion, and teaching. It provides grants for seminaries, colleges, and universities interested in improving the quality of their teaching.

AAAR Scholars Seek To Create Religion Op-Ed Page

AR MEMBERS Sheila Davaney of the lliff School of Theology and Gary Laderman of Emory University are using a Ford Foundation grant to lay the groundwork for a religion opinion-editorial page on progressive values, religion, and public affairs, titled “The Religion Report: Research and Opinions on Religion in Today’s World.” Through a new Web-based venue and subsequent outreach, they hope to change the landscape of religious discourse across the country.

“Progressive” in this case means not a singular ideological perspective, but widely inclusive views; we’re committed to a diversity of ideas that are oriented toward just social and political outcomes for everyone,” said Davaney, Harvey H. Porthoff Professor of Christian Theology at lliff and project director. “Our goal is to widen and deepen the conversation about religion and public life in America and the world.”

“9/11 was a watershed point for people to bring religion into the public arena,” said Laderman, professor of religion and director of Emory’s Graduate Division of Religion. “Religion has always played a role in public life; we’re trying to develop new ways to fairly and respectfully discuss religious and public policy issues that include all kinds of perspectives in the discussion.”

Davaney and Laderman said the idea for an op-ed page grew out of their frustration at the lack of depth, nuance, or diversity in discussions involving religion on a range of pressing public concerns. Often, they said, views of various religious groups are lumped together, distorted, or not heard at all.

“Branding religion in a certain way, whether it’s Christianity, Judaism, Islam, or any other faith, erases the true picture of what religious perspectives really bring to the table,” Laderman said.

As scholars, Davaney and Laderman have witnessed the tremendous growth of academic interest in religion and research on religious issues across the country. Yet often that research doesn’t appear in the public sphere for a variety of reasons, from academic wariness of popularizing research, to lack of funding or a reliance on a narrow range of often nonexpert interpreters of religion.

They believe that a progressive opinion-editorial page can serve as an antidote.

“We hope to stimulate change by bringing together a wide spectrum of alternative scholarly, civic, and religious voices to address the most significant issues of the day via a Web-based venue,” Davaney said. “The page will use the most up-to-date technology to allow progressive voices to share their opinions and provide information that is often absent from the public arena.

“We hope to reach policy makers and a broad public with viewpoints that they simply are not exposed to currently.”

During the planning stage of the project underway, Davaney and Laderman have organized broad-based conversations among scholars and civic and religious leaders and activists. They are identifying issues, assessing available resources, and exploring collaborations with leaders and institutions that can contribute to the creation of what they hope will be “a more vital national conversation about religion in our day.”

Plans call for the opinion-editorial page to be launched via the Internet during 2007.

Socrates and the Irrational

James S. Hanks

“A lucid and graceful, sustained and subtle meditation on the dialogue between reason and the irrational that is deeply related to the connection between the ethical and the aesthetic.” — Ronald A. Sharp, Professor of English and Dean of Faculty, Vassar College

John Ruskin and the Ethics of Consumption

David M. Craig

“David Craig’s great book on the personal wisdom of John Ruskin re-energizes a much-needed dialogue between this sad genius and twenty-first-century...” — Ronald A. Sharp, Professor of English and Dean of Faculty, Vassar College

Religion and Violence in a Secular World

Toward a New Political Theology

Edited by Clayton Crockett

How are we to think about religion and violence in the contemporary world, especially in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001? In this collection of essays, nearly a dozen scholars, including some of the leading voices in the field of academic religious thought, offer a theological and theological response to the 9/11 attacks as well as a broader and more sustained and subtle meditation on the connection between religious and public life in America and the world.

“9/11 was a watershed point for people to bring religion into the public arena,” said Laderman, professor of religion and director of Emory’s Graduate Division of Religion. “Religion has always played a role in public life; we’re trying to develop new ways to fairly and respectfully discuss religious and public policy issues that include all kinds of perspectives in the discussion.”

Davaney and Laderman said the idea for an op-ed page grew out of their frustration at the lack of depth, nuance, or diversity in discussions involving religion on a range of pressing public concerns. Often, they said, views of various religious groups are lumped together, distorted, or not heard at all.

“Branding religion in a certain way, whether it’s Christianity, Judaism, Islam, or any other faith, erases the true picture of what religious perspectives really bring to the table,” Laderman said.

As scholars, Davaney and Laderman have witnessed the tremendous growth of academic interest in religion and research on religious issues across the country. Yet often that research doesn’t appear in the public sphere for a variety of reasons, from academic wariness of popularizing research, to lack of funding or a reliance on a narrow range of often nonexpert interpreters of religion.

They believe that a progressive opinion-editorial page can serve as an antidote.

“We hope to stimulate change by bringing together a wide spectrum of alternative scholarly, civic, and religious voices to address the most significant issues of the day via a Web-based venue,” Davaney said. “The page will use the most up-to-date technology to allow progressive voices to share their opinions and provide information that is often absent from the public arena.

“We hope to reach policy makers and a broad public with viewpoints that they simply are not exposed to currently.”

During the planning stage of the project underway, Davaney and Laderman have organized broad-based conversations among scholars and civic and religious leaders and activists. They are identifying issues, assessing available resources, and exploring collaborations with leaders and institutions that can contribute to the creation of what they hope will be “a more vital national conversation about religion in our day.”

Plans call for the opinion-editorial page to be launched via the Internet during 2007.
Regional Meetings and Calls for Papers

Eastern International

AAR Eastern International Regional Meeting
May 4–5, 2007
University of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University
Waterloo, ON, Canada

The Regional Program Committee invites you to submit proposals for papers and panels to be presented at the 2007 Regional Meeting. The deadline for submissions is January 15, 2007. Each proposal should consist of a one-page abstract (300 words max.) describing the nature of the paper or panel, a current CV for the participant(s), and a cover letter that includes full name, title, institution, phone number, fax number, e-mail, and mailing address. Please send this information as an e-mail attachment in MS Word format to AAR_EIR2007@uwaterloo.ca.

Proposals are welcome in all areas of religious and biblical studies. The Program Committee is particularly interested in panels and thematic sessions in the following areas:

- Religion and International Affairs
- Religion and Public Policy (especially bioethics, education, and health care)
- Religious Diversity in North America
- Religion and Popular Culture

The committee is also interested in panels combining activism or performance with scholarly inquiry.

The committee wants to encourage interdisciplinary panels that maintain religion as a central theme. Scholars from any region may apply to participate.

Only those proposals received by the deadline will be considered for inclusion in the program. Presentations are limited to 20 minutes, with time allowed for questions. If you require technological support for your presentation (such as Internet connection, or audio and projection equipment), you must request it with your proposal.

Student Paper Competition

Undergraduate and graduate students residing in the EIR region are invited to enter the student paper competitions. Please note that to be eligible for submission, the student must attend a university in the Eastern International Region. Furthermore, the paper must be accepted for reading in the conference to be eligible for the competition and must be presented at the conference by the student. The committee will give preference to work that is new at this conference. Two $100 awards are reserved for winning papers (although in some cases the committee can decide to award up to three). The awards will be formally presented at the business meeting on Saturday, May 5, during lunch, and all attendees who entered the competition are encouraged to attend the awards luncheon. To enter the competition, please send a letter of intent along with the essay being presented, a full CV of the author, and four copies of the essay. We ask that submissions to this contest not be submitted by e-mail, but through regular mail to Scott Kline at the following address:

Scott Kline
Department of Religious Studies
St. Jerome’s University–University of Waterloo
290 Westminster RD N.
Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G3
Canada
skline@uwaterloo.ca

Note: All presenters at the Spring 2007 regional conference must have active membership in the AAR. ALL participants must preregister for the conference. Deadline for conference registration is April 1, 2007.

Mid-Atlantic

Mid-Atlantic Regional Meeting (AAR/SBL)
March 1–2, 2007
Radisson Hotel at Cross Keys
Baltimore, MD

The call for papers for the 2007 Mid-Atlantic Regional Meeting can be found at www.aarweb.org/regions/region-ma.asp.

New England–Maritimes

Instead of holding a NEMAAR regional meeting in 2007, the region will co-sponsor the following conferences proposed and organized by regional members.

1) Christ in Contemporary Cultures: An Interdisciplinary Conference at Gordon College, Wenham, MA, September 28–30, 2006. Contact person: Greg Thusswaldner, greg@thusswaldner@gordon.edu.


If you have ideas for other events, we welcome additional proposals from regional members (see call below).

For this year’s call:

Our goal is to sponsor events in different parts of the region, to benefit the greatest possible number of members. Such events will be organized by members and supported with regional financial and promotional assistance, provided that the event is open to any regional member, faculty, and graduate students with a faculty mentor, are all eligible to apply. We have set a rolling deadline to make it possible to submit an application at any time. If you have an idea or inquiry and want feedback, please send it to Regional Secretary Linda Barnes at linda.barnes@tmc.org. Applications should be sent to individuals listed in the call.

Co-Sponsoring Committees: Instead of organizing a single annual regional meeting, which relatively few people attend, NEMAAR will function as a co-sponsor of other events proposed by members around the region. NEMAAR’s contribution will involve a) NEMAAR grants of up to $800 to help support conference-related costs; b) assistance with resources to facilitate conference planning, including best-practice planning schedules; and c) access to regional e-mail lists to publicize the event. Proposals should be sent to Ann Wetherell at wetheri@emmanuel.edu, and should include a conference title, an abstract, a list of projected speakers, schedule, contact person, and a budget that indicates how the NEMAAR grant will be used. If submitted by graduate students, a faculty mentor must be identified. Rolling deadline.

Teaching Workshops: The topics of greatest interest to our members include course development and teaching skills. If you would like to organize a teaching workshop, NEMAAR will provide a) NEMAAR grants of up to $800 to help support conference-related costs; b) assistance with resources to facilitate conference planning, including best-practice planning schedules; and c) access to regional e-mail lists to locate presenters and/or to publicize the event. Proposals should be sent to Barbara Darling Smith at fordcatena@comcast.net. They should include a workshop title, abstract, list of projected speakers and/or facilitators, schedule, contact person, and a budget that indicates how the NEMAAR grant will be used. If submitted by graduate students, a faculty mentor must be identified. Rolling deadline.

Salon Series: A lunch and/or dinner series, held in different parts of the region, focusing on the work of regional authors (these can be works in progress). NEMAAR will provide a) grants of up to $400 to help support related costs; and b) access to regional e-mail lists to publicize the series. Proposals should be sent to Michael Harwig at peres@econ.umass.edu, and should include a title, abstract, list of authors and/or facilitators, schedule, contact person, and a budget that indicates how the NEMAAR grant will be used. If submitted by graduate students, a faculty mentor must be identified. Rolling deadline.

If you have an idea that is not listed here but that you feel is consistent with these goals, please send an inquiry! For a list of currently scheduled events, see www.aarweb.org/region/ne.

See REGIONAL MEETINGS, p. 42
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Celebrating 10 Years
Strengthening and Enhancing Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion

Nadine S. Pence
New Director of the Wabash Center

Dr. Pence, professor of theological studies at Bethany Theological Seminary, will assume responsibilities from Dr. Lucinda Huffaker on January 1, 2007.

AAR & SBL Annual Meeting Events

Friday
- Teaching Theology and Religion Editorial Board Meeting
- Wabash Center Reunion Meetings

Saturday
- Breakfast Meeting for Participants in Barbara Walvoord’s Study of Highly Effective Teachers of the Introduction to Religion Course
- Caucus of Scholars at Religiously Affiliated Institutions Luncheon
- Wabash Center Reunion Meetings

Sunday
- AAR and SBL Graduate Student Luncheon
- Wabash Center Reunion Meetings
- Wabash Center 10th Anniversary Reception

Monday
- Open Consulting on Grant Writing
- Writing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Luncheon
- Annual Dinner for New Teachers
- Wabash Center Reunion Meetings

Workshops and Colloquies

2007-2008

Accepting Applications - Deadline: January 31, 2007
Colloquia and Workshops on Teaching and Learning for
- Mid-Career Theological School Faculty
- Pre-Tenure Theological School Faculty
- Pre-Tenure Religion Faculty at Colleges and Universities

Wabash Center
For Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion
www.wabashcenter.wabash.edu
New AAR Dues Structure

COMBINING OUR RESPECT for a changing membership base and desire for a greener environment, the American Academy of Religion has revamped its dues structure and renewal process. Beginning in 2007, new and renewing members alike will be urged to visit our secure Web site at www.aarweb.org to complete a greatly simplified application form.

The updated dues structure remains based on a sliding scale, which allows for full participation in the Academy by those at all income levels. The range of incomes as well as the number of income levels have both been adjusted to reflect shifts in the marketplace. For example, a new income category of less than $20,000 has been included to accommodate adjunct faculty. At the other end of the spectrum, we have added tiers for those whose incomes have risen substantially since the 1990s, the last time the structure was revised. Dues were determined after a close review of fifteen peer associations in the American Council of Learned Societies.

As in the past, special AAR membership categories still offer substantial discounts to current members of the Society of Biblical Literature and to retired scholars. The window for reduced student membership has been widened from seven to ten years, and another category has been introduced to welcome international scholars earning less than $15,000 annually.

The advantages of joining online, both for the individual and for the AAR as a whole, are many. Taking this environmentally sound approach, members can ensure the accuracy of their data input and feel confident that all financial information is subjected to stringent encryption and protection. Those who prefer to pay their dues by check may, of course, continue to do so. The cost savings from creating, distributing, and processing many fewer paper forms can be redirected toward substantive member services.

What has not changed over the years is that membership dues cover just 30 percent of the AAR’s programs and services. Generous contributions to the Academy Fund help close that gap, but we hope you will consider becoming a sustaining member ($1,000) or a supporting member ($500). Your gift can be restricted to a special purpose, such as international programs or research grants, or it can lend support to the Academy’s general operations. Either way, your donations further the AAR’s mission to foster excellence in the study of religion.

Try the safe, paperless alternative at www.aarweb.org to strengthen the yield of your membership dues. Your colleagues will thank you—and so will the trees.

Please Renew Your AAR Membership Today!

www.aarweb.org/dues

Already renewed? Confirm your membership status at: www.aarweb.org/membersonly

Beginning this year, AAR is requesting that members take advantage of online renewal because renewing online ...

- Helps the environment
  Online renewal is a sound environmental choice because it replaces production and delivery of 10,000 renewal packets.

- Helps the whole academy
  The funds saved by every online renewal can be applied to services and programs that benefit the study of religion.

- Helps each member
  The online submission is instant (immediately gain access to online services), accurate (no handwriting confusion or transcription mistakes), and safe (secured with strong encryption through VeriSign). Additionally, it frees staff time to assist directly with member needs.

If you still wish to renew by paper, we are, of course, happy to serve your needs. You can print membership forms directly at www.aarweb.org/membership/join.asp or you can contact us at membership@aarweb.org or 404-727-3049 to have forms mailed or faxed to you.

Journal Discounts for AAR Members

AAR members are entitled to discounts on many journals. Check online for details at: www.aarweb.org/membership/benefits/

- Society of Biblical Literature
  Journal of Biblical Literature
  Review of Biblical Literature
- Oxford University Press
  Journal of Islamic Studies
  The Journal of Theological Studies
  Literature and Theology
  Modern Judaism
- Indiana University Press
  Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion
- Association for the Sociology of Religion
  Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review
- Blackwell Publishing
  Dialog: A Journal of Theology
  The Heythrop Journal
  International Journal of Systematic Theology
  Journal of Chinese Philosophy
  Journal of Religious Ethics
  Modern Theology
  The Muslim World
  New Blackfriars
- Religious Studies Review
  Review in Religion and Theology
  Teaching Theology and Religion
  Zygon: Journal of Religion & Science
- Brill
  Aries
  Biblical Interpretation
  Church History and Religious Culture
  Die Welt des Islams
  Exchange
  Hauwa
  Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions
  Journal of Empirical Theology
  Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy
  Journal of Religion in Africa
  Novum Testamentum
  Numen
  Religion and the Arts
  Religion and Theology
  Review of Rabbinic Judaism
  Vigiliae Christianae
  Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte
- Cambridge University Press
  Harvard Theological Review
  Journal of Ecclesiastical History
  New Testament Studies
  Religious Studies
  Scottish Journal of Theology
- Deepak Heritage Books
  Journal of Vaisnavism Studies
- Religious Research Association
  Review of Religious Research
- United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
  ARTS: The Arts in Religious and Theological Studies
- University of California Press
  Nova Religio
  Religion and American Culture
A new paradigm is needed to view African religious experience and expression through a more comprehensive and holistic prism reflecting religions as they flourish in villages, towns, and cities in crisis.

A new paradigm is needed to view African religious experience and expression through a more comprehensive and holistic prism reflecting religions as they flourish in villages, towns, and cities in crisis.
Jane Marie Law, Cornell University

In the Spring of 2005, at the AAR board meeting in Philadelphia, a group of regionally elected directors and other board members from across the country discussed the current political climate in the United States — polarized, ideologically driven, and in many areas of government and the body politic, dangerously informed by religious rhetoric. We were concerned about the impact this climate could be having on scholars working in the academic study of religion. Because our diverse disciplines within religious studies (in many of its forms) require the intellectual freedom to be able to contextualize religion in history, critique religion, and raise questions about the role of religion in society and culture without having to conform to the doctrines, dogmas, and ideologies of religious institutions, we were concerned that this political climate could have a chilling effect on the very enterprise of religious studies itself.

Were scholars of religion who were doing their jobs as professors of religious studies being politically targeted because of the very nature of the work they do? This was a question we were interested in exploring. We felt strongly that it is the place of the professional organization representing scholars of religion to promote tolerance and fairness in all treatments of religion. At the same time, we should protect the intellectual rights of those scholars who either work outside religious communities as historians of religion or scholars of critical studies, and those scholars working within religious communities who, while they do not work within religious institutions, question institutional authority within those communities or institutions.

A number of us proposed that we use our annual Regions Forum to address this problem. Carol Anderson from Kalamazoo College, Mary McGee from Columbia University, Linda Moody of a West Coast College, and I agreed to spend the 2005 summer reflecting on this problem and gathering cases. Within the Regions Committee, there was a discussion about the possibility that such a panel could be perceived as the AAR taking sides in the current culture wars. In the end, we decided to go ahead with the panel, with the strong consensus that it was certainly part of the mission of the American Academy of Religion to protect free intellectual inquiry into the role of religion in history and society.

My own participation in this project was spurred by a series of conversations I had with nonpromoted or adjunct professors of religious studies working largely in state institutions, predominantly in what we know as “red states” (though I personally loathe the term, because I feel those of us in the United States are all in purple states of varying hues). They felt that students and in some cases other professors at their institutions were putting pressure on their administrators, who in many cases reported to state legislators, who in turn are sensitive to (and in many cases supportive of) the role of the religion culture wars in their own political survival. These scholars cited cases where they felt they were being censured for their views of religion, which students, campus clergy, and others often perceived as challenging religious truth claims.

Several of my colleagues at these institutions, who could not, for fear of their jobs, come forward to present their cases, encouraged me to make contact with a wider range of scholars from across the country. I posted my contact information on several on-line discussion forums, and contacted colleagues at various institutions, inviting scholars to contact me.

In the end, I heard from 26 people, and determined that 24 of the cases constituted what we were concerned about. Of these 24 cases, only one, Professor Miguel de la Torre, formerly of Hope College and currently at Iliff School of Theology in Denver, agreed to come forward whose work speaks at our meeting. De la Torre resigned from his post at Hope College after being reprimanded by college administrators (at the request of Donald Dobson) for his focus on the Family, a major donor to the college) because de la Torre had written editorials in the local newspaper critical of Dobson’s view of homosexuality and Dobson’s linking of Spongebob Squarepants to “a gay agenda.”

De la Torre was comfortable speaking at our meeting, partly because his case had garnered national attention, and partly because he also had the security of a job at a new institution that supported his inquiry as a theologian. He is also an eloquent person, not afraid of controversy. The scholar who could not come forward are also eloquent and brave, but did not feel they had the security (or in some cases, the stamina) to stand up to the students and administrators (and in some cases, even colleagues) who were calling their work, and thus employment, into question. In several cases, these scholars were concerned about the linking of their health care benefits to their employment and for health or family reasons could not take such a risk. This made me feel all the more strongly that those of us in institutions supportive of what we do, or with the job security to speak out, must do so. And when appropriate, we ask the AAR to stand with us.

As scholars of religion, we have an obligation to be fair and sensitive in our treatment of religious materials. But at the same time, we cannot be prohibited from treating religion as an aspect of human culture both worthy of our appreciation and also worthy of historical contextualization and critique. It was our intention to start this conversation, and to make it clear that the American Academy of Religion is a large tent, and scholars of religious studies, whose work may at times (for some scholars, often) put them at odds with religious doctrine and truth claims, can expect their professional organization to stand up for the right to free inquiry.

The reflections included herein are a sample of what we discussed in our lively panel this past November.
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Carol Anderson, Kalamazoo College

Jacoby analyzes several studies that are commonly used to defend the claim that conserva-
tives are underrepresented in the humanities and social sciences. Most of these studies use rather poor methodologies that involve comparing voter registration lists with faculty lists. One study widely cited is entitled “How Politically Diverse Are the Social Sciences and Humanities?” They only had 17 percent of their initial 5,500 surveys returned in usable form. The findings revealed that, on average, more professors in the humanities and social sciences were registered Democrats than Republicans, by 15 to 1. The biggest error in this study is the assumption that because a faculty member is a registered Democrat, they are, by definition, political liberals who denigrate conservatives in the classroom.

Jacoby points to another study which claims, according to its sponsor the American Council of "Forced Maturity (AC)" that 50 percent of students report that professors "use the classroom to present their personal political views." The flaw in this study is a criti-
cal flaw in the methodology. The crucial ques-
tion was worded as follows: “On my campus, some professors use the classroom to present their personal political views.” In response to this vague wording, “Of the 658 students polled, 10 percent answered ‘strongly agree’ and 36 percent ‘somewhat agree,’ which yields the almost 50 percent figure that appeared in head-
tlines claiming half of American students are subject to political indoctrination.”

Thus, the 50 percent figure that ACTA reports as evidence of widespread bias in the classroom is inaccurate at best. In an article in the January–February 2005 Academic, Lionel Lewis took these arguments apart in his article “The Academic Elite Goes to Washington, and to War.” He argued that, contrary to the stereo-
type that higher education is a stronghold of liberal/socialism, universities in this country have turned out some of the most strenuous and conservative supporters of current government policies. As problematic as these studies are, they are widely cited as evidence that conserva-
tives are underrepresented in the humanities and social sciences. In short, just as affirmative action arguments used proportional representa-
tion for racial and ethnic minorities in the classroom, those who wish to use the language of the 1940 Higher Education Act to defend their right to choose to be politically conservative cannot turn around and use the same argument to deny rights to lesbians and gay men. The logic behind this attack is flawed, insofar as certain political conservatives now wish to claim status as a “protected class” on the basis of their cho-
sen political views, where elsewhere, others have used that argument to deny protection to les-
bians, gay men, bisexuals, and transgendered individuals.

Horowitz’s call for “academic freedom” is an extension of the distortion of the affirmative action argument: because we don’t have enough conservative faculty, it is up to students to demand that a diversity of points of view be taught in their classes. Horowitz and his organi-
zation, Students for Academic Freedom and the Academic Bill of Rights (www.studentsforacade-
micfreedom.org), have articulated the arguments that rest at the center of various bills introduced in federal and state governments.

Horowitz’s “Academic Bill of Rights” is at the core of a bill called the Federal Higher Education Act. It has also been at the core of legislation introduced in 14 states in the past two years, most recently in Pennsylvania. The hearings in Pennsylvania held on March 22–23, 2006, did not find cause for “remedial legisla-
tion” to ensure academic freedom. The Ohio case was similar and Horowitz was not successful, due to the efforts of the American Association of University Professors and faculty members throughout Ohio. None of the state bills have met with success.

In Ohio, Horowitz met with Senator Larry Mumper, a Republican from Marion. The result was a bill introduced in the State House on January 26, 2005. It met with strong oppo-
sition, with Ohio universities quickly passing motions in opposition on the floors of faculty meetings. Mumper used language that was right out of the arguments discussed above from Horowitz, calling faculty “card-carrying communists” in a January 2005 article in the Columbus Dispatch. Horowitz also testified at the Pennsylvania hearings in March 2006.

The text of Ohio SB 24 is useful for an exami-
nation of Horowitz’s “Academic Bill of Rights.” Two key points alone should give us pause (ital-
ics added):

1. Ohio SB 24, Sec. 3345.80. (A) The institution shall provide its students with a learning envi-
ronment in which the students have access to a broad range of serious scholarly opinion per-
taining to the subjects they study. In the humanities, the social sciences, and the arts, the fostering of a plurality of serious scholarly methodologies and perspectives shall be a sig-
ificant institutional purpose. In addition, cur-
ricula and readings in the humanities and social studies shall respect all human knowledge in these areas and provide students with dis-
senting sources and viewpoints.

The last sentence violates the standard of cur-
rent professional practices, and would render any course useless insofar as the students would be overburdened with material and nothing useful could be said about anything. The choice of what to teach has always been the preroga-
tive of the professor, and this legislation would remove that responsibility from those of us who have earned our credentials. Finally, this clause makes it clear that the humanities, social sci-
cences, and the arts are particularly targeted by such legislation.

A second clause is intellectually fascinating, insofar as it takes the language of the 1940 American Association of University Professors Statement on Academic Freedom — but gives it a twist.

Ohio SB 24, Sec. 3345.80. (C) Faculty and instructors shall not infringe the academic free-
dom and quality of education of their students by persistently introducing controversial material into the classroom or coursework that has no relation to their subject of study and that serves no legitimate pedagogical purpose.

The relevant clause from the 1940 AAPU Statement on Academic Freedom (www.aappu.org/statements/Redbook1940draft.html) reads: “Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no rela-
tion to their subject.” A sentence from the 1970 Interpretive Comments glosses the origi-
nal: “That expression of this standard must dis-
courage what is ‘controversial.’ Controversy is at the heart of the free academic inquiry which the entire statement is designed to foster. The passage serves to underscore the need for teach-
ers to avoid persistently intruding material which has no relation to their subject.” The ends to which Horowitz uses this statement do not reflect the spirit of the 1940 AAPU Statement: like much of the “Academic Bill of Rights,” Horowitz wants to place authority for determining what is controversial in the hands of students, not professors.

In conclusion, let me simply urge us to take the issue seriously, as many of us have done in the states that have defeated this legislation. The response to this assault has been swift, thanks to our colleagues, the AUA and many others — and the battle is not yet over.

Nonetheless, faculty members have been suc-
cessfully charged with harassment on the basis of these arguments, and untenured faculty are in great need of protection. The battle for academic freedom in the name of that principle, has great potential to undermine precisely what we do: teach our students how to think critically, empathically, and thoughtfully about theology and religion.
Scholars Face Increasing Challenges from Believers

Mary McGee, Columbia University

This example points to an on-going conflict within higher education surrounding the expectations of donors who seek to influence or build curriculum through their endowments, but who have a limited understanding of the role academic freedom plays in shaping course content, faculty research, and curriculum.

Mary Burgan, the general secretary of the AAUP, wrote in the Chronicle of Higher Education in 2002 about that controversy (9/6/02), “The North Carolina legislators betrayed a misunderstanding of the very nature of education itself. They misled study for advocacy, the presentation of ideas for exercises in conversation, and the university as a franchise for particular doctrines or ideologies.”

“The university,” she explains “is a place for going to the source of ideas that threaten us — for finding causes, explaining problems, and seeking solutions based on knowledge.” To continue this line of thought, she should consider bringing into the university setting the issues of adherents who critique, sometimes maliciously, the way scholars study

Washington Post in 2004. What was called into question here was not just the responsible scholarship of these scholars, but the meaning and value of academic freedom for our times.

While criticism of our scholarship is necessary and even healthy, the consequence of these three scholars and their books has been especially vicious and biased. The denunciation of their respective studies has been, to a large extent, uninformed by methods of critical reading and analysis cultivated not only in scholarly circles but also found at the heart of liberal arts education and central to what most of us do, namely, teaching in an academic setting.

The recent criticisms of these three scholars of Indian religious traditions have largely been voiced by self-identified adherents of Hinduism, sparked mostly by voices within the Hindu-American community. While we want to be attentive to the identity politics of members of the Hindu community within North America and abroad, we also are aware that the criticism and concerns as articulated by the loudest and most adamant are not shared by all Hindus, nor are they representative of all Hindus. But even if they are a minority voice, we cannot and should not dismiss them, as exasperating as they may be.

What do we do with this kind of challenge? Ignore it? Respond to it? Question it? Analyze it? Defend ourselves? Defend our profession? Invite the voices of our opponents into the classroom?

Being the responsible scholars we are, we have not ignored the controversy but have attended to the criticisms, trying to better understand the background, the contexts, the politics, the issues, the questions, the fears that have led to this kind of political targeting of scholars, particularly concerning the study and representation of Hindu religious traditions.

We listen. And if we choose to, enter into dialogue on these concerns with adherents of the traditions, with our students, and with those who criticize us for misrepresenting their histories, their truths. As scholars, our job — and the responsibility that comes with it — would or should lead us to analyze the nature and structure of this discord, as well as the broad influence of the disasters against these scholars and their work. But it is not so easy to respond rationally when your life is threatened or your collaborator in research has been black-faced by an angry mob in India. While some of us may respond with outrage, others among us gather protectively around our colleagues, some acting as mediators. In defending their work, we are protecting one of the core values of our profession, academic freedom.

Over the past 20 years the teaching and study of Hindu traditions in the United States has changed in significant ways due to increased contact and interaction with Hindus in the United States and in the classroom. Fifty years ago someone could publish a scholarly monograph on India or Hinduism without venturing out of the United States or meeting a Hindu face to face. Not so today. Twenty-five years ago, that face-to-face interaction between non-Hindu American scholars and Hindus took place mainly in India; today that exchange can take place in an Internet Cafe in Austin, Texas, a taxi in New York City, a classroom at Santa Monica Community College, a temple in Flint, Michigan, or at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion. And the richness of that interaction has deepened with increasing numbers of scholars of South Asian heritage taking up the study of religion, some of whom have also been targets of censure by members of religious communities with which they self-identify. This increased personal interaction has necessarily contributed to how we think, write, and teach about Hindu traditions, including how we (re)conceptualize and even name these traditions.

What is our responsibility as scholars and teachers to our critics, to adherents, to our students? Do we integrate the challenge into our scholarship and teaching, and if so, how? How do we protect the freedom of ideas and their exploration? Should we teach differently about our subject depending on the cultural, ethnic, political, or religious sensitivities of our audience? Should we re-conceptualize the critical study of religion?

The challenging of liberal thinkers by conservatives is not new, neither is the challenge to scholarly authority by religious authorities, adherents, or politicians. If this kind of criticism is not new, what has changed? Is there something new that has affected the “rules of engagement,” as it were?

Some of the criticism that scholars and our field of religious studies have faced stems from a certain naivety or misunderstanding about the role of the university and scholar-educators. Those Hindus who decried Jeffrey Kripal’s reading of Ramakrishna or Paul Courtright’s interpretations of Ganesha misread these studies as efforts to demean or embarrass Hindus, using the authority of the academy to advocate one particular ideology or interpretation over all others. In this later sense, they are not unlike the North Carolina legislators who sought to end funding of religious studies over the University of North Carolina’s choice of Michael Sell’s book on the Koran as common summer reading for all new incoming students. As their religious texts, history, icons, practices, beliefs and values. Not only do we need to examine these concerns, but we need to teach and model for our students how one responds to this kind of criticism, even when it offends.

Most of us do not want to deny adherents their freedom to express their opinions, THEIR sentiments, their hurt, and their rage about perceived misrepresentations of their beliefs or traditions — nor do we want to silence or censor these voices even as we try to make clear our roles as scholars and teachers. What is our responsibility as scholars, as teachers, as a university?

In the midst of recent controversies at Columbia University (allegations that some Middle Eastern studies instructors slanted their teaching with anti-Israeli politics) and at Harvard University (Lawrence Summers’ comments on differences between men and women), the New York Times excerpted pertinent passages from a commentary on academic freedom posted by the British sociologist Frank Furedi on the Web site “Spiked” (www.spiked-online.com, 2/17/05). Furedi writes, “One of the roles of the university is to challenge conventional truths — and that means academics questioning the sacred and mentioning the ‘unmentionable.’” Many a scholar of religion — never intending disrespect — has been charged with offending their audience — never intending disrespect — has been charged with offending
the sensibilities and beliefs of the faithful by our very questioning of the sacred; going beyond merely mentioning the unintentionable, we subject it to scrutiny and analysis and publish our conclusions. As respectfully as we might be of the religious we study, we must anticipate that some believers will be offended by our work.

Those believers may be in our classroom, within our community, or among our readers. I agree with Furedi that a “proper university teaches its members how not to take hateful views personally and how not to be offended by uncomfortable ideas. It also teaches them how to deal with being offended.” As student orientation each year, we instruct, “if you have not been offended during your course of study here at Columbia, we have not done our job.” But the job does not stop there; we have a responsibility to teach students how to respond when their beliefs are offended, their assumptions challenged, their opinions dismissed. And we as teachers should model that in our own response to our critics. In this sense, my colleagues Laine, Kripal, and Courtright have been the best of teachers, responding to offensive, unreasonable, and painful criticism with dignity, integrity, and open-mindedness, demonstrating the significance of this experience as another opportunity to learn.

While the climate has changed for scholars teaching not only about Hindu traditions but also about religion, culture, and identity more broadly, what has not changed, I would argue, is our mission and core values as scholars and teachers within higher education. Institutions of higher education, whether or not they have a religious affiliation, share a commitment to academic freedom, and the rights and responsibilities attending that freedom.

Most of our institutions drew on, indeed many quote directly from, the 1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure crafted by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors. In the section on “Academic Freedom” in this statement we are told that as university teachers we “should remember that the public may judge [our] profession and [our] institution by [our] utterances.” We have seen disingenuousness with one scholar’s work used as an opportunity to criticize the state of Hindu studies in the United States more generally. A headline on Briefs.org captures this judgment: “U.S. Hindusim Studies: A Question of Shoddy Scholarship,” with this subhead summarizing the article’s content, “criticism of crude academic writing on Hinduism is coming from the community members it is not present in the academic world (www.briefs.org/archives/0160901_1.htm).” This judgment extends to the institutions at which the accused scholars teach, and critics claim that they have been unable to avoid this kind of situation, the AAUP statement goes on to advise that scholars “should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, [and] should show respect for the opinions of others.”

But what constitutes accuracy in a field that examines believed realities alongside historical realities; that analyzes psychological phenomena next to observable phenomena and behaviors? The University of Texas at Dallas faculty handbook states that one of the primary duties of faculty members is to use their professional expertise in the service of society; some of the critics of American scholarship on Hinduism have argued that our scholarship is doing just the opposite. Writing in the Chronicle of Higher Education in July 2007, Religions contributing to a growing endowment for Sikh studies chairs in North America claim that the occupants of three of the Sikh chairs are using their positions “to portray a twisted version of the Sikh traditions . . . Instead of promoting the study of Sikh traditions, they have digressed into challenging the authenticity of the Sikh holy Scriptures . . . [and] are now artfully working at creating chaos in the realm of Sikh philosophy and religion.” The authors, in asking whether “Sikh Chairs [are] serving the Sikh Interests for which they were established,” conclude that “the right move, in our opinion, is to bring all these so-called Sikh Chairs under strict scrutiny. We must insist that they serve the Sikh interest using honest academic freedom.” This example points to an on-going conflict within higher education surrounding the expectations of donors who seek to influence or build curriculum through their endowment, but who have a limited understanding of the role academic freedom plays in shaping course content, faculty research, and the hiring of scholars.

In light of accusations from students that certain instructors within Columbia’s Middle Eastern studies program were using their classrooms to advocate pro-Palestinian viewpoints, the faculty at my home institution has reexamined not only our grievance procedures but our statements on academic freedom, as well as the corequisite responsibilities of teaching and research that go hand in hand with that freedom. The statement on academic freedom in our faculty handbook resembles those at most other institutions. Yet two proposed additions to our statement on academic freedom respond to concerns directly relevant to the climate on many U.S. campuses today. One proposed addition or principle addresses perceptions by students that any material taught by an instructor that offends a student is necessarily biased or a form of harassment. The other proposed addition addresses the increasing presence of certain orthodoxes that one often found their way onto campus or into academic venues via media, politics, or funding sources. When Columbia was faced with charges, from within and outside, of bias or misrepresentation in the classroom, the university went back to its core values to remind our students, the public, and us of our mission and responsibilities. In doing so we have proposed ways to articulate those values more clearly in the current political climate.

In teaching religion in troubled times, be that in the face of identity politics, uninformed critics, smear campaigns, sheer ignorance, hate mail, wrongful accusations, humiliation, terrorism, threats to faculty tenure, and yes, even death threats, it is the principles of academic freedom and integrity that we hold on to and it is the core values of our institutions of learning and our community of scholars that compel us to stay and teach, orienting ourselves and our students.

Institutions of higher education, whether or not they have a religious affiliation, share a commitment to academic freedom, and the rights and responsibilities attending that freedom.

Yet, if that academic freedom is not protected, we will lose not only great teachers — like Laine, Courtright, and Kripal — but great ideas and the discoveries that emerge from intellectual debate and discourse that can transform our world for the better.

Jonathan Cole, former provost at Columbia University, in an essay in the Chronicle of Higher Education last year (9/9/05), lamented “few academic leaders . . . are rising to the defense of academic freedom.” He advises that we must “recognize that the current attacks, analyze carefully the bases for them, scrutinize evidence on their incidence and consequences and organize a defense of the university against these intent on undermining its values and quality.”

The board of the American Academy of Religion has taken a step in this direction by proposing a statement on academic freedom and teaching religion. This statement can go a long way to demonstrate support for our members, as well as to bolster the efforts by institutions to support and defend faculty members faced with campaigns to discredit their scholarship, especially when these institutions are under tremendous pressure from alumni, the media, and donors. While academic freedom is widely misunderstood, so is the study of religion misunderstood, not just by the general public but also by many of our colleagues within the academy. In a world with heightened awareness about the political power of religious belief, it behooves us to vigorously embrace academic freedom and to help our students, as well as religious adherents and communities, understand that the study of religion, pursued under the rubric of academic freedom, expands more than it restricts understanding and respect for religions and our fellow human beings.
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At the Crossroads: Academic Freedom and the Culture Wars

Linda A. Moody

W E ARE ALL aware of the culture wars in higher education. What is new is how increasing-ly personal these wars have become, with the targeting of individual departments and individual scholars. The September–October 2006 Academe, the bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, was dedicated to precisely this issue. Cover stories include articles titled “Defending Academic Freedom: Stories about Fighting Back,” “Conservative Critiques, Liberally Funded,” and even “Is Scholar-Activism Possible?” Perhaps more tellingly, this issue of Academe announces the launch of a new feature called “Fighting Back,” in which individuals are invited to submit their own stories in support of academic freedom.

In this article, I outline three ways in which scholars of religion are being target-ed, suggest that information about these methods of targeting is critical for the profession, and hopefully, in so doing, will provide at least one perspective for our discussion about these current tensions in the academy.

Denominational Pressures on Scholars: Southern Seminary as Case Study

One method of targeting scholars is through institutional pressures stemming from within a denominational or other church body related to the institution of higher learning. These pressures are brought to bear on scholars primarily teaching at theological and religious colleges. A classic case occurred at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, when targeting of so-called “liberal” scholars took place in the late 1970s, throughout the 1980s, and into the 1990s until the faculty of the institution was largely replaced with a more conservative faculty. From one point of view, this change in faculty has been represented as a realignment of the seminary’s ties with contemporary Southern Baptist belief and culture. From another point of view, this has been seen as part of a fundamentalist takeover of the Southern Baptist Convention announced publicly in 1978.

Substantively, arguments over differing hermeneutical approaches to sacred text echoed the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the 1920s. The criticism of these so-called liberals was often framed in terms of their failure to employ a literalist/infantarian reading of scripture. Scholars using accepted modern hermeneutical theoretical approaches to scripture were further put at risk as creeds were proposed requiring faculty to hold to a literal/infantarian reading of creation, the virgin birth of Jesus, resurrection of the body, and other key “fundamentals.” At the same time the controversy was raging over hermeneutics, key social issues were also being debated, and one might well speculate that it was the social issues at stake in the heart of the debates. Abortion, medical ethics, homosexuality, and women’s roles in church and society were key topics. Highly organized strategies employed to “out” professors espousing these so-called “liberal” views were quite effective. Well known is the case of tenured associate professor Molly Marshall, who had to resign or face dismissal. Other women faculty and administrators were equally targeted, including C. Anne Davis, dean of the Carver School of Social Work, education professor E. Jane Hix, social work professor Diana Garland, along with Paul Simmons and other male faculty. The stories of these women, along with many of their male colleagues, left the seminary, some of their own choosing, and others not. Some banded together to found new institutions; others moved on to new careers. Marshall is now president of Central Baptist Theological Seminary.

Nonprofit Organizations

A second method of targeting scholars is through nonprofit organizations that have grown up in various communities, some with overt religious ties and others not publicly related to any specific religious organization. Some of these organizations use direct mail, others use the Internet as their primary means of communication, and some combine their approaches. Two organizations serve as excellent examples.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA)

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), launched by former National Endowment for the Humanities chairperson Lynne V. Cheney, communicates through a Web site, among other means. According to its mission statement, the organization “works with college and university trustees to ensure responsible management of higher education resources, end grade inflation, establish a solid core curriculum, and restore intellectual diversity on campus.” The University of North Carolina was the subject of ACTA criticism in its report Governance in the Public Interest: A Case Study of the University of North Carolina System. Critical in the recommendations made by ACTA was the suggestion that the size of the board needed to be reduced, local trustees needed to be given more authority, and that the governor rather than the general assembly should select members of the UNC Board of Governors. ACTA President Anne Neal was quoted in local news coverage cited on the ACTA Web site as saying, “The governor is essentially not at the table . . . . The power to appoint is the power to lead. (This would) allow one person to set the agenda and take responsibility.”

More than any other substantive critique of UNC, it is this governance recommendation that is most telling. The commonalities between the actions taken to gain control of Southern Baptist institutions of higher education in the ‘70s, ‘80s, and ‘90s and this governance recommendation for UNC, another institution of higher education in the South, bear striking resemblance.

Cardinal Newman Society (CNS)

A second example of a nonprofit dedicated to changing the course of higher education, in this case Catholic higher education, can be seen in the organization called the Cardinal Newman Society, known as CNS. Founded by Patrick J. Reilly, CNS posted a solicitation letter on its Web site (www.cardinalnewmansociety.org/Publications/Action_Alerts/Heresy/Lp.pdf) with the headline “Make no mistake about it — There are heretics and dissenters at Catholic colleges teaching anti-Catholic theology to our children and grandchildren and leading them away from the one true faith.” This six-page letter lists what it calls “a few of the most hard-core dissenters” at the nation’s universities, alphabetically from Boston College to Xavier. Some of our well-known colleagues are named, including James Keenan, Elizabeth Johnson, Diane Hayes, Terrence Tilley, Richard McBrien, and Paul Knitter.

In addition to campaigning with college presidents for a strict interpretation of the application of the mandatum, the letter boasts, “CNS has received unprecedented recognition in the media each spring for several years for leading the campaign to expose the scandal of pro-abortion commencement speakers and honorary degree recipients at Catholic colleges.” Among the media outlets listed were Fox TV’s The O’Reilly Factor, nationally distributed radio, FOX News, the Boston Globe, and the Washington Times.

College Guides

A third method of targeting scholars is through college guides directed toward helping prospective students and their parents along the “right” school for them. In the process of describing these colleges and universities, individual departments who are not so “right” are named. One such college guide written by the staff of the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI), is titled Choosing the Right College: The Whole Truth about America’s Top 100 Schools. The first and second editions of this guide were published by Eerdmans Publishing Company of Grand Rapids, Michigan, an independent publisher whose primary, though not sole focus, has been to disseminate works on theology, biblical studies, church history, and other titles related to the study of religion and culture. Earlier editions were published through ISI, which describes itself on its Web site (www.isi.org/about/our_mission/mision.html) as “a non-profit, non-partisan, tax-exempt educational organization under Internal Revenue Section 501(c)(3).”

The introduction to Choosing the Right College, written by William J. Bennett, does not mince words in describing what he considers to be the ails of higher education:

There is growing evidence that many American universities no longer view their duty to educate. The widespread abandonment of academic standards and moral discipline, the politicization of all aspects of campus life, and the deconstruction of academic disciplines have devastated the traditional mission of the liberal arts curriculum. In too many class-rooms, radical ideological theories are taught to students that Western thought is suspect, that Enlightenment ideals are inherently oppressive, and that the basic principles of the American founding are not "relevant" to our time. The result is not education, but confusion — over the importance of knowledge, the universality of the human experience, the transcendent of ideals and principles.

The ISI guide asserts, “Among features unique to the ISI Guide are lists of the best professors on each campus. Similarly, we tell you the best and the worst departments, . . . Choosing the Right College is a blueprint to what’s best — and what’s worst — in American higher education.” It lists what it considers the “best” professors, presumably inferring that it has made an assessment of all professors in a given department. An easy search of a college Web site would presumably reveal the names of those not considered “the best” by the guide.

Academic departments targeted in the ISI guide often include women’s studies, ethnics studies, and religious studies:

The most ideologically driven department at Amherst is women and gender studies (WGS), which, according to one professor, is the only department where “you lose IQ points.” Religious studies departments around the country are notoriously politicized and
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Universities Bend to Pressure of Donors

Scholar of Mormon History, Expelled from Church, Hits a Wall in Job Search

Daniel Golden, Wall Street Journal

R

ANOCHU CUCAMONGA, California — In 1993, the Mormon church excommunicated D. Michael Quinn, one of the world’s foremost authorities on the faith, whose writings had frequently contradicted the church’s traditional history.

Now, he has become a pariah in some higher-education circles as well. Although Mormon studies is a fast-growing academic discipline, Mr. Quinn — a former professor at Mormon-run Brigham Young University and the author of six books on Mormon history — can’t find a job. In 2004, he was the leading candidate for openings at two state universities. Both rejected him.

At least three other secular schools plan new professorships in Mormon studies, but he appears to be a long shot for these posts, too — not because he lacks qualifications, but because almost all the funding for the jobs is coming from Mormon donors.

“At this point, I’m unreliable,” says the 62-year-old scholar, who lives with his mother to save money in this town east of Los Angeles.

Mr. Quinn’s struggles reflect the rising influence of religious groups over the teaching of their faiths at secular colleges, despite concerns about academic freedom. U.S. universities have usually hired religious studies professors regardless of whether they practiced or admired the faiths they researched. But some universities are bending to the views of private donors and state legislators by hiring the faithful.

“If you want to succeed in Mormon studies you have to make compromises and you have to tread gently,” says Colleen McDannell, a professor of Islamic studies at the University of Utah. “Michael would not do that.”

W. Rolf Kerr, commissioner of education for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the faith’s formal name, said Mr. Quinn “is highly regarded in his discipline” and the church would not “campaign against him” for any academic post. However, Mr. Kerr’s wife, said, “there may be a perception” of Mr. Quinn in the Mormon community “that would cause him, in the eyes of some, to be less acceptable.”

Some professors at both state universities that rejected Mr. Quinn say fear of offending Mormons played a role. Deans at the universities deny that.

In the 1970s, some universities pioneered the idea of privately funded professorships in specific religions by establishing Judaic-studies chairs. Now many universities have chairs and rivaling faiths ranging from Islam to Sikhism. They are usually underwritten by donors of the same religion, who generally expect that the scholar filling the chair will be sympathetic to the faith.

Former Princeton University president William G. Bowen says there are similar issues in many other areas of academic study such as unionism, which is why university presidents and trustees prefer professorships to cover broader areas. “What the university shouldn’t do is allow the donor control over the hire or the curriculum,” says Mr. Bowen, who is now president of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

“Every single department of religion is negotiating with religious communities in new ways,” says Laurie Patton, chairwoman of the religion department at Emory University, a private, secular school in Atlanta.

In 1999, the Aquinas Center, a Roman Catholic organization affiliated with Emory, agreed to endow a new chair in Catholic studies. The Aquinas board of directors, and former White House staff director Walt lawn Neches, chaired the chair.

“Mr. Quinn’s struggles reflect the rising influence of religious groups over the teaching of their faiths at secular colleges, despite concerns about academic freedom. U.S. universities have usually hired religious studies professors regardless of whether they practiced or admired the faiths they researched.”

LARGER PRESENCE

Mormon studies are growing in popularity as the church expands. It now boasts 5.6 million members in the U.S. and 12.5 million worldwide. Mormons are becoming a larger presence at secular universities now that church-run BYU has capped its enrollment because of limited resources.

Like many minority religious groups, Mormons have faced a history of prejudice that shapes their identity today. A mob assassinated the faith’s founder, Joseph Smith, in 1844 and the federal government prohibited Mormons in 1864. The church condemns homosexual behavior. Mr. Quinn says he still believes in the “fundamentals” of Mormonism but doesn’t practice the faith.

Supporting himself on research grants and fellowships, Mr. Quinn cemented his scholarly reputation by publishing four books on Mormon history between 1994 and 1998, including a two-volume study of the church’s interactions with politics and American society. In 1999, he began pursuing a full-time faculty job, to no avail. Few secular schools at the time sought a specialist in Mormonism.

In 2003, when he was a visiting professor at Yale University, BYU threatened to withdraw funding for a conference it was co-sponsoring with Yale on Mormonism if Mr. Quinn was allowed to speak there, according to the conference’s organizer, Kenneth West. Noel Reynolds, a longtime BYU administrator and now a U.S. ambassador, determined that Mr. Quinn’s presence would spark an uproar, and BYU declined to participate.

SPECIAL SUBJECTS

Mr. Quinn nonetheless published articles in Mormon studies and continuing to write about the church. “The church’s attitude toward same-sex friendships and romances in the nineteenth-century Mormonism. The church condemns homosexual behavior. Mr. Quinn says he still believes in the ‘fundamentals’ of Mormonism but doesn’t practice the faith.”

Sensitive Subjects

Mr. Quinn nonetheless published articles on sensitive subjects such as one in 1985 that suggested church leaders tolerated polygamy after officially prohibiting it. He says BYU restricted his research and denied him a much-needed job offer. When he resigned from the university, BYU says it didn’t force him to go.

Five years later, the president of his Salt Lake City campus — a Mormon administrative unit composed of five to ten congregations — handed Mr. Quinn a letter citing examples of his alleged apostasy. They included his public criticism of the church for limiting dissent and an article maintaining that Joseph Smith treated Mormon women more equally than the church does today. He was soon excommunicated along with four other scholars.

Mr. Quinn’s personal life contributed to his estrangement from the church. He spent his fifth wedding anniversary in his empty apartment. He says BYU restricted his research and didn’t force him to go. BYU says it ultimately resolved the dispute by agreeing to introduce the keynote speaker rather than have a scholarly paper.

The following year, Mr. Quinn was the only finalist for a tenured professorship in Utah and Mormon history at the University of Utah. Mr. Quinn’s request, Thomas Alexander, a BYU historian, wrote a recommendation for him. But while Professor Alexander praised him as a scholar and teacher in his recommen- dation, he added, “I do not recommend Mr. Quinn, warning that the Mormon-dominated state legislature might cut the university’s funding.

When Mr. Quinn came to the school’s Salt Lake City campus for a job interview, his father divorced her. Mr. Quinn became curious about Mormon history in high school, when a friend gave him a memoir about a Mormon leader who practiced polygamy after the church banned the practice in 1890. “I was jolted by the reality that there could be a public stance and private behavior that contradicted each other,” he says.

After graduating from BYU, Mr. Quinn earned his doctorate at Yale, and then joined the BYU faculty in 1976. He buried himself in the church archives, typ- ing thousands of pages of notes that would provide raw material for his articles and books.

Such research ran into head winds in the 1980s as the church restricted access to documents. Boyd Packer, one of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles that helps rule the church, declared in a 1981 speech that writing and teaching about church history ‘may be a faith destroyer.”
joined him in criticizing church censorship. He describes Mr. Quinn as the second-best historian of Mormonism, behind retired Columbus University professor Richard Bushman.

Nevertheless, when Utah's faculty voted on whether to offer Mr. Quinn the job, Professor Clayton opposed him. Now retired, he says: "There was a concern by several of the department that Mike was not the right person to head up any kind of Mormon history or Mormon studies program given the fact he's very publicly communicative. There would be quite a number of people in the Mormon community who would look unfavorably on that. That gave me pause."

Robert Newman, dean of humanities at Utah's history department, supported hiring Mr. Quinn because his research presentation wasn't strong enough and most of his books weren't published by university presses. Utah eventually down-graded the opening to an assistant professor-ship and filled it with an active Mormon church member.

Soon another school beckoned. Arizona State University's department of religious studies had just received university administration that Mr. Quinn be offered a one-year appointment for 2004-05. It was starting a doctoral-degree program with a focus on religion in the Americas. Aware that Mr. Quinn was controversial, the faculty took pains to stress to administrators that his scholarship was first-rate, says "Tracy Fessenden, a professor of American religions.

A public university with 61,500 students, Arizona State has been cultivating Mormon students and donors — for example, by letting students resume receiving scholarships after leaving from Mormon missionary work, says ASU president Michael Crow. Many of Arizona's Mormons, about 6 percent of the state's population, are concentrated in the Phoenix area near the university.

Ira Fulton, a Mormon home builder in Prescott, Arizona, has given the school at least $155 million since 2003. Mr. Fulton says Mr. Quinn has taught 3,700 students and "I'd like to have 6,000, 7,000, 8,000 or 10,000. They'll make ASU a better university."

ASU's administration vetoed Mr. Quinn's hiring. Simon Peacock, then associate dean for personnel, says Mr. Quinn lacked expertise to teach Christianity and Judaism courses left uncovered by a professor's departure. Mr. Peacock says Mr. Quinn's communication was discussed but had no effect on the decision.

However, the chairman of the religious studies department, Joel Gereboff, wrote in an e-mail to faculty that Dean Peacock and another dean asked him to review the "risks and benefits" of the hire and "thought that it is probably not wise to undertake such risks" for a one-year appointment. Professor Gereboff says the deans were referring to the risk of alienating the Mormon community.

Several professors criticized the decision. "What the administration is doing is as wrong as racial or sexual discrimination," James Fould, a religious studies professor, wrote in an e-mail to colleagues. The administrators stood their ground.

Professor Gereboff says he could "live with" the deans' decision. "We exercise sensitivity. We don't exercise censorship," he says. Mr. Fulton, the donor, says he doesn't get involved in faculty hiring. He calls Mr. Quinn a "nothing person."

At least three other schools are contemplating chairs in Mormon studies — Claremont Graduate University, the University of Wyoming, and Utah State. At Claremont, the school of religion has nearly completed raising $5 million for a Mormon studies chair, to be led by retiring Howard W. Hunter, a late president of the church. Nearly all the money has come from Mormon businesspeople in the state, the school says. Professor Torjesen, the religion school dean, traveled to church headquarters in Salt Lake City to build rapport with church leaders. The school's Mormon studies advisory council includes two BYU professors among its dozen members.

Claremont says it prefers that the holder of the chair have access to church archives in Salt Lake City, a privilege sometimes denied dissidents. Mr. Quinn's access, without the need for his excommunication, was restored in 1997 and the church has made more documents available in recent years.

Asked whether Mr. Quinn might be hired, Claremont's associate dean of religion Patrick Horn, replies: "Probably not." At Wyoming, where Mormons comprise about 10 percent of students, a committee headed by a professor of Spanish, Kevin Larsen, is exploring a Mormon studies professorship. Mr. Larsen, himself a Mormon bishop, says he wouldn't rule out critics of the faith for such a post. But he says he has explained to church leaders that "it's not going to be a chair of anti-Mormon studies."

Wyoming is also sponsoring a lecture series on Mormonism. Professor Larsen says the local Mormon stake provided several hundred dollars for the lectures through a Mormon student group.

Utah State has attracted more than 50 donors, most of them Mormons, for a professorship in Mormon history. History chairman Norman Jones says it's premature to discuss job candidates. He says his university will look for "a person who can get along with everybody. We know what the minefields are, and we're trying to avoid them."

Mr. Quinn says his only significant income since leaving Yale was a $40,000 bequest from a Los Angeles doctor, contingent on his writing a biography of his late benefactor. So far, he has received $13,500, with the balance to come when the book is finished.

In the meantime, Mr. Quinn sleeps on a futon in his mother's condominium and says he can't afford health insurance, car repairs, or Internet access. His library of books on Mormon and American social history lies boxed up in her garage and closets.

Write to Daniel Golden at daniel.golden@wsj.com.

Reprinted by permission of the Wall Street Journal, Copyright (c) 2006 Dow Jones & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved Worldwide. License number 1479460884029. Dow Jones & Company's permission to reproduce this article does not constitute or imply that Dow Jones sponsors or endorses any product, service, company, organization, security or specific investment.

MOODY, from p.29

Holy Cross's entry is, sadly, no excep-

tion. The very supplanting of depart-
ments of theology by "religious stud-
ies" departments is indicative of the focus of studies. If a Catholic school doesn't have a department of theology, who can?

And finally, in reference to none other than the Religion Department at Harvard University, the guide warns: "Among the most politicized depart-
ments is religion," which a faculty member says "has its problems with politicization and lack of wisdom."

Conclusion

Despite AAUP and AAR policies on academic freedom, there can be no doubt that, as scholars of religious stud-
ies in all of its many and varied histori-

cal, philosophical, and theological appro-
aches, we live and teach and com-

mit to praxis in an era in which some of our colleagues are being unfortunate-
ly targeted for what they say and how they say it. Substantive content and forms of scholarship are both under attack. We have seen enough history to understand that the strategy of target-

ing individuals and entire departments has been successful in controlling insti-
tutions of higher learning. Academic free-

dom of the professorate is but one aspect of the political targeting of scholars; the freedom of institutions of higher learning to be self-determin-

ing in the accomplishment of their mis-

sions is another.

By any discussion of individual academic freedom, religious social eth-

ici

Beverly Wilding Harrison would have no doubt point us to the larger picture, including the alliances of fundamen-

tals across denominational and reli-


gious lines, including international alliances. She would advise us that in order to fully understand the targeting of scholars, departments, and institu-

tions of higher learning, it is critical to follow the money and the power behind this contemporary social move-

ment. By doing so we can begin to comprehend the interconnections between those key individuals and the social and political capital represented in the organizations they form — SBC-religious, COSNS, ESLI, and other nonprofit and for-profit organizations (secular, religious and political, or oth-

erwise), including publishing outlets and media of all sorts, the unions and off-

course that are dedicated to changing the course of higher education. 
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I was at the end of my first semester of teaching Middle Eastern history at a large research university in the South. Like any new faculty member, my anxieties revolved primarily around not breaking the PowerPoint projector, not being mistaken for a Nazi, much less an expletive-laden one, but those were the words that started back at me as I tripped by my office to check my e-mail after a particularly long day of teaching. The message immediately following that one had a subject line that read “anti-Semitic leftist professors.”

I wasn’t on the list.

Two weeks earlier, I had spoken on a panel about the Israeli occupation of Palestine. It was on the closing night of a week-long Palestinian film festival called “Life under Occupation,” sponsored jointly by a few human-rights groups on the campus and a Palestinian advocacy group for which I am the faculty adviser. The group is a university-approved student organization that aims to educate and raise awareness about the plight of Palestinians living under Israeli rule. Similar organizations are found on many American campuses.

The students had been trying without success for close to a year to find a faculty adviser. Some of the people who had been asked to serve as the group’s adviser were just too busy. Others apparently were nervous about having their names associated with a Palestinian group, even one dedicated to a just and peaceful resolution to the conflict for both Jews and Palestinians.

At the time, I confess I thought those people were being slightly paranoid. I’m now a little more understanding.

I wish I could say I became a target because of my passionate feats of oratorical brilliance and advocacy on the panel. In fact, overtired and underprepared, I said a few words about the humanitarian costs of the occupation on Palestinians and the necessity of a just political solution. Then I went home to catch up on some sleep.

A student in the audience who is the head of a political group on the campus was apparently more impressed with my performance than I was. She wrote an article that appeared on a right-wing Web site, identifying me as someone who condoned terrorism and objecting to my use of the term “occupation” to describe Israel’s military presence in the West Bank.

That’s when the e-mails began arriving. I knew now I wasn’t naive not to have expected something like this. Bring a scholar of anything to do with Islam, the Middle East, or the Arab world has become, in the post-9/11 era, a full-contact sport.

Charging Middle East scholars with “anti-Semitism,” “liberal bias,” and “support for terrorism” has become (in fashion parlance) the new black of right-wing political discourse. Entire Web sites are devoted to exposing academics with expertise on the Middle East as dangerous radicals who pose a threat to the young minds of America. I have seen many of my professors, colleagues, and friends over the past few years placed on such blacklists.

The message to those of us who believe there must be room for ethical and reasoned debate on American involvement in Iraq, on the Israeli occupation, and on the war on terror has never been clearer: “We are watching you. And we’re going to take you down.” I never thought I would be immune to it. I just thought I would have a little more time before it happened to me.

I’m luckier than many other young scholars who have found themselves in this situation. My departmental colleagues have been supportive, both personally and professionally.

They reassure me that they will back me up when I get called into the dean’s office some day because angry alumni and donors write letters asking why my institution allows student groups that “promote terrorism” to operate on the campus.

My supporters also let me know when faculty members in other departments — people whom I’ve never met, seen, or spoken to — write letters urging the department to help purge the campus of dangerous viewpoints and the faculty members who espouse them.

But my colleagues have also pointed out that, as an untenured faculty member, I am vulnerable. Just don’t do anything “stupid” in your classes, they caution, and you’ll probably be all right.

It’s good advice, of course. But I have to ask myself, “What does it mean?”

I do stupid things in my class all the time. I suspect every new teacher does. I forget to put the weekly readings on the Web in time for the students to read them. There’s always one student every semester whose name I continually get wrong. I snap at a student who is repeatedly disruptive in class instead of calling him into my office for a calm, rational talking-to about his behavior.

Still, I get my colleagues’ messages. Somewhere between teaching students to try to think critically about the world and their place in it, and giving students a reading, delivering a lecture, or asking them to discuss issues that might land me in the middle of a public witch hunt, there’s a line that can’t be crossed.

The problem is that no one can tell me where that line is.

Plenty of resources out there tell untenured professors how to teach, how to get grants, and how to balance the pedagogical side of their career with the imperative to publish. But there’s nothing that explains how to negotiate the road to tenure in a climate that is increasingly hostile to the meat and potatoes of a liberal-arts education — classroom exposure to, and engagement with, alternative ideas.

So I stand in front of my class. I think about the articles I won’t write and the book I won’t publish if I inadvertently take a wrong step and have to spend all of my time defending my integrity as a scholar and a teacher to the university administration. I think of my partner having to deal, day after day, with a grumpy, depressed, and anxious spouse.

I think of the career that I dreamed about during endless years of graduate school and dissertation writing that might become less in that moment that I choose between educating my students and saving my own hide. And it is in that moment that those who want to stifle debate on campus win. They don’t need to get me fired to shut me up. I’m already doing it to myself.

And I know I’m not alone. I talk all the time with untenured friends and colleagues about how our attempts to be cautious in the classroom often translate into self-censorship. We also share our feelings of anger and frustration that the political agendas of a few well-placed, well-organized people can dictate how we do a job that we’ve spent years training for.

Yet in those feelings of anger and frustration I find reason to hope. Because it means that, despite the uncertainty and anxiety that come with teaching controversial subjects in an inhospitable intellectual climate, we haven’t given up on the idea that it’s still our job to teach our students that the world is a messy and complicated place; a place that is not easily reducible to simple political platitudes or clichés about “us” and “them.” When that struggle becomes less important than getting tenure or leading a comfortable life, I know it will be time to start looking for another line of work.
I N WHAT FOLLOWS we hope to sketch an outline to building constructive and collegial relationships between Hindu and non-Hindu in the academy and outside. For us, the cumulative effect of everyday acts of understanding and cooperation between Hindu and non-Hindu has the deeper power to shape our world.

**Interlogue: a new way of expressing a classical concept**

We begin with some questions that break down the categories that currently dominate the language of the debate about the representation of Hinduism. We start with these questions because we are interested in the concrete reality of people being part of and vantaged or disadvantaged not merely as essentialized beings called “Hindu” or “non-Hindu.” While people may refer to themselves in broad ways in these categories, we believe that there is no simple dichotomy to be resolved between a Hindu and a non-Hindu identity. Instead of a dichotomized identity, we have found in our everyday experience that a complex engagement of people with multiple identities is truly available to people. And we wish to talk about such possible engagement as an “interlogue.” This term would be one way to translate samvada, usually translated as colloquy, or dialogue, in order to bring all of its complexity in the Sanskrit tradition. Samvada implies the idea of a transformation through existentially engaged conversation. In the samvadas of early and classical India, there may be two or more speakers, but the participants are many—witnesses, audiences, critics, and detractors. This “interlogue” can and does exist between people in various complex historical circumstances.

**Queries**

First, we challenge the opposition of Hindu/non-Hindu. We feel that there are endless practical examples that make such distinction meaningless and unnecessarily oppositional—spouses, children, gurus, disciples, teachers, students move happily and unremarkably across the apparent Hindu/non-Hindu divide. Moreover, at a more “official” religious level, both in India and in the diaspora, many caste and sect groupings have reworked the sense of identity in the United States or Mundan identity in India. As early as the fifth century B.C.E. the thinker and lexigrapher Yaska argued that the possibility of a profoundly irreducible difference of principle of multiplicity. As early as the fifth century B.C.E. the thinker and lexigrapher Yaska argued that the possibility of a profoundly irreducible difference of principle of multiplicity.

For us, the cumulative effect of everyday acts of understanding and cooperation between Hindu and non-Hindu has the deeper power to shape our world.

Fourth, we want to challenge the claim of any single ideology, including liberalism, to be the sole and incontestable ideology of interpretation. Rather, we are committed to exploring the tensions between liberalism and pluralism. The dominant academic/critical ideology used by Hindus and non-Hindus alike is liberalism, which emphases certain values especially the normative concept of “free” inquiry and speech, untrammeled by constraints on the individual. Exclusive liberalism is committed to the rejection of values and symbols that do not conform to its own; indeed, it asks for their defeat. To put it another way, the study of Hinduism is forced to parake in the “perennial paradox of liberalism.” It must insist on tolerance and inclusion of others’ religious voices even as it argues with, and even condemns, those religious voices that are not tolerant.

We must ask ourselves: does a pluralist framework of some sort (rather than a purely tolerant one) deliver more intellectual satisfaction to both scholars and adherents and dissolve the paradox of liberalism? Pluralism seeks to guarantee even conflicting values. Its framework must therefore rest on metaphors that are neither derived from the liberalism of scholars nor the beliefs of adherents, but can nevertheless accommodate both.

We ask for modes of engagement that deliver tolerance as a practice, and whose appeal comes from pluralism. In genuine pluralism, one acknowledges and allows oneself to be constrained by the sensitivities of the other; thus a Hindu might be constrained by the scholar’s deep commitment to rigorous inquiry, while the scholar is constrained by the Hindu’s equally deep commitment to cultural and religious sensibilities. People who are able to count themselves members simultaneously of both communities will of course be able to move freely across these boundaries, but they would be mindful of the need to manifest plurality in their work and life. Scholars, then, should not see pluralism as a weak-kneed surrender of academic responsibility, for it is an insistence on mutuality that does not sacrifice intellectual integrity. For Hindus, similarly, pluralism should not be seen as an abbreviation of faith or religious loyalty.

**Principles**

In purely intellectual terms, such a demanding plural and liberal discourse, or “interlogue,” between Hindu and non-Hindu must acknowledge both a common reality and the possibility of a profoundly irreducible difference of opinion. In our own conversations, we have found principles in the Indian tradition that might allow for both possibilities in such an interlogue.

First, Indic traditions have taught us the principle of holding multiple interpretations simultaneously. This is the principle of multiplicity. As early as the fifth century B.C.E. the thinker and lexicographer Yaska argued that there have been multiple schools of Vedic interpretation, and Indian thinkers have done so ever since. Second, Indic tradition has taught that one must always read works in their entire context. This is the principle of attention to the context of a conversation. The early thinker Jaymini teaches that, if we do not understand
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RSN: When did you retire, and how did you spend your time after retirement?

Kaufman: Although I am now 80 years old, there really is no specific date when I "retired." When I was about 65, I began to think about retirement, but I had no intention of formally retiring then (1990). I wanted to continue teaching for a number of years, though I was also anxious to finish the book — *In Face of Mystery* — on which I had been working for 15 years. So I explored the possibility of reducing my teaching responsibilities to half time. To my surprise I discovered that going on half time would not substantially reduce the rate in which my pension was growing. (By that time most of the pension's growth was no longer due to the interest on my contributions.)

By that time my teaching responsibilities were gradually dropping away, my life would continue in largely the same pattern it had for many years.

RSN: What has been the most significant change in your life since you retired?

Kaufman: This is a rather complicated matter. At the time of my formal retirement Dorothy and I had talked about making some major changes in our living. Our entire life together had been ordered largely by my professional responsibilities and interests. To give an example: I received five sabbatical years for research and writing during my teaching career. These were spent abroad in Europe, Asia, and South Africa, with Dorothy taking care of the children while I worked on my various professional projects. We both gained a lot — and so did our children — by living for extended periods in a variety of cultures; and Dorothy liked to travel. But traveling and living in diverse cultures with small children — and, indeed, giving birth to a child abroad — is never easy. Dorothy's life was driven in many respects by my professional needs and interests.

So, as we approached my retirement in 1995, we looked forward to a period when Dorothy's priorities were going to become primary for us. By this time all our children were out of the home, married, and with children of their own; and we planned to do a good bit of traveling in interesting places that we had never seen, both in the United States and abroad. We were going to have great free times together. Before that plan got underway, however, Dorothy died. She had undergone surgery in early 1996 because of a suspected cancer in her stomach; no cancer was found, however. In June 1997, after successful recovery from her first surgery, we had a wonderful three-day celebration of our 50th wedding anniversary at the seashore with our children and grandchildren present (including our two families who were living in Asia). But then further tests led Dorothy's doctors to believe that her cancer was active in her stomach, so a second surgery was performed in January 1998. This time she never left the hospital; she died — of stroke — three weeks after the surgery. Dorothy's death had not been anticipated by any of us: up to a few days before her death we were told that all was well, and the would soon be returning home. So we were completely unprepared for her death. All of this, of course, turned my life upside down.

RSN: How did you get yourself back together again? Did your life change completely?

Kaufman: Well, I was now alone, not knowing what to do with myself. The years ahead were those when Dorothy was to take the lead in what we would do, but she died suddenly. So I had no plans. Because of her serious illness, I had canceled the course I was to teach in the spring term of 1998, and I occupied myself those months with reading children's books. I found myself unable to read anything serious; for several months I simply could not keep my mind on such matters. But as the spring moved along, I decided that it was important that I teach, in the coming fall, the seminar I had canceled; I feared if I didn't do that, I might never be able to bring myself to teach again.

How, then, should Jesus be understood theoretically? That was a big assignment, and I have worked on it much of the time during the past year or so. In the process I have learned how to think about Christology in what I believe is an entirely new way — and of course all of this has been very exciting, though also somewhat exhausting.

In the meantime I was looking around for things to do. I enrolled in a course offered by Hospice, and became for the next three years or so a part-time Hospice volunteer. I looked into the possibility of joining an organization that puts books on tapes for the blind, but decided sitting in a cubicle reading our load into a microphone for several hours a day was not really what I wanted to do. And so on. One day I remembered that over the years I had wanted to read through Plato's dialogues again, and then I began to think of ways that I might do that. It was Plato, despairing fog in which I lived for some years, that finally made me think of ways to put words to tape and have them published in a small book that I had on my hands eagerly because I was quite excited about the possibilities. When I got around to working on it, I discovered the article was not easy to write at all. First, I needed to do quite a bit of research on these three modes of creativity before I could even begin putting it together. Then, it turned out that the article was getting longer and longer, and it had to be put into the wider context of my theology if it was to be intelligible to readers. So it was really a small book that I had on my hands instead of just an article. And it was going to be a lot of work. But I went after it eagerly because I was quite excited about the overall picture that was developing in my mind: I was working on my theology of creativity as a much more surprising and convincing way than I had previously been able to do. Moreover, this approach brought my theological ideas into intimate contact with my experiences of everyday human creativity. All of this at just the historical moment in our culture when the old "warfare of science and religion" over evolution was beginning to warm up again. So I became consumed with the fundamental question of how to think about God as a creator-person. At that moment it occurred to me (for no particular reason) that there are three distinctly different kinds of creativity spoken about in educated circles today: the Big Bang, (an inexplicable event); the 14-billion-years-long series of cosmic and biological evolutionary developments through which today's universe gradually emerged; and finally human creativity here on planet Earth, with all its enormous cultural productivity. What would happen if we spelled out my idea of God-as-creativity in terms of these three modes? That might make an interesting article, I thought. So as we rode I began making notes bearing on this idea. I was quite excited about the possibilities.

When I got around to working on it, I discovered the article was not easy to write at all. First, I needed to do quite a bit of research on these three modes of creativity before I could even begin putting it together. Then, it turned out that the article was getting longer and longer, and it had to be put into the wider context of my theology if it was to be intelligible to readers. So it was really a small book that I had on my hands instead of just an article. And it was going to be a lot of work. But I went after it eagerly because I was quite excited about the overall picture that was developing in my mind: I was working on my theology of creativity as a much more surprising and convincing way than I had previously been able to do. Moreover, this approach brought my theological ideas into intimate contact with my experiences of everyday human creativity. All of this at just the historical moment in our culture when the old "warfare of science and religion" over evolution was beginning to warm up again. So I became consumed with the

RSN: What was that?

Kaufman: No, this surprise turned out to be a happy one. In August 2002 my last living aunt — a favorite person of mine who I usually tried to see when I was in the Bay area of California — was to celebrate her 90th birthday, and her family invited all of the nieces and nephews to come for a grand party. I was pleased to accept, and pleased also that my son Edmund who lived in Oregon planned to drive down for the occasion; we would then drive back together for a visit with his family. During that day-and-a-half trip back to Oregon I suddenly had an idea for a new paper that would extend my thinking about God beyond what I had worked out in *In Face of Mystery*. (There I had suggested that we should think of God as simply the mystery of creativity — the continuous coming into being of new realities — instead of as a kind of creator-person.) At that moment it occurred to me (for no particular reason) that there are three distinctly different kinds of creativity spoken about in educated circles today: the Big Bang (an inexplicable event); the 14-billion-years-long series of cosmic and biological evolutionary developments through which today's universe gradually emerged; and finally human creativity here on planet Earth, with all its enormous cultural productivity. What would happen if we spelled out my idea of God-as-creativity in terms of these three modes? That might make an interesting article, I thought. So as we rode I began making notes bearing on this idea. I was quite excited about the possibilities. When I got around to working on it, I discovered the article was not easy to write at all. First, I needed to do quite a bit of research on these three modes of creativity before I could even begin putting it together. Then, it turned out that the article was getting longer and longer, and it had to be put into the wider context of my theology if it was to be intelligible to readers. So it was really a small book that I had on my hands instead of just an article. And it was going to be a lot of work. But I went after it eagerly because I was quite excited about the overall picture that was developing in my mind: I was working on my theology of creativity as a much more surprising and convincing way than I had previously been able to do. Moreover, this approach brought my theological ideas into intimate contact with my experiences of everyday human creativity. All of this at just the historical moment in our culture when the old "warfare of science and religion" over evolution was beginning to warm up again. So I became consumed with the
From the Student Desk

Turn On, Log In, Log Out
Joseph Gelfer, Victoria University of Wellington

Joseph Gelfer is a doctoral student researching the intersection of masculinities and spirituality at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. He can be contacted at joseph@gelferk.net.

FOREVER THOSE HILLS are the plains of Middle Earth, beyond that the forests of Narnia. Am I lost in a fantasy land? Is this an article about the disproportionate number of religious studies researchers who enjoy role-playing games (surely there should be one?)? No, the reality is more mundane, for I am a distance student living in an obscure part of New Zealand’s South Island, back lot to cinematic parallel dimensions, and this article is about my experience being physically separated from a scholastic community.

Certainly it is the experience of many PhD students to engage with the institution in which they study: to have regular supervision meetings, to drink cups of coffee, and to speculate about being mistaken for an undergraduate. It is an image I find quite appealing, but for me it was not to be.

When I decided I wanted to do a PhD, my wife, my children, and I were happily settled into a new home — our first proper home — and the prospect of leaving it after only a short period of time did not appeal. There was also a compelling economic case not to move, living as we do in a modest, rural part of the South Island, while attending a suitable university would require moving to a costly North Island city. A significant percentage of New Zealand’s population does not live near a university, so distance study is quite popular, and while distance PhDs are not exactly marketed, I found Victoria University of Wellington most accommodating of my research proposal.

This isn’t an article about how hard it is to be a distance student, quite the contrary; but there are some drawbacks, which are easy enough to imagine: how well your research compares to other students when most of the work you see is published material. It can be isolating to contemplate queer theology while living, as I do, primarily among farmers and miners. It is particularly difficult to get teaching experience when there is no one around to teach. But other than that it is a positive story, with some lessons that can be learned by all academics.

Clearly, the main reason that distance research works as well as it does is the Internet. When I read of an interesting paper, I log on to the university library and have it as a pdf almost immediately. When I have a question for my supervisor, I send her an e-mail and she often replies within a couple of hours: a convenience which I doubt could be improved upon even if I lived next door to the department. But there is something more fundamental than just efficient resources and communication going on with the Internet: it is not simply a medium or a tool, but a work-space, a space most of us can access wherever we are.

I am ashamed to say that I used to make an explicit connection between the prestige of a person’s institutional affiliation and the quality of his or her work, with distance learning the last resort of the marginalized. This opinion was always wrong, there being a multiplicity of reasons for studying and/or working at ‘lesser’ institutions, but the transgeographic nature of Internet work-space — cyberspace — makes this opinion even less true. I want to suggest again that the value of this space is not just about communication, but actually working in it, like an office with an unlimited number of colleagues. When we work collaboratively online, we inhabit a particular type of space with the real potential to be free from the old constraints of institutions, hierarchies, privilege, and so forth: an actual meritocracy. There is a burgeoning “paricipatory” or “peer-to-peer” culture (see www.p2pfoundation.net) exploring the nature of effective collaboration which has intellectual, political, creative and, yes, spiritual ramifications that should interest most AAR members.

From a theological point of view it is an obvious manifestation of Teilhard de Chardin’s noosphere; from a more political and philosophical direction, Deleuze’s rhizome. Certainly my own experience of working collaboratively in a solely online environment in establishing the forthcoming, open access Journal of Men, Masculinities and Spirituality (www.jmmusweb.org) has been positive.

I would recommend distance study to anyone whose decision to proceed with his or her research might be compromised by not wanting or being able to change location, especially those with the experience and/or confidence to work with less supervision and physical peer support. Is it preferable to be part of an ‘actual’ scholastic community? Maybe. But those who are not may find themselves developing coping-cutting-edge skills via their online communities that stand them in good stead in the continuing changes in information distribution and general living.
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KAUFMAN (from p.35)
writing of this new book; Fortress Press published it in the summer of 2004 under the title In Face of Mystery. To my surprise, I had had one more book in me. But this book, I was convinced, was surely the last one I would be writing.

RSN: Has writing this last book been the thing that has given you the greatest satisfaction in your retirement up until now?

Kaufman: Well, I think I might have said that a couple of years ago. But then something else happened. A friend of mine read my creativity book and then asked me: “But what about Jesus? You’ve got a very little about Jesus in this book.” I acknowledged that, but replied that I had already said a good bit about Jesus in my past writing, especially in In Face of Mystery; and anyhow there were a number of pertinent footnotes and other references to Jesus in the new book, so nothing more was really necessary. However, as I thought a little more about it, I decided that my questioner was right: the creativity book really raises a lot of important issues about how Jesus should be understood, and I probably should attend to them. So I began to explore the matter further and soon decided I had better write another small book, this one on Jesus and Creativity.

This has been one of the most difficult books I have undertaken. It soon came clear to me that the whole traditional understanding of Jesus — framed in ideas like “Word of God,” “Son of God,” “Second Person” of the Trinity, and so on — had to be reconsidered since all this language is anthropomorphic and anthropocentric, and a major point of the creativity book was to set out a conception of God that was not human-centered in this way. How, then, should Jesus be understood theoretically? That was a big assignment, and I have worked on it much of the time during the last few years. In the process I have learned how to think about Christology in what I believe is an entirely new way — and of course all of this has been very exciting, though also somewhat exhausting. But the task is now about completed, and the book is to be published come summer, as a companion book to In the beginning . . . Creativity. But this, I am quite sure, is my last book! Writing these two books during the past three years has, without any doubt, been the most satisfying thing I have done during my retirement. But both of these were complete surprises to me, and I am quite confident there won’t be another surprise of this sort.

RSN: Knowing what you know now, what might you have done differently during your academic career?

Kaufman: As I look back over my academic career, and think about it in connection with what I see younger colleagues must do today to gain tenure, I feel quite fortunate. I came out of graduate school shortly after World War II, a time when there was a steadily increasing demand in colleges and universities for teachers in the study of religion. As a result, that whole generation of new teachers in religion studies found themselves on a kind of conveyor-belt of rapid promotions. In my own case I began in 1953 as an instructor in religion at Pomona College, and then two years later, after I had finished my dissertation and received my Ph.D, I was promoted to assistant professor. During my fifth year at Pomona, I accepted an invitation to become an associate professor of theology, with tenure, at Vanderbilt Divinity School; and after five years there I was invited to Harvard Divinity School as a full professor in theology.

Harvard proved to be a good place for me. I had virtually complete freedom to work on the kind of theology and philosophy of religion thinking and teaching that I wanted to pursue; I had excellent colleagues in related fields, and very good students on whom I could try out my ideas and from whom I got good criticism; and on my sabatical leaves I was blessed with fellowships and appointments that enabled my family and me to live in — and learn from — a number of different cultures around the globe. There were, of course, tensions and problems of many sorts also — Harvard University is not the easiest place to live and work for some 40 years — but it did provide a context for me to think through a number of theological issues in a way that I doubt would have happened anywhere else.

And for that I am very grateful. As I normally used to say from time to time when I became discouraged: “Gordon, you are one of the fortunate persons who has been able to do what you really wanted for most of your life!” That doesn’t mean there weren’t plenty of problems and struggles, disappointments and failures, that I wish I had never happened; but basically, I think, she was right. Dorothy was with me for a little over 50 years; had that not been the case, things would surely not have worked out this well. But — with the exception of her death — I don’t think there is much of my professional life I would want to change.

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

Kaufman: That question is very easily answered. Instead of dying when she did, Dorothy would have been with me through these last eight years and more to come; and our time together would have been a happy conclusion to the lives of both of us. I would hope, of course, that in that world my last two books would also somehow have been written by this time; but it is more likely, I suspect, that they would never even have been thought of. So perhaps we can say that some good came out of what was undoubtedly the greatest loss and pain in my life. I will have to meditate on that irony for a while: it never occurred to me before just this moment.

Thank you for the invitation to make these remarks. [ wenigl]
Research Briefing

Healing Zen: Japanese Buddhist Women's Rituals of Transformation
Paula Arai, Carleton College

As she had done for over three decades, after finishing the breakfast dishes, Nogawa-san went to the talisman-adorned and ornately carved Buddhist altar (see picture) that had been in her husband’s family for generations to perform her morning ritual of offerings and chanting. She placed a cup of tea in a “Huckleberry Finn” mug on the altar for her ancestors (“Personal Buddhas”) then lit the candle and a stick of incense. The small room began to fill with the aroma of incense when she glanced at the small clock placed between the incense burner and the bell. Noting the time, she called out to her husband to take out the garbage, because they were due to collect it any minute. She then struck the bell and put her hands together in prayer, bowing as she quietly chanted “Namu Amida Butsu” three times. Next she chanted the Heart Sutra from memory. Today she would also chant the whole Kannon Sutra, because it was the 19th anniversary of her having decided to adopt her sister-in-law’s fourth child as her son. He does not know he is adopted. It is all in the family.

It is a private anniversary, a chance for her once again to give thanks to her “Personal Buddhas” for assisting her in becoming a mother.

Through assessing their healing paradigm, it becomes clear that experiencing interrelatedness is the key that unlocks all other elements. In short, this “Way of Healing” is the art of choosing to be grateful in the face of fear-driven and torment-ridden possibilities. This way of living and interpreting the world, self, events, and others requires practice and discipline. An embodied experience of interrelatedness is required for this type of healing to occur. Rituals are a conduit for such experience. Rituals work through the senses to cultivate wisdom in the bones. Unlike narrative discourses on wisdom, which focus on understanding the empty nature of ultimate reality — and hence are sometimes too abstract and cold to comfort someone who is experiencing excruciating pain — rituals can help one feel the connectedness bodily.

Ritualizing activity is not unique to Japanese culture or religiosity, but the details of how and what activities are ritualized are what give Japanese religiosity its distinctive aesthetic. Zen practice in Japan is a rich arena in which the propensity for ritualizing activities — from holding teacups to removing shoes — occurs where lines of delineating sacred from profane are at best blurred. Ritualized activity in a Sôtô Zen context is not a process of becoming. It is an event of (ideally) actualizing Buddha-nature — mindful that all is interrelated, impermanent, and ultimately empty (of substance and individuation) — in the present moment.

Healing is also not a process of curing or getting “better.” It is a mode of experiencing events in the present moment from the perspective of Buddha-nature where compassion neutralizes suffering, though pain may be chronic and death may ensue. This research also reveals how women empower themselves and others as they experience their interrelatedness with all things. This experience is actualized in ritualized activity. Ritualized activity takes such prominence in Japanese Zen due to its embodied (not dichotomizing body and mind) and holistic orientation where even the boundaries of life and death are not divisive, especially in the moments of

See ARAI p.46
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In Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, and Colombia, native people have been drinking a tea made with ayahuasca, the “vine of the spirits” or “vine of the soul,” for many centuries. Called hoasca (from the Portuguese), yaqui, caapi, and vegetal (among other names), the tea is made from a blend of two plants, a liana vine (Banisteriopsis caapi) or the hoasca plant proper, and a bush (Psychotria viridis). Brazilian shamans say the vine is the male that gives power and the leaves of the bush are female and give life, and when the two are mixed, it is possible to commune with the spirits. While the vine acts to prolong the effects, the primary psychotropic of the bush is DMT (dimethyltryptamine), a chemical substance that is banned by the Controlled Substance Act (CSA) as a Schedule I drug. In 1971, the Convention of Psychotropic Substances required that the U.S. government ban the use and importation of DMT, thus criminalizing the use of the substance for anyone not registered by the government for possession of the drug (for example, use in research or medicine). There is a strong disjunction here between what the government calls a “drug” and what religious participants in ceremonies call a “sacrament.”

One contemporary religious organization in Brazil, O Centro Espirita Beneficentes Uniao Do Vegetal (UDV), founded in 1961 by Frei Chico Xavier, uses hoasca tea as a central part of a four-hour, bimonthly ceremony that blends Christianity and indigenous Brazilian spiritual beliefs. The goal of the ceremony includes seeking communion with God through ritual drinking of hoasca as sacramental tea.

This group, about 8,000 strong in Brazil, opened a small church in Santo Fe, New Mexico, in the 1990s which currently consists of about 130 members. The American leader of this church, Jeffrey Bronfman, a Seagram’s heir, had his Santo Fe home and the church property searched by U.S. customs agents in 1999, when 30 gallons of hoasca tea (containing DMT) were seized and all church members threatened with federal prosecution. Eighteen months later the church, with Bronfman’s support, sued the U.S. government in the District Court of New Mexico, seeking a preliminary injunction against prosecution and the right to continue using hoasca in church ceremonies until the case came to trial. This claim was based on violations of various amendment rights as well as protection under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA, 1993). In August 2002, O Centro Espirita was granted its motion under the RFRA claim, with the court rejecting any violation of amendment rights. According to this ruling, UDV members would be able to import, distribute, and use the tea under strict DEA supervision. While the government tried to stay the injunction, in 2004 the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals (for the second time) ruled on ban en force (all district judges hearing the case) in favor of the preliminary injunction, again stopping the DEA from arresting members or seizing hoasca tea imported from Brazil. In February 2005, the Attorney General’s office filed yet another appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court (Gonzales v O Centro Espirita), asking for the court to overturn the preliminary injunction. However, in February 2006, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled unanimously in favor (8-0) of UDV, granting the preliminary injunction.

There is a strong disjunction here between what the government calls a ‘drug’ and what religious participants in ceremonies call a ‘sacrament.’

The decisions in this case are significant, not just for UDV, but also for Native American rights in the use of peyote in the Native American Church (NAC), as well as for other religious groups concerned about issues of religious freedom. Significantly, the UDV was supported in its case by the Baptist Joint Commission on the Global Freedom, the Christian Science Church, and the National Association of Evangelicals, among others. The government’s case, in all points, was denied by the court. In the first religious freedom case of the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Roberts, the judges expressed the view that RFRA requires all federal courts to take a case-by-case approach to every claim of infringement on religious freedom by the government and not to make judgments based on generally applicable laws. This recalls the Oregon v Smith case (1990), in which the Supreme Court ruled against the NAC use of peyote as a sacrament, claiming that the First Amendment “free exercise of religion” clause did not protect NAC members from CSA federal laws banning peyote. The CSA lists mescaline and “all parts of the plant” as a controlled substance.

In turn, the Smith decision provoked Congress to pass RFRA (1993) as a means to affirm and protect American religious freedom (though it does not mention peyote). In 1994, after the failure of the Native American Free Exercise Act of Religion Act (NAFERA) to pass in Congress, a supplemental bill, Public Law 103-334, gave federal protection to Native Americans who use peyote in bona fide NAC religious ceremonies; however, Peyote Way leaders who collect and distribute peyote are still required to register annually with the government. The government’s case against UDV was entirely unsuccessful. The government conceded that criminalizing hoasca tea did in fact “substantially burden UDV members’ exercise of religion,” a burden explicitly prohibited by RFRA. The government was thus required to prove that it has a “compelling interest” and that seizing the tea would have the “least restrictive” impact on UDV religious practice. First, the Supreme Court justices recognized the sincere legitimacy of UDV religion for its members; second, it recognized that hoasca (called a “sacramental tea” in the legal brief) is a controlled, Schedule I hallucinogen banned by CSA.

Justice Roberts summarized the government’s case against hoasca, based on three “compelling interests”: protecting the health and safety of UDV members, preventing the diversion of the tea to non-members, and complying with the 1971 United Nations Convention of Psychotropic Substances. The government’s failure to meet the “compelling interest test” was based on its lack of evidence to clearly demonstrate that hoasca could harm the practitioners, particularly in the face of studies cited by the defense showing no harm came from drinking hoasca. Citing the general dangers of DMT and its inclusion in CSA, the court was not sufficient evidence. In a case of “equipoise” between two sets of evidence, the government is required by RFRA to give greater evidence.

Secondly, the government failed to demonstrate how, in the hoasca case specifically, the compelling interest applied to UDV. Rather than cite a categorical law against DMT, the government is required by the court’s interpretation of RFRA to give an explicit account of its compelling interests, and not take, as Justice Roberts wrote, “the classic rejoinder of the bureaucrat that if I make an exception for you, I’ll have to make an exception for others, therefore, no exception. Overall, RFRA supports the view that granting of an exception to the general rule based on case-by-case analysis, Justice Roberts points out that such an exception to a CSA Schedule I substance must be shown in the government permitting the sacramental use of peyote by 250,000 members of NAC for the last 30 years, the very case (Smith) that motivated Congress to pass RFRA. Though the government cited the “unique relation” between native communities and the federal government, no explanation was given to show how that relationship justified the criminalization of hoasca.

The implication here is that RFRA does allow for and supports the individual right for judicial exceptions to the general rule in the practice of religion. The court noted that the exercise of religion has never interfered with the government’s attempts to enforce the law on peyote for non-NAC persons. Therefore the argument on distribution to nonchurch members of UDV is under-mined. Presently, 15 states allow the bona fide religious use of peyote, seven of which allow any bona fide religious organization to use peyote, not simply NAC. Eight restrict its use to NAC and three of those to NAC plus members with “some Native heritage.” Canada, by contrast, has made peyote exempt from its controlled substance list. Finally, as no substantial evidence was submitted by the government to show how granting an exception for UDV use of hoasca would impact international relations based on treaty rights, this argument failed as well. In summary, the Supreme Court fully supported the UDV and used the NAC as an explicit example of the exception to a government law. Justice Stephen Breyer worried that discrimination between diverse religious groups on the use of sacramental plants “or other substances” might violate First Amendment rights. The hard-line “zero-tolerance” argument of the Bush administration Attorney General’s office was rejected as rigidly categorical and a “once-and-for-all” decision was regarded as inappropriate based on the guidelines in RFRA.

Some people in Indian Country worry that the observation by Justice Roberts about the “unique relationship” between native communities and the federal government concerning NAC might produce greater scrutiny of peyote use by the DEA. However, it seems clear that the O Centro Espirita case offers strong incentives to resist government interference with religious practices. Invoking general laws no longer seems to be an adequate basis for burdening religious freedom.

A final point: the case has not yet gone to trial—all the smoke and dazzle is about the injunction. Will the government pursue its case or will it, as many suspect, try to negotiate closer supervision of UDV hoasca use and RFRA only applies to federal law, not to state law. So the struggle continues, with a little help from above.
The Department of Religious Studies is located on the Tempe campus of Arizona State University, the nation’s largest university in the West, with an enrollment of 62,000 students. Consisting of 24 full-time faculty, the department offers BA, MA, and PhD degrees. The department began as a part of an interdisciplinary program in the humanities and religious studies in the early ‘70s, under our now-emeritus professor Richard Wents, who came here from Penn State and was part of the College of Fine Arts. In 1979, those working in religious studies moved over to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and became the Department of Religious Studies. The department contributes in many ways to ASU’s vision as a “New American University” by offering a large number of undergraduate courses (approximately 60 distinct offerings each semester) that focus on lived religion and have a global focus, and by fostering scholarship that is among the best in traditional approaches in the academic study of religion and unique in its interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary focus in addressing contemporary issues in various parts of the world, with some having a truly global impact. That vision sees the university as socially engaged through its scholarship, teaching, and outreach efforts and at the cutting edge of current trends and concerns. While no students are required to take religious studies courses for any major, freshman student enrollment is 1,000, with many enrolling each semester, many to satisfy various general studies requirements. Nearly 1,000 more students take courses during the summer sessions. The department has 24 full-time faculty, several of whom hold joint appointments in other academic units (School for Global Studies, African and African American Studies) and employs more than 20 part-time faculty. It has excellent ties with many units on campus through joint appointments, cross-listed courses, and the offering of seminars and public programs. At present it continues to identify additional ways to collaborate with more units in doctoral training, especially in areas of overlapping strengths. Our faculty are actively involved in various area studies centers and programs, and have held leadership positions in them. Tod Swanston, Director of Latin American Studies and head of the Center for Study of Indigenous Languages and Policy; Julian Schober, Acting Director of the Program in Southeast Asian Studies; Anne Feldhaus, Acting Director of the Center for Asian Studies; Joel Gereboff, Interim Director of Jewish Studies. Faculty are also engaged in collaborative projects with colleagues from many units on campus.

The department has developed with a clear vision to provide numerous undergraduate offerings that expose students to a range of religions of the world (to avoid a Western emphasis), to identify niches of unique excellence for its graduate and research programs, and to work collaboratively with colleagues from across the campus and outside of ASU. The department is especially strong in the study of religions in the Americas (‘s’ is intended), with particular strengths in the study of religion in the American West, in the Southwest borderlands, in distinct parts of Latin America and Mexico, and in the study of indigenous societies and religions; in the study of Islam as a global religion, especially in the contemporary world; and in religion in Southeast Asia. It has additional depth in the area of East Asia, Judaism, and Christianity, particularly regarding Christianity and colonialism. In general we have promoted a “decolonized” notion of religions by hiring college leaders who look at what often are seen as “nonclassical” forms of traditions. Course offerings cover a number of thematic issues, e.g., “Religion, Peace and Violence,” “Religion and Conflict Resolution,” “Religion and Science,” “Religion in a Postcolonial Globalized World,” “Religion and Violence” and addition to more typical offerings on specific religious traditions.

A novel venture of the department is to promote thematic studies and scholarship. At present “Religion and Conflict” is a recently launched doctoral track within our PhD. This emphasis draws on the strengths of many faculty members, and the department works closely with the university-wide Center for the Study of Religion and Conflict. Professor Linell Cady, former chair of the department, heads that unit. The center fosters interdisciplinary scholarship on religion and conflict, and facilitates conferences and programs that also enhance the department’s efforts. It has opened up a good number of opportunities for the department’s graduate students. The center has already received a number of grants from major foundations and also provides seed grants for collaborative, interdisciplinary faculty research.

Nearly all faculty in the department are presently involved in such projects and have received funding also from the Institute for Humanities Research, the Institute for Social Science Research at ASU, and from a number of small foundations. Thus our faculty have been successful at situating their research within the broader goals of the university, while also continuing their studies that contribute to the understanding of individual traditions. The multidisciplinary background of our faculty, with colleagues holding degrees in religious studies, history, and anthropological (five), and their intellectual flexibility have contributed to this record of success. Faculty have also launched field schools and developed study abroad programs as part of the unit’s effort in the areas of undergraduate and graduate education, and to foster scholarship and community outreach. Tod Swanston, Associate Professor of Religious Studies, has run a field school in the Amazonian region of Ecuador for many years that includes the study of indigenous traditions and Quechua, and that also is involved in research and outreach projects in areas of ethnobiology and health. A new field school in the Yucatan, allowing for studies of Mayan religion and for developing relations with those communities, will begin during the summer of 2007 and will be headed by Miguel Aguilera. Finally, the unique summer study-abroad program in South Africa focused on religion, conflict, and peace that combines study, work in NGOs, and living with families in townships.

At present, approximately 160 students major in religious studies, with nearly a third being joint majors. Most majors do not declare RS as their emphasis until their junior year. Most choose RS after having taken a number of introductory courses and finding them intellectually challenging or broad in their scope, and being taught by concerned faculty. Major feeder courses include “Religion of the World” (with approximately 1,200 students per term), two different courses in “Religion in America” (each enrolling 600–700 students across sections) and “Religious Symbol and Myth” (approximately 400 students). Between 5–10 on-line courses are offered each term, many combining innovative interactive education with rigorous scholarly exercises. Other popular courses include “Religion and Popular Culture,” “Buddhism,” and “Women and Religion.” Majors must take several required themat-ic courses, including a capstone seminar, a course on “Approaches to the Study of Religion,” and most satisfy disciplinary requirements oriented to providing a comparative, global understanding of religion as well as some insight into religion in America. Majors also have an area of emphasis. We also have somewhere between 150–200 minors, though ASU does not track such students well. We have a strong record of attracting the best and brightest at ASU, with two of the school’s Rhodes scholars, for example, having been RS majors. At the same time, a significant challenge we will be addressing is how to best serve our majors who often attend high enrollment classes populated by nonmajors.

Since its inception, the department has fostered a terminal MA degree over the years served a number of populations, including those who have gone on to doctoral work in the best programs in the country and local students with personal or professional interest in the study of religion. Now in its second year, the doctoral program emphasizes areas of strength in the department and has an international group of approximately 18 students. They are funded through teaching assistantships and grants, and several through other units. We hope in time to increase the number of awards we have and their financial amounts, and to attract donor support for fellowships. We have a large number of graduate students with Fulbright grants, especially in the area of Islam.

My own leadership style is to draw upon the strengths of faculty to find ways that each can best contribute and to promote their scholarship and teaching. I value strategic planning and vision, and seek to combine our own sense of mission and strength with sensitivity to institutional and national trends and opportunities. My job is to seek out the opportunities my faculty have and to keep them from busywork. I value open and frank communication. Interviewees always remark on our very congenial character typified by the active involvement of the entire faculty in hires. Though the growth of the unit has necessitated the creation of more formalized substructures, we remain able to function as a unit of the whole. My greatest satisfaction has come from helping students advance, to move them beyond where they started, to assist them in garnering financial support for their studies, and to have them see how the understanding of religion, in all its complexity and diversity, can increase their grasp of so many issues in personal and social life. I equally value helping colleagues pursue their careers. I have gotten immense joy from assisting in our unit’s having chartered new substantive areas of religious studies on the national and international level, and having strengthened tried-and-true and also new ways of exploring and understanding religion.
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Pacific Northwest

Pacific Northwest Regional Meeting (AAR/SBL/ASOR)
May 4–6, 2007
University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, AB, Canada
Submit a 150-word abstract for each proposed paper as well as any equipment requirements for your presentation by January 19, 2007, to the electronic paper submission Web site for the PWN region. Participants in the meeting must have the appropriate academic credentials, may present only one paper, and must be registered for the meeting to participate. Paper proposals (panels and special topics session suggestions are welcome) not fitting into any of the categories below should be sent directly to Doug McGaughy, Willamette University, Salem, OR 97301, USA; dougm@willamette.edu.

Teology and Philosophy of Religion: Where we invite proposals for papers, panels, and book sessions on all aspects of the disciplines of theology and the philosophy of religion, proposals this year are especially solicited on the following themes: 1) The Image of God: Cherishing the Human without Dishonoring the Divine; 2) Canadian/U.S. Relations: Creating Liminal Cultures; and 3) Ancient and Aged: Exploring the Roots of Philosophy and Theology. Co-chairs for this section are Dennis Jewers, Faith Seminary, 5304 North Pearl ST, Tacoma, WA 98407-0186, USA; diower@faithseminary.edu; and Mari Kim, 8411 Renton Ave S, Seattle, WA 98118, USA; niko108@comcast.net.

History of Christianity and North American Religions: Papers are welcomed in any area of History of Christianity and North American Religions. Proposals are especially solicited on the following themes: 1) Canadian religious history, with a special interest in communities fleeing religious persecution; Mormonism; Buddhism; the Orthodox tradition; indigenous religious traditions; 2) Encounters between missionaries and indigenous peoples, including residential schools; and 3) Women’s religious activities in the Western United States and Canada; and 4) Suggestions for a book session and panel members. This section is co-chaired by Suzanne Crawford, Religion, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447, USA; crowfoj@plu.edu; and Priscilla Pope-Levison, Theology Department, Seattle Pacific University, 3307 Third AV West, Seattle, WA, 98119-1987, USA; ppap@georgefox.edu.

Women and Religion: The 2007 session topic is “Well- Behaved Women Rarely Make History.” 1) AAR: We welcome individual papers or panels on any aspect of the study of women and religion. Reflecting the national theme, we are particularly interested in work related to women and religion in Africa. This section especially welcomes proposals that facilitate cross-disciplinary and/or religious traditions in the study of women. 2) SBL: We welcome proposals dealing with women characters in ancient religious literature as well as the portrayal of male attitudes toward women. A re-investigation of women characters in the Hebrew Bible, New Testament, apocryphal literature and Nag Hammadi texts is especially encouraged. The Women and Religion section is co-chaired by Arya Bash.

Religious Studies Department, Gonzaga University, Spokane, WA 99258-0001, USA; sanara@gonzaga.edu; and Kendra Irons, Religious Studies, George Fox University, 414 N. Meridian ST, Newberg, OR 97132, USA; kironn@georgefox.edu.

Asian and Comparative Studies: This section is chaired by Nicholas F. Gier, Philosophy Department, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844-3016, USA; nfgier@uidaho.edu.

Religion and Society: This section is chaired by Gary Chamberlain, Department of Theology and Religious Studies, Seattle University, 901 12th Ave, Seattle, WA 98122-1090, USA; gcham bc@seattleu.edu.

Interreligious Dialogue with the Natural Sciences: Papers for this session should focus on conceptual dialogue with the natural sciences from the perspective of the traditions normally included under the academic discipline “history of religion.” Accordingly, papers written from Buddhist, Christian, Jewish, Islamic, and Chinese religious perspectives in dialogue with the natural sciences on such broad topics as cosmology, evolution, stem cell research, ecoscenism, the relation between mind and body, the problem of suffering in light of the theory of evolution, the sacred natural principle, and the problem of consciousness are especially welcome. This section is co-chaired by Paul Ingram, Department of Religion, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA 98447-0003, USA; poingram@comcast.net; and Mark Unno, Department of Religious Studies, 1294 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1294, USA; munno@darkwing.uoregon.edu.

New Testament and Hellenistic Religions: We welcome papers reflecting the research endeavors of New Testament and Hellenistic religions scholars in the Pacific Northwest, and we especially invite papers on fresh approaches to classic issues or new methodologies that contribute to meaningful biblical interpretation. For the next two years, we will invite papers for a special session involving “Literary and Theological Readings of the Fourth Gospel.” Papers last year included Levinasian and Bakhktinian readings of John, and we welcome further interdisciplinary contributions along these lines. This section is chaired by Paul N. Anderson, George Fox University, 411 N. Meridian, Newberg, OR 97132, USA; panders@georgefox.edu.

Hebrew Scriptures: Papers are welcomed in any topic related to Hebrew Scriptures. Proposals are especially solicited on the following themes: 1) A response to John Petersten’s book Reading Women’s Stories: Female Characters in the Hebrew Bible; 2) Wisdom Literature; and 3) Cosmology and History in the Prophets and Poets. This section is chaired by Heidi Saper.

Religious Studies Program in the Department of Philosophy at Central Washington University, 400 E. University WAY, L&L Building Room 337, Ellensburg, WA 98926, USA; szapokb@cwu.edu.

Archaeology of the Ancient Near East (ASOR): All topics related to the art, history, and archaeology of the Ancient Near East are welcome. This section is chaired by Gloria London, 7701 Crest DR NE, Seattle, WA, 98115-5215, USA; glondon@earthlink.net.
Southeastern

Southeast Regional Meeting (AAR/SBL/ASOR/SE)
March 16–18, 2007
Sheraton Nashville Downtown Hotel
Nashville, TN

The 2007 meeting will take place in Nashville, Tennessee at the Sheraton Nashville Downtown Hotel from March 16–18. The room rate is $119.00. Located centrally, the Sheraton Downtown is just one block from the Convention Center, three blocks from the Gaylord Entertainment Center, and within walking distance of Titan’s Coliseum, historic Second Avenue, Printer’s Alley, and the Financial District.

The meeting is sponsored with the help of Vanderbilt University Divinity School. We will also be working closely with the Freedom Forum First Amendment Center in Nashville.

The theme for our 2007 program will be “Religion and Education: Past, Present, and Future.”

The following sections and program units invite members who wish to present a paper or coordinate a session to submit proposals (1–2 pages) or complete manuscripts to the appropriate section chair by the call deadline, October 1, 2006. Each member is limited to one proposal.

Please use the proposal submission form available on the SECSOR Web site (www.secor.appstate.edu). Proposals for joint sessions should be sent to all chairs. Please note that unless otherwise indicated, papers must be of such a length as can be presented and discussed within 45 minutes.

Needs for audiovisual equipment must be noted on the submission form. Because of the very high cost of renting digital video projection equipment, presenters who wish to use such equipment must provide it themselves. The copying of handouts is also the responsibility of the presenter.

All program participants must be preregistered for the meeting.

Suggestions for new program units or special speakers should be sent to SECSOR’s executive director or to the vice president/program chair of the respective society (see list of regional officers below).

Important Note on AV Equipment: It is imperative that we have all information concerning AV equipment on proposal forms. This allows us to plan “AV rooms” where sessions with similar needs can be scheduled. AV costs are based on a per-room, per-day basis. By blocking rooms, SECSOR can save substantial costs. SECSOR cannot support the cost of digital projection equipment. If you must use this equipment, note on your proposal form that you will provide your own equipment at the conference. Thank you for your cooperation.

(AAR) Academic Study of Religion and Pedagogy (3 sessions and 2 joint sessions)

Themes: 1) Open call on religion, pedagogy and/or both, proposals related to the intersection of the teaching of religion and pedagogy.


An invited panel, joint session with History of Religions: “Best Practices of Teaching World Religions.” Chairs: Carolyn M. Aymer, The Interdenominational Theological Center, maymer@tc.edu.

(AAR) African American Religion (3 sessions)

Themes: 1) Open call. 2) Engaging Black Popular Religion. Papers are solicited that respond to the late Wayne Leeks, “African American New Preacher and Milson F. Harrison’s Righteous Riches: The Word of Faith Movement in Contemporary African-American Religion.” Papers may include matters of methodology, concerns related to religious and theological disciplines, and the implications of these texts for the current and future study of African-American religion are encouraged. 3) Race, Religion, and Theology in the Public Square. Papers are solicited that deal with the intersection of race, race-sensitive and/or racial and religious theological disciplines, and public concern. Papers are sought that relate disciplines such as Bible, theology, ethics, religious studies, and sociology, among others. Papers may include studies into the intersection of race, religion, and public theology, including the effect of black youth, physical and mental well-being and black communities, globalization, living wages, incarceration rate. Chair: Ronald B. Neal, Claflin University, renell@claflin.edu.

(AAR/SBL) African American Biblical Hermeneutics (1–3 sessions and 1 joint session)

Themes: 1) Open session: Papers on all topics related to Biblical interpretation will be considered seriously for a general session. 2) Invited panel: Intelligent Design (co-sponsored with Religion, Ethics, and Society). 3) Bible, Music, and Popular Culture. 4) Joint session with Arts, Literature, and Religion: Teaching the Bible as Literature and in the Arts (Literature, Music, and the Visual Arts). Submissions are due to proposal Chair: N. Samuel Murrell, UNCW, murrell@uncw.edu, and Co-chair Finbar S. Benjiamin, Oakwood College, University of Birmingham, finbarj@oakwood.edu.

(SBL/ASOR) Archaeology and the Ancient World (4 sessions)

Themes: 1) Joint session with Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament/New Testament: “The Dead Sea Scrolls: Recent Research: Participants will be invited. 2) Open session on “Archaeology and the Uses and Misuses of Archaeology in Film and Television. 3) Open session: "Archaeology and the Biblical World." The material culture of the biblical world, including artifacts that did not limit to reports from the field, interpretations of finds, archaeologically informed readings of texts, and historical analyses. 4) Presidential Address: Milton Montal (Rhodes College). Respondents will be invited. Send title and abstract (150 words) or complete paper (required for first-time presenters) to C. O. G. D. Wineland, Kentuck Christian University, 100 Academic PKWY, Grayson, KY 41143, USA; wineland@kcu.edu.

(AAR) Arts, Literature, and Religion (4 sessions)

Themes: 1) Recovery and reconciliation in Islam. Papers will be invited. 2) Islamic and religious traditions mix media, adapt art forms, and borrow ideas and images to (re)present religious meaning. 3) Joint session on “Early Judaism in Islamic Space.” Chairs: Carolynn M. Aymer, The Interdenominational Theological Center, maymer@tc.edu. 4) Open call. For joint sessions, please submit all proposals to section chairs. Chairs: D. Wineland, Kentuck Christian University, 100 Academic PKWY, Grayson, KY 41143, USA; wineland@kcu.edu.

(AAR) History of Religion (4 sessions)

Themes: 1) Engaging the representation of non-Christian traditions in public schools. 2) Religion and the state: Cross-cultural perspectives. 3) Asceticism. 4) Interecclesiologcal dialogue. 5) Contemporary issues, including the representation of the canonical bodies/anthropology. 6) History of Religion. Chairs: Steven Ramey, University of Alabama, stevenr@bama.ua.edu.

(SBL) New Testament (5 or 6 sessions)

Themes: 1) Open call. 2) Call for papers with focus on some aspect of slavery in the New Testament and Early Christianity. 3) Call for papers with focus on some aspect of New Testament discourse on bodies/anthropology. 4) A joint session with Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament on “Teaching the Bible in the Public Schools.” Submit proposals to chairs of both sessions (Hebrew Bible/Old Testament chair, depola@um.edu). 5) Joint session with Academic Study of Religion and Pedagogy: Invited panel discussion of Decolonizing Biblical Studies (ed. Fernando Segovia). Chair: Shelly Matthews, Furman University, shelly.matthews@furman.edu. 6) Joint session with Academic Study of Religion and Pedagogy: Invited panel discussion of Decolonizing Biblical Studies (ed. Fernando Segovia). Chair: Shelly Matthews, Furman University, shelly.matthews@furman.edu.
(AAR) Philosophy of Religion and Theology (4 sessions and 1 joint session)
An invited panel discussion of Paul Dehart’s The Trial of the Witnesses: The Rise and Decline of Pseudol Theology. Chair: Mark S. Medley, Campbellsville University, School of Theology, 1 University DR, Campbellsville, KY 42718, USA; mmedley@campbellsville.edu.

(AAR) Religion, Ethics, and Society (2 or 3 open sessions, 2 joint sessions)
Themes: Papers on all topics will be considered, but the following themes are especially invited: 1) Music. 2) Public education (not topic of intelligent design because of invited session on topic). 3) Reproductive issues. Submit a copy of proposal to Laura Stivers, Pfeiffer University, lstivers@pfeiffer.edu, and Grace Kao, Virginia Tech, gkao@vt.edu.

(AAR) Religion in America (4 sessions)
Themes: 1) Open call. 2) The First Amendment: Cases and Conflicts. 3) Hale Bopp and Heaven’s Gate Ten Years Later. 4) Teaching American Religion: Sources and Strategies. An invited panel honoring the work of Charles Lippy. Chair: Lynn S. Neal, Wake Forest University, nealall@wfu.edu.

(AAR) Women and Religion (5 sessions)
Themes: 1) Motherhood/marriage (or the lack thereof). 2) Women and popular culture, especially about women in religion, gender, and sexuality. 3) Open call. Chairs: Monica A. Coleman, Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, macoleman@post.harvard.edu; and Michelle V. Roberts, Rhodes College, masserber@emory.edu.

For more information about SECSOR, see www.secors.or.appstate.edu.

Southwest
Southwest Regional Meeting
March 3–4, 2007
Westin Hotel, DFW Airport
Irving, TX
Proposal Submission Deadline: November 1, 2006
Arts, Literature, and Religion
Theme: Other Voices. Papers that address other voices in religious expression are solicited for panels that examine the expression of non-Judeo-Christian religious belief, or the non-western expressions of religious belief. Papers should examine specifically the art of these expressions, and might approach this sociologically, psychologically, culturally, historically, comparatively, or cross-disciplinarily. Panels may be assembled so as to group papers addressing similar cultures, religions, artistic expressions, or themes. Send proposals (Word attachment via e-mail preferable) to: Melanie Harris, Texas Christian University, TCU Box 298100 Fort Worth, TX 76129, USA; mharris@tcu.edu.

Philosophy of Religion and Theology
Proposals are invited in all areas in philosophy of religion or in theology. Those involving multiple presentations or panel discussions (no more than three participants) focused upon a single topic, figure, or publication will be especially welcome (either have each panelist provide an abstract, which is preferred, or supply credentials of panelists). Proposals that feature interdisciplinary or interreligious participation, and that promise to stimulate productive discussion, will be favored. They should be no more than two pages, with the title of presentation and some sense of the argument. Include a return address, contact number, and e-mail address. Please do not submit proposals as e-mail attachments; paste them into the body of the e-mail. Send proposals to: Steve Oldham, University of Mary Hardin–Baylor, Box 8422 UMBH Station 900 College ST Belton, TX 76513, USA; 254-295-4171 soldham@umbh.edu.

History of Christianity
The History of Christianity section has an open call for papers. All submissions in the field of history of Christianity will be considered, but papers in the following areas are of special interest: Walter Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospel Movement, early Protestant missionary activity in China, African-American Christianity, early church history, panel discussion regarding the teaching of Christian history, historical methodology, and historiography. Send proposals to: Mark A. Gottlieb, 3725 Tall Pines DR New Orleans, LA 70125-1098, USA; 504-460-1354 mark.gottlieb@gmail.com.

Reflections on the Teaching of Religion
Proposals are invited for presentations during a Sunday morning session on the topic of teaching introductory religious studies courses as part of the general education curriculum. Proposals may reflect upon the use of film in survey courses, or debate the advantages/disadvantages of using Power Point and other visual media to engage students. Submissions may propose creative strategies for encouraging students to research, write, or perhaps suggest ways to integrate presentations, debates, or discussion in freshman- and sophomore-level courses. Send proposals to: Carol Crawford Holcomb, University of Mary Hardin–Baylor, Box 8422, UMBH 900 College ST Belton, TX 76513, USA;

Theta Alpha Kappa
Student members of Theta Alpha Kappa chapters in the Southwest Region are invited to submit papers for presentation at the regional meeting. Open to all topics. One session will be devoted to the best papers. Submissions must come from the chapter advisor and include the presenter’s name and contact information, the entire paper (preferred) or an abstract of the paper (acceptable), and name of the school. In the event that there are more proposals than can fit in one session, local chapter advisors may be asked to select the one best submission from their schools. Submit proposals electronically to: Nadia Lubotsky, Texas Christian University n.lubotsky@tcu.edu.

Upper Midwest
Upper Midwest Regional Meeting (AAR/SBL)
April 13–14, 2007
Luther Seminary
St. Paul, MN

The program committee invites members of the societies to submit proposals for papers to be read at the regional meeting. To submit a proposal, please complete the Web-based form at www.aar-sbl.org/proposal.htm by December 15, 2006. Proposals of undergradu ate papers are made by members of the societies on behalf of their students by completing the form at www.aar-sbl.org/undergrad.htm. The region only accepts proposals submitted through this Web site.

Joint AAR/SBL Sessions:
Continuing the Conversation
Although the national meetings of the societies are going their separate ways, the regional remains a place where scholars of religion and of the Bible meet and converse. The Upper Midwest Region invites interdisciplinary papers meant to engage members of both societies and continue the conversation. Corrine Carvalho, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN.

Undergraduate Research
The Upper Midwest regional meeting includes undergraduate papers, reflecting the preponderance of undergraduate institutions in the region. Members nominate outstanding papers. Each institution is allowed up to two submissions.

Tom Reynolds, St. Norbert College, De Pere, WI

AAR Sessions:
Multicultural Perspectives on Theology and Religion
This section seeks papers that address theology and religion from diverse racial, ethnic, and demographic perspectives in conversation with analysis of other forms of difference. Priscilla Eppinger, Graceland University, Lamoni, IA.

Ethics
Mary Gaebler, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, MN

Historical Perspectives on Religion
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Vedic instruction, we must look at nearby sentences and nearby paragraphs, as well as what might be assumed by the readers and authors. Jaimini’s principles are precursors to the kinds of modern literary interpretations that we all can engage in, in which sensitivity to environment need not curtail freedom of speech.

Third, the Indic tradition has taught us the principle of upaaya, “learning in stages.” This is the principle of incrementality. While upaaya is most prevalent in the Buddhist tradition, it is also a clear modus operandi of pedagogy in the ancient Indian educational system. Scholars might follow upaaya, or learning in stages, in the teaching of any methodology, and ask students to read many different interpretations at once, both Indian and Western. But they should do so only if the students are ready to consider and challenge each view.

Fourth, Indic tradition has taught us how to choose battles. This is the principle of commonality. Krishna was constantly thinking about the nature of his alliances in the Mahabharata, and which was the more important battle that could clarify and uphold Dharma. Certainly, in his dialogue with Yudhisthira about whether going to battle is appropriate, Krishna still strives for the larger cause of peace, even as he fears that the signs for war are mounting.

Perhaps, in this spirit, it would be best for all engaged in dialogue to describe what specific battles exist for the university. Due to budget cuts, there is no guarantee in America or Europe that the study of Hinduism will remain a part of the university curriculum. Many scholars have devoted their lives to changing that fact and making sure that Hinduism remains. This work involves persuading people that Hinduism is of historical, philosophical, social, and human value, and worthy of a place in our cultural world. Here, alliances between Hindu communities and universities should be straightforward and natural. Krishna also understood that it is far more important for us to recognize the larger battle and fight it together than spend our energies arguing.

Fifth, Indic tradition has taught us that life of the mind is constantly about self-correction and growth. This is the principle of reflexivity. The Indian poet Ashvaghosha inspires us in a similar way in the Buddhacarita. He writes that the great works of the ancient sages were carried out and approved by their sons, who were also sages. They honored their father’s work as crucial, and then tried to change and adapt it to the roles and concerns of their own times. The ancient Indian philosophers who developed darshanas, or systems of insight, also splendidly illustrate this process. In their work, respect is offered to the forebears and freedom expressed in reading them. Like Ashvaghosha and the ancient philosophers, we would need to embrace a self-corrective intellectual tradition.

These beginning thoughts are designed to challenge formidable presuppositions that exist in the current debates over the relationship between Hindu communities and academia, and Hindus and non-Hindus. We have also suggested some ways, drawn from the Hindu (and larger classical Indian) traditions, to work through and beyond those presuppositions. We hope this contributes to a fruitful and more productive engagement across putatively “separate” worlds. In our experience of everyday reality, these worlds intersect far more often than our discourse presently admits.

The process of conducting this long-term and intimate field research required me first to become very close to each woman in order to understand her experiences and views. Then I had to establish distance to see the patterns, significance, and meaning in the idiosyncratic details. This last field research allowed me to reengage with each woman directly while also having the larger picture in focus. I am grateful to the AAR support, for it enabled me to more thoroughly engage in reflexive, accountable, and finely tuned research.
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