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 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), theological education (through the annual Spotlight on Theological Education), 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/enrm.
Dear Readers:

This issue is packed with articles dealing with the work of the Academy.

The Academy’s 2008 Annual Report will provide you with a summary of our operations in 2008. We are very excited about the upcoming 2009 Annual Meeting in Montréal. In this issue, you will find your registration materials, articles dealing with new program units, outgoing program unit chairs, and good housing, food and beverage, shopping, and cultural centers in Montréal. You will also find professional development information on the Job Center and our popular Leadership Workshop.

Also in this issue, you will find our reports on the 2008 Annual Meeting, which include the survey data, media attendance, the minutes of the Academy’s annual business meeting, and Job Center statistics. This issue also contains several opportunities and announcements regarding publishing:

• A call for a new JAAR Editor;
• Two JAAR calls for papers;
• A call for an Oxford University Press/AAR Book Series editor;
• A list of the latest Oxford University Press/AAR titles; and
• A call for articles for the From the Student Desk column.

We also have a call for nominations for the President, committee memberships, and the AAR’s representative to the ACLS.

We round out this issue with several interesting articles dealing with the vocational identities of ministerial students and doctoral students, the future of Jerusalem, teaching pluralism, the Obama administration’s endorsement of faith-based initiatives, religion and medicine, and list of contributors to the Academy.

We look forward to seeing you in Montréal!

Carey J. Gifford
Executive Editor

FROM THE EDITOR

Benchmarking Humanities in America

T HE AMERICAN Academy of Arts and Sciences recently unveiled the Humanities Indicators, a prototype set of statistical data about the humanities in the United States. The new online resource is available at www.HumanitiesIndicators.org.

Organized in collaboration with a consortium of national humanities organizations, the Humanities Indicators are the first effort to provide scholars, policymakers, and the public with a comprehensive picture of the state of the humanities, from primary to higher education to public humanities activities. The collection of empirical data is modeled after the National Science Board’s Science and Engineering Indicators and creates reliable benchmarks to guide future analysis of the state of the humanities. Without data, it is impossible to assess the effectiveness, impact, and needs of the humanities.

“The humanities have long served as a wellspring for a vibrant culture and a well-informed society,” said Jack Fitzmer, Executive Director of the American Academy of Religion. “What’s been missing — which the Humanities Indicators now provide — is a consistent way to track how investment in humanities education may correlate with outcomes such as employment of humanities graduates and public perception of the humanities. Because religion, history, literature, philosophy, and the arts vitaly inform society, it’s vital to have sound data available for those who influence the role these subjects have in school curricula.”

The American Academy of Arts and Sciences project collected and analyzed data from existing sources to compile a prototype set of 74 indicators and more than 200 tables and charts, accompanied by interpretive essays covering five broad subject areas. The Indicators will be updated as new information becomes available, including data from a survey administered last year to approximately 1,500 college and university humanities departments. The Academy views the Indicators as a prototype for a much-needed national system of humanities data collection.

“Until now the nation has lacked a broad-based, quantitative analysis of the status of the humanities in the United States,” said Leslie Berlowitz, chief executive officer of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and project codirector. “We need more reliable empirical data about what is being taught in the humanities, how they are funded, the size of the workforce, and public attitudes toward the field. The Humanities Indicators are an important step in closing that fundamental knowledge gap. They will help researchers and policymakers, universities, foundations, museums, libraries, humanities councils, and others answer basic questions about the humanities, track trends, diagnose problems, and formulate appropriate interventions.”

Among the organizations collaborating with the Academy on the effort are the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Academy of Religion, the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, Association of American Universities, the College Art Association, the Federation of State Humanities Councils, the Linguistic Society of America, the Modern Language Association, and the National Humanities Alliance (http://www.nhalliance.org/research/humanities-indicators/index.shtml).

Almost a decade ago, Academy Fellows Steven Marcus, Jonathan Cole, Robert Solow, and Francis Oakley joined Berlowitz in recognizing the need for improved data on the humanities and spearheaded the Academy’s efforts to establish a data collection system. Other leading humanists, including Patricia Meyer Spacks, Denis Donoghue, Norman Bradburn, Pauline Yu, Arutt Jones, and Rosemary Feal helped guide the project.

The need for and potential value of the Humanities Indicators was described in the Academy’s 2002 report, Making the Humanities Count: The Importance of Data (available at http://www.amacad.org/projects/humanities.aspx). “The humanities community has suffered from a protracted case of data deprivation, especially in comparison with science and engineering,” said Oakley, cochair of the Academy’s Initiative for the Humanities and Culture and President Emeritus of both Williams College and the American Council of Learned Societies. “We know that public support of the humanities depends on accurate data. The Indicators prototype is the start of an infrastructure that will broadly support policy research in the humanities.”

The Academy’s Initiative for the Humanities and Culture provides a framework for examining the significance of the humanities in our national culture. It is a necessary backbone for developing adequate resources and informed policies to ensure the continued growth and health of the humanities. The Academy’s work in this area has received support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Teagle Foundation, and the Sara Lee Foundation. For more information on the Initiative, see http://www.amacad.org/project/humanities.aspx.

What Do the Humanities Indicators Tell Us?

The picture of adult literacy in the United States is one of polarization. Among Western industrialized nations, we rank near the top in the percentage of highly literate adults (21 percent) but also near the top in the proportion who are functionally illiterate (also 21 percent).

Public debate about teacher qualifications has focused mainly on math and science, but data reveal that the humanities fields suffer an even more glaring dearth of well-prepared teachers. In 2000, the percentage of middle (29 percent) and high school (37.5 percent) students taught by a highly qualified history teacher was lower than for any other major subject area. The definition of “highly qualified” is a teacher who has certification and a post-secondary degree in the subject they teach.

Humanities faculty are the most poorly paid. They also have a higher proportion of part-time, non-tenured positions compared to their counterparts in the sciences and engineering. But almost half of humanities faculty indicate that they are “very satisfied” with their jobs overall. Since the early 1970s, the number of Americans who support the banning of books from the public library because they espouse atheism, extreme militarism, communism, or homosexuality decreased by at least 11 percentage points, although still 26 percent to 34 percent of the public would support banning some type of book. In the case of books advocating homosexuality, the decline was a particularly significant 20 percentage points.

Recent federal legislation identifies certain languages as “critical need languages” (Arabic, Persian, Hindi, Bengali, Turkish, and Uzbek, among others), but the data show these languages are rarely studied in colleges and universities. At the same time, there has been a substantial increase in the number of students studying Chinese.

Charitable giving to arts and cultural organizations grew between the mid-1990s and early 2000s before leveling off. But little of public or private sector funding for the humanities goes to academic research. This trend undermines both academia and the public since public institutions rely on humanities scholars to provide much of the knowledge on which these activities are based.

The number of American adults who read at least one book in the previous 12 months decreased from 61 percent to 57 percent in the decade between the early 1990s and the early 2000s. The greatest rate of decline (approximately 15 percent) occurred among 18- to 24-year-olds.

March 2009 RSN • 3

Registration and Housing is open now!

FAX: 301-694-5124
WEB: www.aarweb.org/Meetings/Annual_Meeting/registration.asp
MAIL: AAR Annual Meeting Registration and Housing
c/o Experient Registration and Housing
2451 Edison Boulevard
Twinburg, OH 44087

Questions:
TEL: 1-800-575-7185 (U.S. and Canada)
+1-330-425-9330 (outside U.S. and Canada)
E-MAIL: aarreg@experient-inc.com

Membership

Don’t forget to renew your membership dues before you register or else you won’t be able to get the lower member registration rates. If you are not certain about your current 2009 membership status, please see www.aarweb.org/Members/Dues or call 404-727-3049.

Getting Around

Most AAR sessions will be held at the Palais des Congrès. Some evening receptions and additional meetings will be held at the Fairmont Queen Elizabeth and La Centre Sheraton hotels. Shuttle service will run between the headquarters hotels and the Palais. Montreal has excellent public transportation to get to other areas of the city. Check online at www.aarweb.org/Meetings/Annual_Meeting/registration.asp for more travel information!

Additional Meetings

Requests for Additional Meeting space are being accepted through the new online Additional Meetings system at www.aarweb.org/Meetings/Annual_Meeting/Additional_Meetings. All requests are handled on a space and time-slot available basis. The Additional Meetings program, held in conjunction with the AAR Annual Meeting, is an important service to AAR members. Additional Meetings must have an AAR member listed as the primary contact. All Additional Meeting participants are expected to register for the Annual Meeting. Be sure to read the instructions carefully before completing and submitting your space request. The deadline for priority scheduling is May 1, 2009. For more information about the Additional Meetings, please see www.aarweb.org/Meetings/Annual_Meeting/Current_Meeting/Additional_Meetings. Questions should be directed to Asilinn Jones at ajones@aarweb.org.

Job Center

The 2009 AAR Annual Meeting Job Center will be located in the Palais des Congrès. Candidates and employers who wish to participate should visit the AAR website at www.aarweb.org/Programs/CareerServices/Job_Center. Candidate registration is open now through the Annual Meeting registration system.

Childcare

AAR is proud to provide childcare service at the Annual Meeting for the convenience of our members. Childcare is available at an hourly or daily rate. It will be located in the Fairmont Queen Elizabeth Hotel.

Disability Accessibility

AAR members with disabilities or who may have difficulty getting around the meeting are encouraged to note this during registration. AAR will make every reasonable attempt to accommodate you, whether by arranging special services such as sign language interpreters, assigning accessible hotel room space, or through the AAR’s taxi reimbursement policy. More information can be found at www.aarweb.org/Meetings/Annual_Meeting/DisabilityAccessibility.

Canadian Immigration

It is necessary for those entering Canada to clear customs and immigration. International visitors, including those coming from the United States and Mexico, must present a passport in order to enter Canada. Non-North American and European Union citizens should inquire about possible visa requirements from their own country. Official letters of invitation to the Annual Meeting to support visa applications are available. E-mail annualmeeting@aarweb.org with your name, address, and the full contact information of the consulate of your country.

AAR Annual Meeting Online Services

At www.aarweb.org/Meetings/Annual_Meeting/Current_Meeting you can:
• Register for the Annual Meeting
• Reserve your hotel room
• Find a roommate
• Request Additional Meeting space
• Register for the AAR Annual Meeting Job Center
• View the complete AAR program
• Discover more about Montreal including tours, museums, houses of worship, restaurants, and much more!
New Program Units

AR’S PROGRAM Committee approved the following new program units for the 2009 Annual Meeting:

- Body and Religion Consultation
- Jain Studies Consultation
- Religion, Memory, and History Consultation
- Religious Conversions Consultation
- Sociology of Religion Consultation
- Women of Color Scholarship, Teaching, and Activism Consultation
- Yogaçaśa Studies Consultation
- Latin/o Critical and Comparative Studies
- Religion in Europe and the Mediterranean, 500–1650 CE Consultation
- Religion in Europe and the Middle Eastern Christianity Consultation
- Middle Eastern Christianity Consultation
- Mediterranean, 500–1650 CE Consultation
- Religion, Memory, and History Consultation
- Religious Conversions Consultation
- Sociology of Religion Consultation
- Women of Color Scholarship, Teaching, and Activism Consultation

Where to Stay in Montréal

AFTER A LONG DAY of attending sessions at the Annual Meeting, it is good to have a haven to relax and recharge for the next day. AAR has negotiated special conference rates at a number of luxurious hotels for the convenience of meeting attendees. All rates are listed in Canadian dollars. Hotel room rates do not include the 15.5 percent hotel room tax. Please note that the single/double/triple/quadruple room designation denotes the number of room occupants, not the number of beds. A triple room means three people are sharing two double beds unless a roll-away bed is requested at an extra charge.

- Headquarters Hotel

Fairmont Queen Elizabeth
900 Rene-Levesque Boulevard West

This landmark hotel is celebrated internationally for its world-class accommodations. The Fairmont Queen Elizabeth boasts a skillfully integrated health club, featuring state-of-the-art equipment and an indoor pool, as well as three distinctive venues to experience Montréal’s gastronomy at its best: Les Voyager Lounge, Le Montréalais Bistro-restaurant, and the award-winning Beaver Club, recognized as one of the best places in Canada. Guests of Fairmont Hotels and Resorts will enjoy high-speed Internet connectivity in all guest rooms as well as wireless Internet access in public areas such as lobbies and lounges. CAN 165/165/189/189

La Centre Sheraton Montréal
1201 Rene-Levesque Boulevard West

Stroll out our doors and into the heart of beautiful Montréal. La Centre Sheraton is close to exceptional shopping, fine dining, the entertainment district, and just minutes from the lively business district. The guest rooms are tastefully appointed and designed for comfort. Sink into the Sheraton Sweet Sleeper Bed, with its custom-designed plush-top mattress, cozy fleece blanket, plump duvet, and five cushion pillows. All guest rooms feature high-speed Internet access and are equipped with an in-room safe that is large enough to store a laptop computer. Multilingual concierge services and the lobby-coffee bar are conveniently located at the lobby level. A completely redesigned business center is located on level A. The sixth floor spa/health club is open daily and includes a superb indoor, atrium-style lap pool, a sauna, a whirlpool, and a fully equipped state-of-the-art fitness center. CAN 160/160/175/175

- Student/Retired Member Hotel

Hyatt Regency Montréal
1255 Jeanne-Mance

This hotel offers direct underground access to the Palais des Congrès, the Metro, and the Contemporary Museum of Art. It is also within walking distance of Old Montréal, Chinatown, and the trendiest restaurants. Enjoy every productivity advantage, including continental breakfast, free local calls, generous work area, and wireless high-speed Internet access. Beautiful views of Montréal or the Place des Arts complement stylish decor, including Pigotio amenities, and two double beds with ultra-plush pillows, soft sheeting, and down blankets piled atop pillowtop mattresses. CAN 160/160/175/175

Future AAR Annual Meeting Dates and Sites

2009 — Montréal, QC, Canada
November 7–10
2010 — Atlanta, GA
October 30–November 2
2011 — San Francisco, CA
November 19–22
2012 — Atlanta, GA
November 3–6
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Aix Cuisine du Terroir
Hôtel Place d’Armes
711 Place d’Armes Hill
514-904-1201

Aix Cuisine du Terroir celebrates Québec’s finest products thanks to the innovative and flavorful cuisine of Chef Carl Röder. The warm and contemporary décor of the restaurant blends in perfectly with Le Place d’Armes Hôtel and Suites’ classic urban chic design, as well as with the stylish yet relaxing Aix La Terrasse, located on the roof of the hotel. The new bar, Suite 701, offers a great selection of drinks and an upscale gourmet bar menu. $$$

Auberge Le Saint-Gabriel
426 Saint-Gabriel Street
514-878-2232

Founded in 1754, the Auberge Le Saint-Gabriel is located in one of the oldest inn in North America. Its fine French and Quebec cuisine is prepared with the best available market ingredients, served in a charming atmosphere reminiscent of yesteryear. A graceful terrace for those sultry summer days and a fireplace in winter make for romantic dining year round. $$

Bonaparte
443 Saint-François-Xavier Street
514-489-4368

Three decorated halls in the Empire style that dominated the Napoleon era give the restaurant the intimate character that guests treasure. The Imperatrice Hall can accommodate up to sixty people. The Greenhouse, bursting with green plants, and the Centre Hall, with its stonework, can easily accommodate twenty guests.

The Bonaparte cuisine is inspired by the French countryside. The menu, with its array of tempting suggestions, is made to satisfy the most diverse palates at reasonable prices. $$

Brisket Montréal
1093 Beaver Hall Hill
514-879-3641

Since 1986, fans from far and wide have been converging on Brisket Montréal for its delectable smoked meat, prepared in the traditional manner. But Brisket’s secret to success relies equally on its relaxing surroundings, and classical decor, as well as on its outstanding and charming service. $

Canadian Maple Delights
84 Saint-Paul Street East
514-765-3456 ext. 224

Gelati, coffee, pastries, organic maple syrup, and many more delicacies from maple syrup are beautifully displayed on the shelves of this bistro-boutique, where guests are treated to the myriad flavors of maple, in warm ambiance. Furthermore, visitors might want to stop by the onsite museum to discover the secrets of maple products. $

Cavali Ristorante and Bar
2040 Peel Street
514-843-5100

Cavali Ristorante is the epitome of cosmopolitan fine dining, not only for dinner and cocktail hour, but also for its classic yet playful business lunch. With its retro decor and picturesque bar scene, the restaurant offers the art of glamorous dining, and the city’s most sense-exhilarating dining experience! $$$

Chez L’Épicier
311 Saint-Paul Street East
514-878-2232

Chez L’Épicier is a restaurant that offers a fresh, surprisingly creative, and refined menu. For the past eight years, Chef Laurent Godbout has reinvented Québec gastronomy using local products that revive the palate.

Chez L’Épicier is more than just a restaurant, it is also a fine grocery store where one can obtain a wide array of “Les Saveurs de L’Épicier” products, as well as take-out dishes that will satisfy even the greatest gourmets. $$$

Chez Queux
158 Saint-Paul Street East
514-866-5194

Chez Queux is located just steps away from the Palais des Congrès in a historic building at the heart of Old Montréal. Whether for its express menu, gourmet dinners, business lunches, or group receptions, the restaurant treats fans of fine French cuisine to personalized service in enchanting ambiance. $$$

Confusion/Tapas du Monde
1635-7 Saint-Denis Street
514-288-2225

Critics are unanimous in their praise of Confusion, which serves a wide range of tapas in a totally feel-good ambiance. Seat yourself comfortably on a plush banquette or a swing, and thrill your taste buds with the flavors of fete gras, the famous sweetbreads popcorn, and a variety of seafood dishes. These small-sized plates, which are perfect for sharing, are artfully reinvented in a flavor explosion and gourmet outing that goes easy on the wallet. $$

Fourquet Fourchette du Palais
265 Saint-Antoine Street West
514-789-6370

When you combine artfully prepared local dishes with beer and historical reenactments, the resulting dinner-theater or brunch feast is nothing short of masterful. $$

Le Boulangerie
363 Saint-François-Xavier Street
514-845-3646

Close to the St. Lawrence River is Le Boulangerie, with its menu of seafood specialties, in particular, poached salmon. Fish and seafood lovers, as well as those craving red meat, will find satisfaction in the chef’s selection, served in an unpretentious atmosphere. $

Le Cabaret du Roy
363 de la Commune Street East
514-907-9000

Get ready for a trip to another time as Le Cabaret du Roy transports you to New France, with period musicians, historic figures, and an old world table. American dishes, locally-grown Québec products, and grilled game add authentic flavor to the feasting and festivities. $$$

Le Pavillon Napnic
75A de la Gauchetière Street West
514-395-8106

A great restaurant to enjoy a gourmet meal prepared with only fresh, quality ingredients and spices resulting in mouthwatering flavors and vibrant colors. $$

Restaurant du Vieux Port
39 Saint-Paul Street East
514-866-3175

The Restaurant du Vieux Port is renowned for its Angus beef, seafood, and devoted service. Located in the heart of Old Montréal, the restaurant invites you to warm up by the fireplaces on cold winter days. $$

Restaurant Le Pier Gabriel
39 de la Commune Street East
514-396-4673

In a friendly atmosphere, Chef Michel Racine offers a varied table d’hôte inspired by the flavors and colors of the season. In addition to exquisite cuisine, the age-old stones, classical woodwork, majestic view of the Old Port, and lounge all guarantee an unforgettable fine dining experience. $$$

Restaurant Mr. Ma
Corner of Cathcart and Mansfield
514-866-8000

Picture yourself in the refined surroundings of this charming downtown restaurant. Treat yourself to a fine Szechuan meal, enjoy fresh seafood, or discover dim sum at Mr. Ma’s. Business lunch specials from Monday to Friday. $$

Restaurant Toqué
900 Place Jean-Paul-Riopelle
514-499-2084

Member of Relais and Châteaux since 2006, Toqué is located in the heart of Montréal’s Quartier International. Rated five diamonds by the CAA and AAA, the restaurant features an elegant and luminous décor, as well as a remarkable wine cellar. Chef Normand Laprise showcases exceptional products, such as his famous melt-in-your-mouth duck foie gras, and co-owner Christine Lamarche looks after your every need. $$$

Tour De Ville
777 University Street
514-879-4777

Boasting a remarkable panoramic view of the city, this revolving restaurant, located on the thirtieth floor of the Delta Centre-Ville Hotel, takes you on a culinary world tour. $$
Request for Proposals
Deadline - September 1, 2009

Pedagogy of Transnational Education

✔ What are the pedagogical challenges posed by the presence of students from a variety of countries in North American classrooms and at your institution?

✔ What project or activity for faculty conversation can help you address this opportunity?

The Wabash Center invites proposals for projects up to $20,000 from faculty teaching theology and religion in theological schools, colleges or universities in the United States or Canada.

We welcome inquiries and would be glad to talk with you about this grant opportunity.

Application information
http://www.wabashcenter.wabash.edu/grants/default.aspx

Contact: Paul Myhre - 800-655 7117 - myhrep@wabash.edu

SHARING

Underground Pedestrian Network
The name “Underground Cary” refers to the vast network of pedestrian walkways below the city. There are 33 kilometers of connecting passageways beneath downtown, with the métro (subway), commuter trains, and buses also converging here. The passageways serve a more leisurely purpose as they provide access to foxy entertainment venues and attractions.

Crescent Street
Known as one of the world’s friendliest and liveliest cities, Montréal is recognized for its cosmopolitan side and its openness. In the middle of it all is famous Crescent Street, the heart of downtown Montréal for tourists and locals alike. A wonderful sense of hospitality characterizes this tiny strip; it also has a unique architecture that tends to create a warm and authentic atmosphere. Famous for its specialty shops, art galleries, and designer boutiques, the like of Parasuco, Hugo Boss, Shan, and Matt Bailey, Crescent shopping is the ideal mix of style and class.

SHOPPING

The Biosphère is an exclusive venue to better understand major environmental issues, including those related to water, air, climate change, sustainable development, and responsible consumption.

Cinémathèque québécoise
3175 Chemin de la Cité-Des-arts
514-286-3000
www.cine.org

The Cinémathèque québécoise has presented audiences with films of excellence and originality — French language films of the highest quality. Cinémathèque is the annual rendezvous of cinephiles to discover exceptional new feature films judiciously selected from nearly 200 films viewed annually by its professional team of programmers. The 2009 film festival will be held from November 5–15.

Montreal, a Living History Centre D’Histoire de Montréal
335 Place D’Youville
514-872-3207
www.ville.montreal.qc.ca/chm

Relive more than one hundred events from Montreal’s history. This exhibit provides a unique opportunity to explore the living history of Montrealers through the ages.

Montreal Holocaust Memorial Centre
5151 Côte Ste-Catherine Road
514-345-2605

The exhibition weaves the catastrophic events of the Holocaust into a tapestry of Jewish history and heritage, exploring the richness and diversity of Jewish life before, during, and after the Shoah. What makes the exhibition unique is its connection to Montreal. Approximately 5,000–8,000 survivors live in the Montreal area, making the city home to the third largest survivor population in the world. Over 418 original artifacts (bequeathed to the museum by Montreal survivors), 372 photographs, and 20 films give visitors a “locally focused” lens through which to reflect on the Holocaust.

Musée des Hospitiales de l’Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal
201 Pine Avenue West
514-849-2919
www.museedeshospitalieres.qc.ca

The Musée des Hospitiales de l’Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal opens on a magnificent oak staircase built in the seventeenth century. It relates the history of the Hospitaliers of St. Joseph and of the Hôtel-Dieu, a history forever entwined with that of Montréal. With a permanent exhibition as well as temporary exhibitions focusing on its history, medicine, and religious art, the Musée des Hospitiales de l’Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal does not merely speak of the past, but also offers an enlightened view of the present.

Musée des Maîtres et Artisans du Québec
615 Avenue Sainte-Croix
514-747-7367
www.mmajq.qc.ca

Prior to our industrial era, the making of daily objects depended on the talents and ingenuity of our masters and artisans. Their knowledge, transmitted from generation to generation, has left us an impressive heritage. The Musée des Maîtres et Artisans du Québec transports its visitors into this forgotten universe and presents the tools, furniture, textiles, ceramics, metalwork, statues, sacred objects, and other religious ornaments that constituted the everyday lives of the French-Canadians of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.

Nativity Scenes
St. Joseph’s Oratory of Mount-Royal
3800 Chemin Queen-Mary
514-733-8211
www.saint-joseph.org/en_1119_index.asp

The exhibit of nativity scenes from the Oratory Museum has become a tradition during the Christmas season. Artists and craftspeople from around the world have given a new meaning to faith, hope, and joy. The exhibit unites religious and social traditions as it presents the Nativity of Jesus in a wide variety of settings, each one more inventive than the last. Over 260 crèches coming from 111 countries are represented in the annual offering.

Natural History and Ethnology Exhibit
Redpath Museum
859 Sherbrooke Street West
514-388-4088 ext. 4094
www.mcgill.ca/redpath

Discover the natural history and diversity of Quebec through exhibits on paleontology, mineralogy, and biodiversity as well as an impressive variety of cultural displays from ancient times (Egypt and the Mediterranean) and from around the globe (Africa, Asia, Oceanica, and South America). Highlights include dinosaur skeletons and Egyptian mummies.

Sacred Africa: Ancient Art from Sub-Saharan Africa Exhibit
Museum of Fine Arts Montréal
3800 Sherbrooke Street West
514-285-2000
www.mfam.qc.ca

The exhibition features fifty stunning pieces of high-quality, traditional African art — objects, sculptures, and masks — from the Sub-Saharan region.
Louis Rousseau is a professor in the Département de Sciences des Religions at the Université du Québec à Montréal. He is a specialist in the history of modern Christianity, in particular Québec of the nineteenth century, the religious dimension of First Nations in Quebec, and religious expression of migrant communities in contemporary Québec. He is a founding member of the Groupe de Recherche Interculturelle sur le Montréal Éthnoculturel (GRIME) and the Centre de Recherche sur la Diversité au Québec (CQRD). Rousseau has written extensively in his area of specialization. His most recent publication is Les Sulpiciens de Montréal: Une Histoire de Poirot et de Discrétion, 1657–2007 (Montréal, QC: Fides, 2007).

Seventeenth through Eighteenth Centuries: Catholic Missions Engaged in Unequal Partnership Alliances

The French presence in America, mostly in the St. Lawrence Valley, is a result of the commercial expansion will of the European nations, a will that pushed them out of their homelands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In Europe, the rise of monarchic national powers and religious fragmentation gave birth to national churches strongly linked to the state. France’s international missionary movement emerged after the religious wars as an expression of the Catholic phase of the Reform. Between 1660 and 1640, an awakening movement was felt through浸透, members of religious orders, and secular clergy. From this “devout France” came the Jesuit missions in New France, the founders of religious schools, first developed for Amerindian girls (Ursulines of Marie-de-l’Incarnation, 1639) and the Jesuit missions in New France, the scene of forced religious integration and assimilation of the Huron people, so-called Powhatan people, by the Jesuits. This was a creation of individuals influenced by personal mysticism that embarked on an evangelical journey for the conquest of the New World. But what became of this adventure at the end of the French regime?

Recent historiography gives a lukewarm portrait of the Jesuit experience. The Amerindians were generally curious and open to discuss the religious beliefs of the newcomers, for they felt their own belief system was equal, if not superior, to that of the French. “Black Robes” were first seen as powerful, placed in the same category as chiefs, sorcerers, and healers. This perception soon changed as it became clear that they wanted to attack the foundations of the aboriginals’ world view. With the propagation of illnesses, frequent deaths of catechumens and the newly baptized, and the decrease of the Huron population due to war against the Iroquois League, Jesuits slipped into the “dangerous men” category. Hostages, without knowing it, of the aboriginal rule regarding commercial alliances, they were tolerated for a few years, mostly because they were imposed by Québec, and because aboriginal children played the same role in the French community. The Christian Huron project ended in 1649, with the termination of the League by the Iroquois. Attempts to achieve a reduction of nomad Amerindian populations near Québec and Montérégie by evangelization and settling were a failure. Amerindians understood early on that it was their ability to supply the fur market that made them valuable to the French, a fact that encouraged them to maintain their hunting activities. Because of that, the missionary strategy developed differently until the end of New France, going deeper and deeper into the continent by following the military and commercial routes. With the Canadian voyagers, Amerindians were able to establish a fair exchange of cultural and commercial goods under the protection of the inter-Indian peace recognized and formally signed by a large number of Aboriginal Nations in 1700 and 1717. Introduced by French politicians, the inter-Indian peace offered them protection under the “mediator” function of New France’s Governor (Omontio). From Father Le Jeune (1633) to Father Lafitau (1724), the Jesuits’ observations, whether they were motivated by ethnographic or public-interest interests, provide us with a unique corpus of information still deemed incredibly valuable. This first missionary period ended with the transfer of New France to England, while Amerindians suffered a clear loss of power against the growing French and English populations.

1840–1960: The Conversion of Savage People to Catholicism

Catholic missionary activity started again in the Saint Lawrence Valley around 1840. In the context of an ultramontane cultural revitalization, the Québec church embraced a new missionary vocation aimed at the Amerindians, the different hunting Nations living in the Laurentian forest, and the western peoples—those baptized half-breeds and never converted Plains Cree. Secular priests, Grey Sisters, and Oblats de Marie-Immaculée promoted at the core of this new conversion and civilization process, supported by the federal government in its territorial and commercial expansion policies. Ever since the Indian Act of 1851, the Amerindians’ status was legally considered minors, and this fragile population, at a loss without its traditional way of life, welcomed the help and the conversion call of the white power being delivered by the missionaries. At the end of the nineteenth century, the Amerindian population of Québec was almost completely baptized by the missionaries. However, outdoor native religious practices remained. As for the Inuit population farther north, the conversion sped up after World War II.

1960–Today: Amerindian Awakening and the Criticizing of Cultural and Territorial Despoliation

Since 1960, starting with traditionalist Mohawks faithful to the Longhouse Religion, a gradual reclaiming of the traditional heritage can be observed through the Twelve Nations represented in the province of Québec. This process of reconversion, with its political, economic, and territorial aspects, is based ultimately on the spiritual dimension. The challenge is immense; changing ways of life profoundly modified the traditions. The public examination of the perverse effects of the Catholic missionary activities has just begun. In June 2008, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was launched in order to support a process of truth and healing on a path leading towards reconciliation and renewed relationships based on mutual understanding and respect. Governments and churches are deeply involved in a dialogue about the negative effects of the Indian boarding schools. The Québec government recognized the Amerindian Nations as equal partners in ongoing negotiations. Public opinion does not always agree.
Annual Meeting Leadership Workshop

Three Religion Majors Meet in a Café: What Do They Have in Common?

The Teagle/AAR working group, which produced the white paper, “The Religion Major and Liberal Education,” identified five common characteristics that suggest the religious studies major is by its very nature intercultural and comparative, multidisciplinary, critical, integrative, creative, and constructive. In this interactive workshop, participants will have an opportunity to discover and discuss this constellation of characteristics. Participants will then explore the presence of these characteristics in the design of majors in different institutional contexts (small public, large public, private, and theological). The workshop will conclude with presentations and discussions about how we address these in ways attentive both to our responsibilities as educators and to the students and the reasons they are in our programs.

“In light of the findings of the AAR/Teagle Working Group and from our own conversations with department chairs over the past few years, sustained discussion about the shape of the major in religious studies and its relation to liberal education in the twenty-first century is more important than ever,” said Fred Glennon, chair of the Academic Relations Committee.

The interactive workshop will feature several speakers, panelists, and breakout sessions. Eugene V. Gallagher will open the workshop with a discussion titled: “The convergent characteristics of the religious studies major. Findings of the Teagle Working Group.” Gallagher, the Rosemary Park Professor of Religious Studies at Connecticut College and founding director of the Markoff Center for Teaching and Learning, was a member of that working group. A panel will follow addressing how the five characteristics play out in different institutional contexts. A breakout session led by members of the Academic Relations Committee immediately follows, which will allow participants to discuss these issues in depth.

Following lunch, which is provided, will be a session on student dynamics, their motives for study, and how students can be targeted with the characteristics in mind. Another breakout session will allow for participation from attendees.

The workshop will conclude with a plenary address from Gallagher.

“Our hope is that this workshop will not only continue the conversation begun by the AAR/Teagle Working Group but also extend it to illuminate some best practices for curriculum and program development,” Glennon said.

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 $100, which includes the entire day of sessions, lunch, and a book on the topic.

The topics for past chairs workshops have been:

- 2008 Annual Meeting Leadership Workshop — Taking Religion(s) Seriously: What Students Need to Know
- 2007 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Best Practices: Diversifying Your Faculty — Honest Conversations
- 2006 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Personal Issues: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly
- 2005 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Enlarging the Pie: Strategies for Managing and Growing Departmental Resources
- 2004 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Being a Chair in Today’s Consumer Culture: Navigating in the Knowledge Factory
- 2003 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Scholarship, Service, and Stress: The Tensions of Being a Chair
- 2002 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Building and Sustaining Your Department in an Era of Shrinking Resources and Increasing Demands
- 2001 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Teaching in the Religious Studies Department
- 2000 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — Assessing and Advancing Teaching in the Religious Studies Department
- 1999 Annual Meeting Chairs Workshop — The Entrepreneurial Chair: Building and Sustaining Your Department in an Era of Shrinking Resources and Increasing Demands
- 1998 Annual Meeting Leaders Workshop — New Directions in Religious Studies

We look forward to seeing you in Montreal!

The Academic Relations Committee: Fred Glennon, chair, Chester Gillis, L. Deane Lagerquist, Steve Young, Rosetta Ross, Edwin David Aponte, and Kyle Cole, staff liaison.
Call for Committee Nominations

Each year, members of the American Academy of Religion are invited to nominate persons to fill open positions on AAR Standing Committees, Task Forces, and Juries. This year, there are openings on the following groups:

- Academic Relations Committee
- Book Award Juries
- Career Services Advisory Committee
- Graduate Student Committee
- International Connections Committee
- Public Understanding of Religion
- Status of LGBTQ Persons in the Profession Task Force
- Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession Committee
- Teaching and Learning Committee
- Theological Education Steering Committee

Nominations for positions on these groups must be made in writing, and must include: 1) A description of the nominee’s academic and professional interests; 2) A summary of the nominee’s activity in the AAR; 3) A statement describing the nominee’s interest or promise for a particular assignment; and 4) A current copy of the nominee’s curriculum vita. Members may nominate themselves. All nominees must be members in good standing of the AAR. Nominations must be received by May 1, 2009, and may be E-mailed, faxed, or posted to:

Jack Fitzmier
Executive Director
American Academy of Religion
Suite 300
825 Houston Mill Road NE
Atlanta, GA 30329 USA
Fax: 404-727-7959
nominations@aarweb.org

Mark Juergensmeyer, President of the AAR, will review nominations and make selections during August and September 2009. Nominees will be notified of their status soon thereafter. If you have questions about particular assignments, please feel free to contact the AAR’s executive staff, Board members, or Committee/Task Force chairs. Committee descriptions and rosters are available at www.aarweb.org/about_AAR/committees.

Further information on books published in this series can be found at www.aarweb.org/Publications/Books/teachingreligiousstudies.asp.

AAR Career Services

Visit the AAR’s Career Services webpage at www.aarweb.org/jump/careers for these services:

- Job Postings
- Annual Meeting Job Center
- Candidate CVs
- Workshop Information
- Employment Statistics
- Articles Discussing Career Issues
Actions of the Board

T he AAR Board of Directors passed several actions at the Winter 2008 meeting in Chicago. It voted on a new firm, Tarpley and Underwood, to handle the fiscal year 2009 audit. The Board approved a recommendation to adopt a Statement of Best Practices for Academic Job Offers, which was penned by the Job Placement Task Force. The Board also accepted the Nondiscrimination Task Force’s recommendation that the AAR executive staff, in future Annual Meeting negotiations with cities and hotels, ask competitors to propose what their sites can offer in regards to sustainability — including recycling, availability of local food, housekeeping, energy use — and to factor their responses into the decision of which site to select. And finally, the Board approved several motions proposed by the Status of LGBTQ Persons in the Profession Task Force:

- That gender identity and sexual orientation be included in future surveys of AAR members that request demographic information;
- That the AAR requires every institution posting a job listing to disclose whether or not the institution has an antidiscrimination policy, and if it does to make it available;
- That institutions requiring a signed statement of faith from their employees be required to disclose this information in all Job Postings listings;
- That all listings in Job Postings be required to provide a link, if available, to the benefits provided by the institution; and
- That the AAR adopt an antidiscrimination policy, and display it prominently on its website (see below for policy).

New Nondiscrimination Statement

In the November 2008 Board of Directors meeting in Chicago, a motion was put forth by the Status of LGBTQ Persons in the Field Task Force, and was supported by the Status of Women in the Profession Committee and the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession Committee, that AAR adopt the following nondiscrimination statement:

The American Academy of Religion respects the rights, dignity, and worth of all people. It unequivocally rejects all forms of harassment and unethical discrimination, including discrimination and harassment based on race, ancestry, place of origin, color, ethnicity, citizenship, sex, gender expression or identification, sexual orientation, disability, religion, culture, political convictions, socioeconomic status, age, health conditions, or marital, domestic, or parental status, or any other applicable basis proscribed by law. All activities taking place under the aegis of the AAR (including the Annual Meeting, regional meetings, and academic-sponsored publications, publications, and sessions) are bound by this antidiscrimination policy.

The nondiscrimination statement was approved by the Board of Directors and can now be found on the AAR website at www.aarweb.org/about/AARBoard_and_Governance/Resolutions.

Call for AAR Delegate to the ACLS

The AAR Executive Office invites candidates to nominate themselves or others for the position of Delegate to the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). The term of office for the Delegate is January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2012. The Delegate performs the following functions:

- Represents the AAR as its delegate to the annual spring meeting of the ACLS (a collection of approximately seventy learned societies in the humanities fields);
- Responds to occasional ACLS requests for information about AAR programs;
- Writes an annual report to the AAR Board of Directors;
- Serves as a member of the AAR Board of Directors; and
- On an occasional basis, solicits names of scholars of religion who could serve on the selection committees for the ACLS Fellowship Program.

Nominations for this position must be made in writing, and must include: 1) A description of the nominee’s academic and professional interests; 2) A summary of the nominee’s activity in the AAR; 3) A statement describing the nominee’s interest or promise for this assignment; and 4) A current copy of the nominee’s curriculum vita. All nominees must be members in good standing of the AAR. Nominations must be received by May 1, 2009, and may be e-mailed, faxed, or posted to:

Jack Fitzmier
Executive Director
American Academy of Religion
Suite 300
825 Houston Mill Road NE
Atlanta, be included USA
FAX: 404-727-7959
nomination@aarweb.org

Mark Juergensmeyer, President of the AAR, will review candidate applications and make a final selection in the summer of 2009. The announcement of the final candidate will be made soon thereafter.

Call for Presidential Nominations

In recent discussions of our updated Strategic Planning goals, the Executive Office is working on making AAR’s practices and processes more transparent to the general membership. Four forces impel us to do this:

- Our approaching centennial, a time when it will be especially important for potential contributors and funders to clearly and readily understand our governance structures;
- Members’ concerns about transparency and accountability;
- The rise over the last decade — in the wake of prominent corporate and non-profit scandals — of heightened public expectations for disclosure; and
- Our own interest in excelling at the way we conduct and hold ourselves accountable ethically.

With that in mind, the Nominations Committee has outlined below the election process in detail.

Vice President — Serves a one-year term, so candidates run for election every year. The current Vice President will be in line to be confirmed President-Elect in 2010 and President in 2011 and will continue to serve on the Board of Directors as Immediate Past President in 2012, for a total of four years of service. In additions to serving on the Board of Directors, the Vice President serves on the Executive and Program Committees. During his or her 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.

Secretary — Serves a three-year term, so candidates run for election every third year. The next election for Secretary will take place in 2010. The Secretary is responsible for recording and verifying the official records of the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee, the Program Committee, and the Annual Business Meeting.

Student Director — Serves a two-year term, so candidates run for election every second year. The Student Director position will be up for election in 2009 and again in 2011. The Student Director is a member of the Board of Directors, representing the particular concerns and issues of AAR student members at large. In addition, the Student Director works with the Graduate Student Committee.

Elections Process

Candidates can self-nominate or nominate others by sending materials as described in the Call directly to the Chair of the Nominations Committee. The Chair collects the names of proposed candidates. The Chair then meets with the rest of the committee in late winter to discuss the slate of candidates (both submitted by the general membership and by Nominations Committee members). Candidates are chosen for each position that is coming up for election that year. Three or four candidates are chosen at first, ranked 1–4. The Chair of the Nominations Committee works down the slate by contacting the candidates to see if they are willing to stand for election. Once two candidates agree to stand, the Chair sends the final slate to the AAR Executive Office for presentation to the Board of Directors at the Spring Board meeting, to be approved by a vote of the Board of Directors.

Once the slate of candidates is approved, the AAR Executive Officer contacts the candidates to request a photo, bio, and statement for inclusion in the election materials. Those materials are printed in the October issue of RSN and are mailed to all members who do not have an e-mail address in the membership system. For those members who do have e-mail addresses, they receive an e-mail announcing the start of the election period with a link to the election page on the AAR website. They also receive reminders to vote in both the September and October E-bulletins.

The elections period varies from year to year, but is usually thirty days in length. In 2009, the elections will be held from Monday, September 28 to Wednesday, October 28. The day after the elections close (October 29, 2009), the AAR Executive Officer tallies the electronic and mailed ballots and reports the results to the Executive Director.

The Executive Director first contacts both the winning and losing candidates, and then announces the election results to the Board via e-mail.

Once the candidates have been contacted and the Board informed, the election results are posted on the website. A further announcement is printed in the January issue of RSN and is mentioned at the Annual Business Meeting at the Annual Meeting.

Candidates take up their positions at the end of the Annual Business Meeting.

Call for Candidates for Elected Positions

The Nominations Committee is pleased to announce that both the Vice President and Secretary positions are up for election in 2010 (the nominations deadline has already passed for 2009 elected positions).

To be considered for any elected position, submit the following information: 1) A brief biographical sketch of no more than 200 words; 2) A statement on your candidacy for the position, between 500–600 words (e.g., what objectives and goals you would bring to the position); and 3) A current curriculum vita.

Nominations must be received by January 1 of the election year and should be sent directly to the Chair of the Nominations Committee, Rebecca Alpert at ralpert@temple.edu.
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**2009 Committee Roster**

### Board of Directors

**Officers**
- Mark Juergensmeyer, President, University of California, Santa Barbara
- Ann Taves, President-Elect, University of Chicago, Santa Barbara
- *Kwok Pui Lan, Vice President, Episcopal Divinity School*
- Michel Desjardins, Secretary, Wilfrid Laurier University
- David Thibodeau, Treasurer, Nashville, TN

**Members**
- *Rebecca Alpert, Temple University*
- Donna Bowman, University of Central Arkansas
- *Miguel A. De La Torre, Iliff School of Theology*
- Christopher Denny, St. John's University, Queens, NY
- W. ClarkGilpin, University of Chicago
- Fred Glennon, Le Moyne College
- *Susan E. Hill, University of Northern Iowa*
- *Cheryl A. Kirk-Duggan, Shaw University*
- Susan M. Maloney, University of Redlands
- Charles Mathewes, University of Virginia
- Douglas R. McGeagh, Willamette University
- *Rebecca Sachs Norris, Merrimack College*
- John J. O'Keefe, Creighton University
- *Sarah M. Pike, California State University, Chico*
- Steve Young, McHenry County College
- *Maryk Juergensmeyer, Chair, University of Chicago*
- Chester Gillis, Georgetown University
- *Chester Gillis, Georgetown University*
- *Steve Herrick, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion*
- *Nominations Committee*
- Rebecca Alpert, Chair, Temple University
- Susan M. Maloney, University of Redlands
- Charles Mathewes, University of Virginia
- Douglas R. McGeagh, Willamette University
- *Rebecca Sachs Norris, Merrimack College*
- John J. O’Keefe, Creighton University
- Brian K. Pennington, Maryville College
- Nicholas Phillips, Vanderbilt University
- *Tina Pippin, Agnes Scott College*
- Judith Plaskow, Manhattan College
- Sarah McFarland Taylor, Northwestern University
- Emilie M. Townes, Yale University

### Standing Committees

**Academic Relations Committee**
- Fred Glennon, Chair, Le Moyne College
- Edwin David Aponte, Lancaster Theological Seminary
- Chester Gillis, Georgetown University
- L. Deane Lagrange, St. Olaf College
- Rosetta E. Ross, Howard University
- Steve Young, McHenry County College
- Kyle Cole, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Executive Committee**
- Mark Juergensmeyer, Chair, University of California, Santa Barbara
- *Donna Bowman, University of Central Arkansas*
- Michel Desjardins, Wilfrid Laurier University
- *Fred Glennon, Le Moyne College*
- *Kwok Pui Lan, Episcopal Divinity School*
- *Brian K. Pennington, Maryville College*
- Sarah M. Pike, California State University, Chico
- Ann Taves, University of California, Santa Barbara
- Emilie M. Townes, Yale University
- *John R. Fitzmier, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion*

**Finance Committee**
- David Thibodeau, Treasurer, Nashville, TN
- Donna Bowman, University of Central Arkansas
- *John J. O’Keefe, Creighton University*
- John R. Fitzmier, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Graduate Student Committee**
- Whitney Bauman, Chair, Florida International University
- Annie Blakely-Gray, Millsaps College
- Janet Gunn, University of Ottawa
- Cameron Jorgenson, Campbell University
- Nicholas Phillips, Vanderbilt University
- *Almedia Wright, Emory University*
- Margaret P. Jenkins, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**International Connections Committee**
- Tai-siong Benny Liew, Chair, Pacific School of Religion
- Edward Philipp Antonio, Iliff School of Theology
- Tetrang E. Hinga, Santa Clara University
- Xiaofei Kang, Carnegie Mellon University
- *Gilya Gerda Schmidt, University of Tennessee, Knoxville*
- *Manuel Vasquez, University of Florida*

**Nominations Committee**
- Rebecca Alpert, Chair, Temple University
- Linell E. Cash, Arizona State University
- *Luis Leon, University of Denver*
- Stacy Parry, Lubbock Christian University
- *Emilie M. Townes, Yale University*
- Jonathan E. Walton, University of California, Riverside
- John R. Fitzmier, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Program Committee**
- John R. Fitzmier, Chair, American Academy of Religion
- Michel Desjardins, Wilfrid Laurier University
- Mark Juergensmeyer, University of California, Santa Barbara
- *Kwok Pui Lan, Episcopal Divinity School*
- Ellen Orr, Marshall, Claremont School of Theology
- Charles Mathewes, University of Virginia
- Evelyn L. Parker, Southern Methodist University
- Michelene Pesantubbee, University of Iowa
- Ann Taves, University of California, Santa Barbara

**Public Understanding of Religion Committee**
- Sarah M. Pike, Chair, California State University, Chico
- Shaun Allen Casey, Wesley Theological Seminary
- Diane Connolly, Religion Newswriters Association
- *Jonathan Herms, Georgia State University*
- Lawrence Mamiya, Vassar College
- Colleen McDannell, University of Utah
- Steve Herrick, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Status of Women in the Profession Committee**
- Judith Plaskow, Chair, Manhattan College
- Stacey M. Floyd-Thomas, Vanderbilt University
- *Yudit K. Greenberg, Rollins College*
- *Gail Hamrner, Syracuse University*
- *Anne Joh, Phillips Theological Seminary*
- Nadia M. Lahutsky, Texas Christian University
- *Andrea Smith, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*
- Aislinn Jones, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Teaching and Learning Committee**
- Tina Pippin, Chair, Agnes Scott College
- Carolyn Medine, University of Georgia
- Paul Myhre, Wabash Center
- Andrew Sung Park, United Theological Seminary
- *David C. Ranke, Lenoir-Rhyne University*
- Jessica B. Davenport, Staff Liaison and Virtual Teaching and Learning Center Editor, American Academy of Religion

**Ad Hoc Committees, Task Forces, and Juries**
- *Elizabeth Margaret Bounds, Emory University*
- *Dwight N. Hopkins, University of Chicago*
- *Daisy L. Machado, Union Theological Seminary*
- *Kathryn Relieks, Union Theological Seminary*
- *Angels Simins, Saint Paul School of Theology*
- *Dennis W. Wiley, Covenant Baptist Church*

**Centennial Advisory Committee**
- *Peter J. Paris, Chair, Princeton Theological Seminary*
- *Rita Nakashima Brock, Faith Voices for the Common Good/The New Press*
- *Rebecca S. Chopp, Colgate University*
- *Miguel A. De La Torre, Iliff School of Theology*
- *Stacey M. Floyd-Thomas, Vanderbilt University*
- *Warren Frisina, Hofstra University*
- *Amir Hussain, Loyola Marymount University*
- *Pamela Klassen, University of Toronto*
- *Davina C. Lopez, Eckerd College*
- *Linda A. Moody, Mount St. Mary’s College*
- *Mark Silk, Trinity College*
- *Joseph Winters, Princeton University*
- *Glenn E. Yocum, Whittier College*
- Margaret P. Jenkins, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Governance Task Force**
- Jeffrey L. Stout, Cochise, Princeton University
- Emilie M. Townes, Chair, Yale University
- *Rebecca Alpert, Temple University*
- David Kyuman Kim, Connecticut College
- Robin W. Lovin, Southern Methodist University
- Jacqueline Paris, La Salle University
- Nilly Van Doorn-Harder, Valparaiso University
- John R. Fitzmier, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Job Placement Task Force**
- Timothy M. Renick, Chair, Georgia State University
- Alice Hurri, Chicago Theological Seminary
- Davina C. Lopez, Eckerd College
- Albert G. Miller, Oberlin College
- Wayne Proudfoot, Columbia University
- Carey J. Gifford, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Religion and the Arts Jury**
- S. Brent Plate, Chair, Hamilton College
- Sally M. Promey, Yale University
- Norman Girardot, Lehigh University
- Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, Georgetown University
- Stephanie Gray, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Religion in the Schools Task Force**
- Diane L. Moore, Chair, Harvard University
- *Mark A. Chancey, Southern Methodist University*
- Betty A. DeBerg, University of Northern Iowa
- David Haberman, Indiana University, Bloomington
- Bruce B. Lawrence, Duke University
- Stephanie McMullan, Brookline High School
- Steve Herrick, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion
**Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered, Intersex, and Queer Persons in the Profession Task Force**

Melissa M. Wilcox, Chair, Whitman College
Jennifer Harvey, Drake University
Mark D. Jordan, Harvard University
Laurel C. Schneider, Chicago Theological Seminary
Stephanie Gray, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Sustainability Task Force**

Sarah McFarland Taylor, Chair, Northwestern University
Roger S. Gottlieb, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Laurel D. Kears, Drew University
Isabel Mukonyora, Western Kentucky University
John J. O’Keefe, Creighton University
Barbara A. B. Patterson, Emory University
Kyle Cole, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Theological Education Steering Committee**

John Thamamul, Chair, Vanderbilt University
Daniel O. Aleshire, Association of Theological Schools
David H. Kelsey, Yale University
*Emmanuel Lartey, Emory University
Paul Lim, Vanderbilt University
Anant Rambachan, St. Olaf College
*Stephen G. Ray, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
*Claire Wolfteich, Boston University
Carey J. Gifford, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Best First Book in the History of Religions Jury**

Pamela Klassen, Chair, University of Toronto
Paula R. Arai, Louisiana State University
Ebrahim E. I. Moosa, Duke University
Louis A. Ruprecht, Georgia State University
Jessica B. Davenport, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Book Awards, Awards for Excellence Juries**

*Glen Stassen, Coordinator of Juries, Fuller Theological Seminary
TBD, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

**Analytical – Descriptive Studies**

Steven P. Hopkins, Swarthmore College
*Laurie Louise Patton, Emory University
*Ludger Viefhues, Yale University

**Constructive – Reflective Studies**

*John D. Caputo, Syracuse University
Francis X. Clooney, Harvard University
*Jennifer A. Herdt, University of Notre Dame

**Historical Studies**

*Paul B. Courtright, Emory University
David Frankfurter, University of New Hampshire
*Judith Weisenfeld, Princeton University

**Textual Studies**

*Barbara A. Holdrege, University of California, Santa Barbara
*Andrew Rippin, University of Victoria
*Vincent L. Wimbush, Claremont Graduate University

**Research Grant Jury**

*Julius Bailey, University of Redlands
James L. Ford, Wake Forest University
Amir Hussain, Loyola Marymount University
*Kathleen M. Sands, University of Hawai‘i, Manoa
John R. Fitzmier, Staff Liaison, American Academy of Religion

* indicates newly appointed or elected
Border Crossing: Collaborative Theological Reflection for Ministry at the University of Chicago Divinity School

Daniel Sack, Project Administrator, sack@uchicago.edu

Daniel Sack is the administrator of the Border Crossing Project at the University of Chicago Divinity School. A historian of American religion, he has taught at Heye College and Columbia Theological Seminary. He was assistant director of the Material History of American Religion Project. He is the author of Whitebread Protestants: Food and Religion in American Culture (Palgrave, 2000) and the forthcoming Moral Re-Armament (Palgrave, 2009).

Seminaries have many responsibilities, serving multiple audiences. Most obviously, they prepare people for leadership in religious communities and other institutions. But they also help educate lay people, support faculty research, create educational and liturgical materials for congregations, and in some cases maintain denominational identity and orthodoxy. Those seminaries that offer doctorates add the teaching of future teachers to their missions.

University divinity schools face even more demands. Depending on their university, some teach religious studies to undergraduates and graduates, others teach theology and religious studies, prepare people for ministry, prepare people to teach, and teach out to the general public.

Inevitably the faculty and students in those divinity schools become specialized, focusing on particular parts of the school’s mission — some concentrate on preparation for ministry, while others prepare for academic teaching careers in religious studies. The result is a rich and diverse institution, but a sometimes fragmented academic community, with people pursuing different vocational and academic goals.

The University of Chicago Divinity School is working to build connections between these diverse and diverging vocational communities. The Border Crossing Project, a three-year initiative supported by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, supports collaboration between ministry students and doctoral students and encourages those students to reflect on their often-complementary vocations. The project has already had an impact on both individuals and the school’s culture, encouraging students to connect theory and practice and creating discussions of vocation and pedagogy.

School leaders anticipate that the project can have benefits beyond the Divinity School. Graduates will pursue their careers with a clearer sense of their vocation, benefitting the universities, seminaries, or churches that they serve. They will also have a better understanding of how their work intersects with that of other ministries and scholars, overcoming the specialization and fragmentation that marks American academic life.

The University of Chicago was founded in 1892, but like most colonial American colleges, it had the education of a learned ministry among its original missions. In fact, the Divinity School predates the rest of the university, with roots in the Baptists’ Theological Union which was founded in the middle of the nineteenth century. The university’s first president, William Rainey Harper, and many of his dependents were Baptist clergymen.

But unlike Harvard or Yale, the University of Chicago was born in the heyday of the German university, a model enthusiastically embraced by Harper and the others. From the beginning, the Divinity School’s main goal has been excellent scholarship in religion, offering both doctorates and ministry degrees, and preparing graduates to teach in colleges and seminaries as well as to serve congregations.

Over the ensuing decades, these two vocations and their associated degrees have coexisted in the Divinity School in varying proportions. Unlike some university divinity schools, the Divinity School has always added teachers and students in history of religions and other fields outside the classical theological disciplines. In the last decade, the Divinity School has also offered classes for students pursuing a BA in the university’s undergraduate college, the basis of a concentration in religion.

Students at most institutions in the Association of Theological Schools are focused on one destination: the Master of Divinity degree that will prepare them for ordained ministry. The Divinity School’s more than 300 students and more than 30 faculty members, on the other hand, are pursuing a wide variety of personal and professional goals — most likely there are more goals than people.

Some critics of American higher education would argue that these multiple goals at this diverse institution indicate the secularization of the university — diminishing its original Christian mission and erasing the values of the academy. In this view students and faculty disavow the church and ministry by rejecting in universal truth. The Divinity School has surrendered to the corroding acids of modernity.

That’s not quite what has happened at the University of Chicago, however. There are many students in the Divinity School strongly committed to Christianity and to the church. Those students who would not call themselves Christian respect those who do. Believing students are not besieged by skeptics, and secular students are not evangelized by eager ministers-to-be. With strong programs for the study of Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, and other world religions, the Divinity School attracts students with a wide variety of faith backgrounds. As in any educational institution, there are substantial theological — or denominational — disagreements, but they reflect varying commitments rather than hostility to faith. Instead of secularizing, the Divinity School’s experience reflects a less dramatic aspect of modernity, specialization.

Unlike most seminaries and some university-related divinity schools, ministry and doctoral students spend a lot of time together at the University of Chicago. Many classes attract both MDiv and PhD students. They read the same texts and pursue similar research. Students from all the degree programs attend Divinity School chapel services and the weekly community lunches. More informal, they socialize together.

Nevertheless, like all graduate students, Divinity School students are pursuing specialized paths in pursuit of specialized vocations. Some are preparing to be clergy in traditional congregations. Others want to be teachers in a college or seminary. Still others are seeking some kind of specialized ministry — chaplaincy or social service. Doctoral students prepare for their comprehensive exams and write their dissertations, while ministry students do their field work and satisfy other requirements of their denominations.

There are advantages and disadvantages to these intersecting and diverging vocational paths. The diversity enriches the Divinity School community. Students bring multiple perspectives and a variety of experiences into these classroom discussions and bring their classmates. A ministry student brings insights from her Buddhism class to her suburban congregation, while the doctoral student in Islam gets a new perspective from a student preparing for the Episcopal priesthood.

While students benefit from each others’ perspectives, however, they rarely get a chance to share the passions that lie behind those perspectives. All graduate students are well aware that all people involved with theological education — Divinity School students are busy. They rarely get a chance to reflect on their vocations with each other. Such reflection, when it does take place, happens within their cohorts, with people in the same degree program. A doctoral student may know what a ministry student thinks about Buddhism, but not why she cares and how it might influence her vocation.

The Divinity School initiated the Border Crossing Project in fall 2007 to encourage that sort of collaborative reflection on vocation.

The project aims to create opportunities in the school where students preparing for ministry and students preparing for teaching careers can reflect on the commitments and curiosities behind their vocations. While students pursue very diverse specialized goals, the school believes that the two professions have both commonalities and differences that, if investigated in an intentional and engaged way, could enhance vocational understanding and practice all around.

A significant project initiative broadens the staffing for a vital course sequence in the Divinity School’s ministry program. All second-year Master of Divinity students take a three-course sequence in the arts of ministry, with classes in preaching, worship, and pastoral care. Generally, these classes have been taught by full-time members of the faculty, who may or may not have had ministry experience.

With the support of the project, these classes are now taught by a three-member team. A full-time faculty member takes the lead and ultimate responsibility for the class. A doctoral student brings insights from his or her academic research and an ethics student brings new insights to vital issues of pastoral care.

For instance, while a student of religion and literature helps preaching students think about performance, a clergy person offers wisdom from his or her years of parish experience as well as research and reflection.

This team teaching has benefited everyone involved. The ministry students get a broad perspective on the arts of ministry and encouragement to reflect on their own vocational paths and identities. Faculty members find their own teaching enriched by the participation of colleagues. Doctoral students get good teaching experience and an opportunity to think about a possible vocation in theological education. Clergy members find their vocations enriched by a bracing teaching experience.

The project includes other new teaching models. A similar teaching team leads the research seminar for third-year ministry students preparing their senior theses, similarly broadening what happens in the classroom and in student independent research. An advanced graduate student teaches an elective course for ministry students on a class closely related to her or his research, connecting new research at the Divinity School with the classroom.

The project’s theologians-in-residence program encourages ministry and doctoral students to collaborate with a local congregation around an issue of the pulpit and classroom. Students apply as a team, using their different experiences and perspectives to address the congregation’s needs. A ministry student and a doctoral student in the New Testament, for instance, led an adult education class about the Eschaton. Another team, composed of a ministry student and a doctoral student in religion and literature, organized an outreach to Catholic young adults focused on architecture, liturgy, and the arts.

The congregations benefited from the students’ variety of experience, and the students investigated how their vocations diverged and intersected. The Divinity School is encouraging others, both inside and outside the school, to reflect on these questions. At a series of lunches, students have talked about their own vocations and what they have learned from participating in these classes. These lunches have drawn in other students as well as faculty members from across the university. Quarterly conferences for students, faculty, and local clergy address broad issues of religious practice and vocation. A session on advocacy, for instance, got participants to consider how churches and universities are similar and different as places of theological and political advocacy. An upcoming conference will draw...
To Prevail in Jerusalem

Brian Britt, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, bbritt@vt.edu

Bring me my Bow of burning gold; 
Bring me my Arrows of desire ... 
I will not cease from Mental Fight, 
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand: 
Till we have built Jerusalem, 
In England’s green and pleasant Land. 

- William Blake, “Jerusalem” (Preface, Milton: A Poem, 1804)

Brian Britt is Professor of Religious Studies in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. His research on literary and theoretical approaches to the Bible combines the analysis of biblical texts with questions of contemporary culture. In addition to articles in religious studies journals, his work includes Walter Benjamin and the Bible (Esben Mellen Press, 2003), Rewriting Moses: The Narrative Eclipse of the Text (GT&T Clark/Continuum, 2004), and the coedited volume with Alexander Caffeli, Religion, Gender, and Culture in the Pre-Modern World (Palgrave MacMillan Press, 2007). He is completing a study of biblical curses and their modern legacy. He received his PhD from the University of Chicago Divinity School.

WHAT DOES THE future hold for Jerusalem? The question is as ancient as Jerusalem itself, and fundamental to its traditions. Hope and longing characterize biblical texts, messianic traditions, and religious practices concerning the city. Today, the “arrows of desire” described by William Blake (above) seem to fly at the city from all directions. Idealized even by its inhabitants, Jerusalem embodies Western desires more than any other place.

With this desire come strong, dangerous feelings. When you walk through the city, it is easy to hear these feelings expressed by Palestinians, Israelis, and Western visitors. There is sentimentality, vengefulness, lament, and much more. It is tempting to indulge in these feelings, which sharpen some perceptions only by dulling others. It is tempting to exaggerate the longer and the deprivations of the city, but one need not go far beyond Jerusalem to find worse economic and political conditions.

The biblical imperative to remember Jerusalem in Psalm 137, like so many literary expressions (including Blake’s), is an imperative to cling with passion, but this passion takes many forms from which politics and religion are inseparable. Most discussions of Jerusalem suffer from a dualistic view of the world as one part “religious” and one part “secular.”

Boundaries, Walls, and Identities

Jerusalem is really two cities today, contrary to much political rhetoric. Though signs mark the anniversary of the “reunification” of the city in 1967 at the Jaffa Gate and elsewhere, the city has two main bus terminals, two public markets, distinct commercial districts, and separate (but overlapping) systems of education, security, sanitation, and other services. The vision of a united city is further undercut by the imbalance in distributing municipal resources. While about a third of the city is Arab, the city government allocates between 8.5 and 11.75 percent of its budget to Arab East Jerusalem (Mehr Mangis, Discrimination in the Heart of the Holy City, Jerusalem: ICCP, 2006, 111). These facts are not hotly disputed, though many would say that Arabs prefer not to request or even receive support from the Israeli-run Jerusalem government. What makes the division of Jerusalem complete are the many physical, overt, and informal boundaries between neighborhoods.

I tell my students they can understand the Middle East better by studying the past 150 years rather than the past 3,000. Modern nationalism, colonialism, Orientalism, and the Holocaust go a long way to explaining current realities, but one must also grapple with how the past is used and, more indirectly, how ancient traditions live on. Striking this balance is nearly impossible: well-regarded books by Karen Armstrong, Martin Gilbert, and Simon Goldhill on Jerusalem fail to provide critical perspective on competing desires for the city, defining religion and politics in narrow institutional terms (Karen Armstrong, Jerusalem: One City, Three Faiths, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996; Simon Goldhill, Jerusalem: City of Longing, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008; Martin Gilbert, Jerusalem: Rebirth of a City, New York: Viking, 1985, and Jerusalem in the Twentieth Century, New York: John Wiley, 1996). But the pious traditions of the city are inseparable from economic and political systems, and they frequently change as residents of the city seek to make a living amid the ruins, political conflict, and sporadic tourism of the holy city.

There can be no debating the extent to which geographic, religious, and ethnic walls define the boundaries of Jerusalem. Standing near the walls of the Old City, the wall (or “fence”) separating “Jerusalem” from the “West Bank,” by some accounts dividing one part of Jerusalem from another, suggests a rich analogy between the past and the present. Roughly equal in height and function, the two walls are nevertheless opposites of each other: one belongs to the “religious” past, the other to the “secular” present. In this sense, the two walls represent the antinomy of tradition and modernity, the dynamic of persistence and change in Western monotheism.

To ponder the two walls is not to relish a postmodern irony, even though the juxtaposition has received shockingly little notice. Nor is it to denounce all walls and barriers as such, even though a good reason to doubt the lasting value of walls as a technology for keeping populations and territories distinct in an age of globalization and the Internet. Walls, after all, are expensive, both in economic and cultural terms; the new barrier wall is only a part of an elaborate system of checkpoints running through Israel and the West Bank. An extension of the “us and them” thinking often emphasized in monothestic traditions, these walls and boundaries threaten to make the city the most unwelcoming, un-Jewish, un-Christian, and un-Muslim one on earth. One factor behind the wall’s appeal, I believe, is blindness to “biblical” forms of modern identity formation.

Hidden forms of biblical identity coexist with openly biblical declarations, whether by Christian Zionists in the United States or Jewish Zionists of many kinds. For Moshe Dayan (Living with the Bible, New York: Bantam, 1978, viii. See also Nur Masalha, The Bible and Zionism, London: Zed Books, 2007), the establishment of Israel and the capture of Jerusalem represented a fundamental reversal between imagination and reality:

My parents who came from another country sought to make the idea of their imagination, drawn from descriptions in the Bible, their physical homeland. In some what the reverse way, I sought to give my real and tangible homeland the added dimension of historical depth, to bring to life the strata of the past which now lay beneath the desolate ruins and archaeologi cal mounds — the Israel of our patriarchs, our judges, our kings, our prophets.


By themselves, such sectarian forms of biblical identity could not thrive without “secular” values, most prominent of which are “freedom” and “democracy.” Only by conforming these “secular” categories to the discourse of “us and them,” by drawing new lines of righteous group identity, can more explicitly “religious” identities gain a foothold. Yet the biblical traditions invoked today bear scarce resemblance to their ancient or medieval forms. Biblical distinctions between “us” and “them” arose long before the invention of bureaucratic methods of ghettoization, concentration camps, and atomic bombs. These technologies enable the most destructive and efficient means of enforcing identity differences ever known. In a religious landscape where “bad faith” characterizes so many uses of religious tradition, biblical hermeneutics by itself stands little useful.
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chance of reducing religious and political violence. What is needed instead is a robust suspicion of the map that divides life between “secular” and “religious” domains.

The Hot Potato of Sovereignty

Without appeals to sentimentality or tragedy, we can say the Israelis are “stuck” with the burden of legitimacy, or at least the upper hand in the claim to legitimate sovereignty in Jerusalem. Bush’s course, control of the city forms a crucial part of nationalist discourse — the “reunification” of the city in 1967 is memorialized every where next to signs celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of the founding of Israel. The trend throughout the city is to build up Jewish areas: luxury hotels and housing in Mamilla, outlets in East Jerusalem, Silwan, and the Old City, and the hilly neighborhoods springing up in the outskirts to house new immigrants and the fast-growing ultra-Orthodox (haredi) population.

How are the Israelis “stuck”? Imagine being responsible for the preservation and maintenance of the Egyptian pyramids, the Taj Mahal, or even Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello. In terms of religious demography and scale, the burden of Jerusalem exceeds any of these single monuments. But the crisis is already measurable: secular Israelis are leaving Jerusalem, the local economy is stagnant, and 78 percent of Israelis either refuse or prefer not to live there (Greg Myre, “Israel Rider. Love Jerusalem, Hate Living There,” New York Times, May 13, 2007). Popular distaste for Jerusalem reveals an Israeli contradiction between desire and fulfillment, imagination and reality: Israeli “control” of Jerusalem not only fails to weaken Palestinian claims, it has also failed to translate into proportional Israeli growth. What is more, the current period of stalled negotiations and relative quiet (broken recently by attacks by Palestinians from villages near Jerusalem) only makes visible the great expense of maintaining tension between the multicultural myth and the adversarial reality. The recently constructed separation or security wall can be seen from many places within the city, ripp ing across the landscape as a repudiation of the “reunification” discourse.

Unlike the insular United States, Israel is considered the front line in the clash of civilizations. President Bush made this point with explicit gratitude in his May 2008 speech to the Israeli Knesset, reaffirming United States support for Israel as crucial to his goal of spreading democracy and democracy across the region. But the devour ing culture of antiterror vigilance and checkpoints has come to define Israel at no small cost to other potential investments of resources. Without such a costly, melodramatic display of adversarial contrasts, the very idea of a clash of civilizations would be impossible. Like all cultural and political checkpoints, freedom and democracy in the Middle East is dependent upon the ability of defending civilizations in these terms, it must continue pouring resources into the city, its security systems, and the settlements surrounding it, even while thousands of Israelis leave the city in search of a different kind of life shaped by other kinds of desire.

To “prevail in this struggle,” as Bush said in Jerusalem, is to compel the values of freedom and democracy across the people of the Middle East, by force if necessary. One of Bush’s greatest successes has been to link “religious” (“Judeo-Christian”) values with democracy and freedom. He has filled a vacuum created by the dualism of “secularity” and “religion” with a powerful union of the two. Bush’s victory in the war in Iraq in May 2003. Western desires for Jerusalem, more forceful and ardent among Christians than Jews (if only because world Christians outnumber Jews by at least 12:1), now contribute mightily to the failure to achieve political compromise.
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on insights from both the church and the academy and the impact of globalization and intercultural experiences on the church’s international mission work.

The Border Crossing Project anticipates significant benefits from these various initiatives, for both individuals and institutions. The school hopes to create more substantial connections between ministry students and doctoral students inside and outside the classroom, and those who had not connected on their commitments and vocations. The substantial proportion of ministry students at the Divinity School who go on to doctoral study will be better prepared for such work, clearer about why they are there and where their careers might take them. Doctoral students interested in a vocation in theological education and who had not considered the idea — will be better prepared intellectually and personally for such a path.

There are also payoffs for Divinity School faculty. Professors with ministry backgrounds will have opportunities to think about the intersections of their churchly and academic vocations. Those without church connections can explore the world of faith communities in a collaborative way.

The project will also have institutional benefits. The Divinity School will build connections between students in its various degree programs, improving its preparation for ministry and for teaching careers. The project’s use of clergy and congregations in a variety of teaching initiatives will also build its connections to faith communities and to neighboring seminaries. Participating clergy will have the opportunity to refresh their theological educations by working with faculty and students.

Ultimately, school leaders hope that the Border Crossing Project will benefit both the church and the academy. These two callings — teaching and ministry — require practitioners who are deeply reflective about their vocations and commitments. Students and congregation members need teachers and clergy who are not only well-trained but also clear in their motives. Through these programs, Divinity School students can enter into their vocations with a better sense of who they are and why they do what they do.

But the patent fakeness of such a frontier narrative, along with its astronomical expense, contributes to the burden of Israeli legitimacy. Israeliialized citizens of the frontier, pay a disproportionately high price in psychological terms as well. As many recent expressions of popular cine ma and culture show (whether Adam and Rise, Amiel Kollek’s 2007 Betray and Yoav Shamir’s 2008 Flipping Out), the work of occupation dehumanizes all sides.

Bush Doctrine: Freedom to Prevail

The last three American presidents have charted a series of steadily worsening interventions in Israel. Ironically, yet all three have highlighted Jerusalem as the focus of their desires for political and religious peacemaking. President Bush’s remarks during his May visit promulgated his long-standing doctrine of promoting freedom and democracy in the Middle East. Though couched in these universal terms, the speech nevertheless showed a familiar “us and them” rhetoric of righteous conflict, one that cemented the blend of religion and politics at the heart of American policy:

Ultimately, to prevail in this struggle, we must offer an alternative to the ideology of the extremists by extending our vision of justice and tolerance and freedom and hope. These values are the self-evident right of all people, of all religions, in all the world because they are a gift from the Almighty God. Securing these rights is also the surest way to secure peace. . . . Societies where citizens can express their conscience and worship their God will not export violence, they will be partners in peace. . . . Above all, we must have faith in our values and ourselves and confidently pursue the expansion of liberty as the path to a peaceful future (Online at www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/ 2008/05/20080515-1.html).

Bush’s well-known political and religious clarity requires a sharp distinction between extremists ("they") and "we" who love justice, tolerance, freedom, and hope. By this logic, Jerusalem, the symbolic capital of the Judeo-Christian political-religious civilization, demands a struggle in which civilization will prevail over those extremists. Instead of building a culture of peace, defending civilization in these terms, it must continue pouring resources into the city, its security systems, and the settlements surrounding it, even while thousands of Israelis leave the city in search of a different kind of life shaped by other kinds of desire.

To "prevail in this struggle," as Bush said in Jerusalem, is to compel the values of freedom and democracy across the people of the Middle East, by force if necessary. One of Bush’s greatest successes has been to link "religious" ("Judeo-Christian") values with democracy and freedom. He has filled a vacuum created by the dualism of "secularity" and "religion" with a powerful union of the two. Bush’s victory in the war in Iraq in May 2003. Western desires for Jerusalem, more forceful and ardent among Christians than Jews (if only because world Christians outnumber Jews by at least 12:1), now contribute mightily to the failure to achieve political compromise.
The Case Study Initiative: Teaching Pluralism

Elinor J. Pierce, Pluralism Project at Harvard University

Driven by Faith or Customer Service? Muslim Taxi Drivers at the MSP Airport

When Steve Wareham heard that there had been another formal complaint about taxi service at the Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport (MSP), it came as no surprise. As Airport Director, Wareham had been working with the taxi advisory council for years to improve customer service. Together, they enhanced the taxicab ordinance with input from drivers, owners, and taxi companies. Wareham was proud of the progress made on key service issues through this collaborative process. But not every problem had been solved: one issue, which threatened to derail the larger process, had been tabled.

Beginning in 2002, airport staff became aware that some passengers who were carrying alcohol — often visible in the plastic bags from duty-free shops — had been refused taxi service. The drivers, many of whom were Muslims from Somalia, explained that their faith did not permit them to consume or transport alcohol. Wareham and his colleagues at the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC), the regional governing body for the airport, found the issue troubling. Such service refusals were prohibited by the taxicab ordinance: drivers who refused a fare for any reason were sent to the end of the line, and had to wait two to four hours for another fare. Losing fares represented a significant economic and practical hardship; for the drivers, this was an issue of religious accommodation.

Yet, given the practical concerns that arose curbside, and the number of passenger complaints, refusals had also emerged as a serious customer service issue. Passengers being refused service from one taxi might disrupt the flow of traffic, and posed a safety concern. Those who were refused service were confused and frustrated, and often insulted: on one occasion, a traveler threw a bottle of wine to the pavement in anger.

Since Wareham became Airport Director in 2004, he had worked closely with Landside, the department that handles parking and commercial vehicles, to resolve the issue. Early on, he sought input from Somali community representatives and Muslim leaders. For a time, the taxi starter — a dispatcher employed by the MAC — would provide bags to travelers in order to cover the wine or other visible alcohol. It was a “don’t see, don’t look” policy. This worked for a while, but soon the drivers began refusing service to those carrying the distinctive bags. One cab company, which had all Muslim drivers, suggested that the starter refer passengers with alcohol to a cab from another company. After a few days, the MAC was asked to discontinue the practice: the loss of business proved difficult for the drivers and owners alike.

On March 29, 2006, Wareham received a message from Vicki Tigwell, the chair of the MAC. She forwarded the most recent customer complaint:

My wife and I needed a cab from MSP to Apple Valley. The starter directed us to a cab. After loading most of our luggage, he (the driver) noticed I was carrying duty-free liquor, and refused to transport us. The next three cabs also refused. The starter came out and finally located a driver who would take us. We were very unhappy about this. What are the risks of doing nothing? Students may also explore the larger consequences of decision-making: “What are the risks of doing something?” Students may be asked to vote: “How many of you are impressed by the approach Wareham is taking?” As the conversation progresses, students are asked, “Is this the real issue or are there other issues?” And, “Is there a compromise here, or is there a full set of options?”

“Driven by Faith” clearly presents a dilemma: in doing so, it also provides a means to grapple with some of the important issues our society faces in confronting the challenges of religious pluralism. As in all of the Pluralism Project’s cases, it grows out of a real controversy and may be understood as emblematic of a larger issue. In this instance, the question of how Wareham might respond to the Airport Commission’s call to solve the problem of fare refusals — amidst competing interests — raises complex issues about the limits of religious accommodation.

The case study takes Steve Wareham as its central character, outlining his perspective, professional path, and commitment to a collaborative process. It briefly mentions applicable ordinances and laws as a point of reference; it also includes, as an attachment, the ruling, or fatwa, from a local Muslim organization on the issue. The case highlights other voices, including taxi drivers who believe this is an issue of religious accommodation and the passengers who consider it an issue of customer service. The narrative also describes the unique setting of the dispute: a Midwestern airport, which the majority of the drivers are Somali Muslim refugees. Through thick description, students are better able to “inhabit” the case and take an imaginative leap into the controversy when asked, “If you were Steve Wareham, how would you respond?” Or, “If you were a taxi driver, what solution might you propose?”

The written case provides a starting point for critical thinking, investigation, and discussion. As students begin to engage with the case, they explore some of the questions that will arise for them in their professional lives as educators or clergy, or in their public lives as citizens of a complex and religiously diverse society. In the course of case discussion, students become active participants who are asked to analyze situations, identify boundary conditions, formulate responses, evaluate performances, and construct creative responses to conflict.

The discussion itself is guided by a series of questions, which are often open-ended: “What, if anything, does Wareham need to know about the religious needs of the drivers to make this decision?” In discussion, students may also explore the larger consequences of decision-making: “What are the risks of doing nothing?” Students may be asked to vote: “How many of you are impressed by the approach Wareham is taking?” As the conversation progresses, students are asked, “Is this the real issue or are there other issues?” And, “Is there a compromise here, or is there a full set of options?”

“Driven by Faith” is in two parts: the “A” case brings the reader from the description of the dilemma to the point of a proposed solution; the “B” case describes the outcomes and resolution of the dispute. For more information about the case study initiative, please contact Elinor J. Pierce at epierce@fas.harvard.edu.
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NAPTS Call for Papers 2009

The North American Paul Tillich Society welcomes proposals on the following topics for presentations at its Annual Meeting in Montréal on November 6–7, 2009: Submit electronic proposals to David Nikkel by April 1, 2009, at david.nikkel@unr.edu:

- Tillich and the “death of God” theology.
- Tillich and the “new atheism.” Given Tillich’s endorsement of an element of atheism in any viable theology and his expression of appreciation for the challenges hurled by some atheists, what might be Tillich’s assessment of the so-called new atheism?
- Tillich after Mark C. Taylor’s After God. Proposals may relate to Taylor’s appropriation of Tillich’s theology to represent a (monistic) type of religion; comparison of their respective concepts of God or of the divine; and/or comparisons of their respective understandings of the relation between religion and culture.
- Tillich in comparison with Canadian philosophers and theologians Douglas John Hall, Gregory Baum, and/or Charles Taylor.

- The metaphysics of Paul Tillich and Albert Einstein — two forms of ecstatic naturalism?
- Tillich and Evangelicalism in conversation — the “emerging church” and a theology of culture.
- Responses to recent books on Tillich: Andrew Fineman’s Hearts of Darkness — on original sin in the theology of Tillich, Niebuhr, and Billy Graham — or Ronald Stone’s Moral Reflections on Foreign Policy in a Religious War.
- Responses to Tillich’s recently published first course (1920) on philosophy of religion.
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JAAR Call for Papers

The Return of Religion after “Religion”: Consequences for Theology and Religious Studies

TALK ABOUT “the return of religion” continues to be omnipresent in public conversation and within a variety of academic fields. Along with this talk about religion’s return has come a new attention to theology. Indeed, the centrality of theology is evident in the work of scholars who are not themselves theologians (the work of Agamben, Badiou, and Zizek on political theology; Eric Santner’s notion of “psychotology”; the attention to theology in recent American political philosophy in William Connolly’s Why I Am Not a Socialist and Jeffrey Stout’s Democracy and Tradition).

However, public talk about the return of religion is taking place at precisely the same time as we see within the academic study of religion a sharp genealogical critique of the category “religion” by theologians and religious studies scholars. In the return of religion, how do we make sense of this juxtaposition? How are we to think about the prominence of public discourse about “religion” precisely when the category is under fire within the academic study of religion? JAAR invites proposals for a special issue that critically examines the return of religion after “religion” and its consequences for both theology and religious studies.

What is the meaning of the “return of religion” for theology and religious studies more broadly? How might genealogical interrogations of the category “religion” by theologians and religious studies scholars reconfigure both fields? How do we think these two questions together? How will the growing prominence of religious voices in the public sphere reshape our ideas about theological reflection and the work of religious studies more broadly? What obligations fall to theologians and religious studies scholars in investigating which religion is an integral or contested aspect of public discourse? How do both scholarly communities take up this nexus of issues in a context marked by robust religious diversity?

Deadline for submission is Monday, June 1, 2009.

Please submit papers to:
Journal of the American Academy of Religion
Department of Religious Studies
PO Box 400126
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4126
Please direct queries to jaar@virginia.edu.

Religion and Reasons: Justification, Argument, and Cultural Difference

ARE RELIGIOUS reasons similar to or fundamentally different from scientific and scholarly reasons? The JAAR invites papers that explore the features of reason, justification, and legitimation in religious contexts. Religions provide many kinds of reasons for belief and action. Much attention, for example, has been given to the forms of reasoning embedded in cultural forms labeled as “magic” and “divination,” and similar issues arise for a host of other practices, including textual exegesis.

Do particular examples of religious reasoning bring fundamental problems for understanding across cultures or conceptual schemes? How are reasons, whether religious or scientific, implicated in contestations for influence or power? Does consideration of religious reasoning challenge contemporary academic understandings of what counts as reason or rationality? Topics may include but are not limited to:

- The forms of reasoning embedded in interpretative activities such as divination, dream interpretation, and textual exegesis;
- The roles of extraordinary states (such as mysticism, shamanism, possession, and paranormal phenomena) in discovering and legitimating both knowledge and norms for practice;
- The persuasive dimensions of performative practices, including dance and theater;
- The philosophical grounds for argumentation, rhetoric, and cross-cultural interpretation; and
- The complexities in accounts of Western, scientific, or scholarly reasoning that are constructed with religious reasoning. We particularly encourage papers that offer both specific case studies and theoretical reflection.

Deadline for submission is Monday, August 3, 2009.

Please submit papers to:
Journal of the American Academy of Religion
Department of Religious Studies
PO Box 400126
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22904-4126
Please direct queries to jaar@virginia.edu.

Attention to embodiment and the religious significance of bodies is one of the most significant shifts in recent theology. Yet, however, little of this attention has been paid to disability as an aspect of human embodiment. Disability and Christian Theology seeks to correct this oversight. The author reviews possibilities for theological engagement with disability, focusing on three primary tasks: challenging existing theological methods to engage with the disabled body, analyzing possibilities for a disability liberation theology, and exploring new theological options based on an understanding of the universality of human limits.

Limits are an unavoidable aspect of being human, a reality we often forget or deny. Yet not only do all humans experience limits, most of us experience limits in the form of disability at some point in our lives. In this sense, disability is more “normal” than its absence. If we take such experiences seriously and refuse to reduce them to mere instances of suffering, the author asserts, we discover insights that are unavailable when we take a perfect or generic body as the starting point for our theological reflections.

Out of the many possible applications of this insights, this book focuses on two areas of particular interest: theological anthropology and metaphors for God. Creamer offers new images and possibilities for theological construction that attend appropriately to diversity in human embodiment.


The topic of death and dying confronts us with profound questions about the nature of human existence, God, and the possibilities of an afterlife. Teaching it therefore represents special challenges. Courses on some aspect of death and dying, which first emerged in the 1960s, can now be found at most institutions of higher learning. But such courses tend to stress the psychosocial aspects of grief and bereavement while ignoring the religious elements inherent in the subject.

This is the first collection of scholarly essays to address the teaching of courses on death and dying from a religious studies perspective. It brings together scholars with an interest in death studies from across a broad and varied range of disciplinary perspectives, including religious studies, theology, philosophy, psychology, social work, history, education, and medicine.

The book provides an overview of the subject and considers what a course on death and dying should accomplish; examines practical applications of the study of death and dying; presents ideas for the use of film and other media in teaching a course; illustrates ways to bring the students out of the classroom with different approaches to site visits; and covers beliefs in the afterlife and anomalous paranormal experiences relating to such beliefs.


This book raises in a new way a central question of Christology: What is the divine motive for the incarnation? Throughout Christian history, a majority of Western theologians have agreed that God’s decision to become incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ was made necessary by “the Fall” — if humans had not sinned, the incarnation would not have happened. This position is known as “infralapsarian.” A minority of theologians, however, including some major nineteenth and twentieth century theological figures, championed a “supralapsarian” Christology, arguing that God has always intended the incarnation, independent of “the Fall.” Van Driel offers the first scholarly monograph to map and analyze the full range of supralapsarian arguments. He gives a thick description of each argument and its theological consequences, and evaluates the theological gains and losses inherent in each approach. He shows that each of the three ways in which God is thought to relate to all that is not God — in creation, in redemption, and in eschatological consummation — can serve as the basis for a supralapsarian argument. Van Driel illustrates this thesis with detailed case studies of the Christologies of Schleiermacher, Dornet, and Barth. He concludes that the most fruitful supralapsarian strategy is rooted in the notion of eschatological consummation, taking interpersonal interaction with God to be the goal of incarnation. He goes on to develop his own argument along these lines, concluding in an eschatological vision in which God is visually, audible, and tangibly present in the midst of God’s people.


In a culture increasingly focused on visual media, students have learned not only to embrace multimedia presentations in the classroom, but to expect them. Such expectations are perhaps equally prevalent in a field as dynamic and cross-disciplinary as religious studies. The practice poses some difficult educational issues, but the use of movies in academic coursework has far outpaced the scholarship on teaching religion and film. What does it mean to utilize film in religious studies, and what are the best ways to do it?

In this book, an interdisciplinary team of scholars thinks about the theoretical and pedagogical concerns involved with the intersection of film and religion in the classroom. They examine the use of film to teach specific religious traditions, religious theories, and perspectives on fundamental human values.

Some instructors already teach some versions of a film and religion course, and many have integrated film as an ancillary to achieving central course goals. This collection of essays helps them understand the field better and draws the sharp distinction between merely “watching movies” in the classroom and comprehending film in an informed and critical way.


---

Did you know that you have access to some of the most creative and innovative syllabi in the field?

The Syllabus Project offers a wide range of course syllabi from scholars working within the academic study of religion. Find out more by visiting www.aarweb.org/Programs/Syllabus_Project.
The Place of Personal Faith in the Classroom

John D. Barbour, St. Olaf College

Any religious studies professors consider personal references to one’s own faith to be out of place in an academic context. Even professors of biblical studies and theology at the church-related liberal arts college where I teach are cautious about revealing their religious convictions. We want students to learn to think critically. Nevertheless, I think we scholars of religion are so worried about looking like Sunday-school teachers or evangelists that we do not explain our own religious convictions when it would be appropriate to do so.

As I’ve gotten older (I am now 56), I’ve become more comfortable about revealing my views, which I used to conceal as much as possible. Although students don’t care for self-indulgence, proselytizing, or bias in the classroom, they welcome candid statements about what a professor thinks, including what he believes about some matter of faith, if the comments compare his position with other possibilities and invite discussion and contrasting views.

It can be appropriate for a professor to speak of faith in that way, just as it can be appropriate for a political scientist to explain her political opinions, an art historian to justify his assessments of works of art, or a scientist to espouse a particular energy or environmental policy. In most fields, teachers must learn to balance critical distance and passionate engagement with their subject matter.

To be sure, the study of religion is different from other academic fields. At public universities, professors must honor the separation of church and state. Students are to be taught about religion, not indoctrinated in a specific faith. And at public and private institutions alike, practitioners of religious studies have been anxious to prove that they can be as tough-minded and academically rigorous as their colleagues in any other discipline. That often means trying to be detached, scientific, impersonal, or value-neutral as possible.

Scholarly detachment is crucial, whether one is expounding Aquinas or studying Islam’s impact on the gender roles of Indonesian villagers. In stark contrast with much of their previous experience, students should be exposed in a college classroom to the idea that religious assertions have intellectual content, which can be discussed rationally. But analysis and assessment should not mean that references to one’s own views (which may, of course, be a lack of religious belief) are somehow illegitimate. Something important is lost when a teacher is not able—because of external or internal constraints—to articulate a personal response to the religious issues at stake.

An older colleague who teaches philosophical ethics told me: “I used to be vigilant about never revealing my own position on any issue. I was worried about suppressing a student’s viewpoint. Now I realize that students are tougher than we give them credit for. We professors overestimate our impact on our students. They encounter many teachers and will find their own way.”

Students need something to respond to. They desire teachers who know where they stand and who can articulate and criticize their own views. I think I’m just getting to the point where I can do that comfortably, at least on certain occasions.

Although students don’t care for self-indulgence, proselytizing, or bias in the classroom, they welcome candid statements about what a professor thinks, including what he believes about some matter of faith, if the comments compare his position with other possibilities and invite discussion and contrasting views.

Sometimes I offer my own interpretation of a scriptural passage and explain how it influences my version of Christian faith. In a theology course, I observed that, for me, the resurrection is meaningful not as a statement about what happened to Jesus’s body, but as a symbol of the disciples’ renewed commitment to his message. I also explained why most Christians would criticize that view. In a class on religious autobiography, I commented that Kathleen Norris’s Daben appeals to me because its “spiritual geography” makes me think about what spaces are sacred for me, and because it shows why a Benedictine monastery’s ritual and communal life can appeal to a Protestant.

As I try to get students to appreciate a literary text, I might explain how it says or shows something about what is holy— for the author but potentially also for me, and for students. Our responses to a vision of ultimate reality require not simply detached observation but appreciation and imaginative engagement, which necessarily engage one’s own values.

How and when one refers to one’s own views or beliefs depends a lot on situational context and culture. I feel fortunate to teach at a college that allows and encourages the process of “faith seeking understanding,” in Anselm’s words, without imposing any litmus test of orthodoxy or common belief. A liberal arts college, especially one associated with a religious tradition, can offer more genuine intellectual freedom than some public institutions do. A colleague in economics tells me that he no longer has to avoid discussions of religious values when they arise naturally in his field, the way he did when he taught at a major state university.

Of course, an atheist, Jew, evangelical Christian, or Muslim, for example, might feel stifled by the majority of liberal Protestants and Catholics at my institution. Professors of religious studies face different challenges at different colleges, and in teaching various subjects. At some religious institutions, religion professors are supposed to defend the denomination’s creed and must be very tactful when they express any doubts or dissent they have. And a friend who teaches the Bible in a conservative part of the country says: “I won’t open the door to the proselytizers and those who can only accept one religious position as valid. I need a high wall between academic study and pious testimony.”

At every institution, the power imbalance in the classroom tempts students to try to please teachers by agreeing with their positions. And although I am willing to take the risks involved in speaking about what I believe and why, for other professors—the untutored, those who are fervent skeptics or believers, and members of controversial religious groups—the risks are far greater.

Three generalizations about speaking of faith seem to apply. First, the most significant references to one’s own views usually come at unpredictable moments in the course of teaching, rather than as the kind of ritualized confessions of so-called social location that many academics now do as a set piece. Second, an instructor’s reference to her own views should never be an end in itself but be pedagogically valuable—to explain the subject matter, and to show students that self-critical awareness of one’s own views can influence one’s interpretations. And third, many students are enormously relieved to learn that the instructor, too, has doubts, uncertainties, or views that are at odds with other members of his religious tradition.

As I think back to moments when I’ve explained my own religious beliefs in class, I realize that I was also expressing another kind of “faith seeking understanding”: my version of faith in the values underlying the academic enterprise. I was giving testimony about the significance of the subject matter and the humanities. I asserted the values of encountering ancient traditions and difficult texts, of self-criticism, and of giving reasons for what one believes.

Most of all, I tried to get my students to see why a book or an idea mattered, why it might speak to them as it spoke to me. I find myself, pretty far down the road of my career, more often explaining, thinking out loud about, and seeking further understanding of what I’ve been doing as a teacher all these years.

In the Next Issue of Spotlight on Theological Education:

Theological Illiteracy and Its Effect on the Enterprise of Theological Education
Summer Seminars on Theologies of Religious Pluralism and Comparative Theology: Cohort Two

The American Academy of Religion is pleased to announce the formation of Cohort Two of our Luce Summer Seminars.

These week-long seminars will provide training to theological education faculty who often prepare students for future religious leadership and ministry. The Theological Education Steering Committee invites applications from theological educators interested in pursuing questions about the meaning of religious diversity. The seminars will help address the question of religious diversity as a properly theological question: What is the meaning of my neighbor's faith for me? While we expect that the bulk of applicants will come from seminaries and divinity schools, we also welcome theological educators who teach in theology and religious studies departments.

The seminars, composed of twenty-five participants and eight instructors, are designed for those relatively new to the theologies of religious pluralism and comparative theology, allowing them to learn from expert scholars and advance their understanding. The result of the summer seminars will be to increase the number of theological educators who can teach in the areas of theologies of religious pluralism and comparative theology in a variety of institutions in which theological education takes place. All accepted applicants will be awarded a cash stipend of $1,000, plus the grant will cover their expenses incurred during their participation in the seminars.

Cohort Two will meet June 13–20, 2010, at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, then on October 29, 2010, at the Annual Meeting, Atlanta, and, finally May 29–June 5, 2011, at the University of Chicago Divinity School, Chicago.

The application deadline for Cohort Two is January 15, 2010. All accepted applicants will be notified by mid-February 2010.

Further information on the seminars can be found at www.aarweb.org/Programs/Summer_Seminars or by contacting the Project Director, John J. Thatamanil, Vanderbilt Divinity School, john.j.thatamanil@vanderbilt.edu.

Dean of the School of Theology

Azusa Pacific University invites applications and nominations for the position of dean and professor of the School of Theology. The dean reports directly to the provost and serves as the chief administrator of the school through providing academic and administrative leadership. The School of Theology is divided into the Undergraduate Division and the C.P. Haggard Graduate School of Theology. The C.P. Haggard Graduate School of Theology's programs are accredited by the Association of Theological Schools. The School of Theology enrolls 320 graduate students, 228 undergraduate students, and engages APU’s 4,000 undergraduate students, all of whom are required to take 18 units of courses within the school.

The dean is responsible for improving and promoting the quality and effectiveness of the school’s instructional, research, and service programs, community engagement, and resource development. The dean also works closely with the university president in holding in trust the theological and biblical direction of the university, providing both proactive and responsive leadership for evangelical, faith-informed learning.

Azusa Pacific University is a private Christian university, accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, that offers liberal arts and professional programs of higher education. As an evangelical Christian institution, APU affirms the supremacy of Christ in all areas of life and expects its employees to model Christian values in their professional and nonprofessional activities.

Position is subject to final funding.

For a complete job description, see www.apu.edu/provost/employment/positions/.

Applicant should send a letter of inquiry, vitae, an APU faculty application (found at www.apu.edu/provost/employment/apply/), a short essay explaining their philosophy of Christian higher education, specifically that of theological higher education and how the School of Theology serves the local church, and references to:

Michael Whyte, Ph.D.
Office of the Provost
Azusa Pacific University
PO Box 7000
Azusa, California 91702-7000

Azusa Pacific University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, age, disability, or status as a veteran in any of its policies, practices, or procedures. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply.
In the Public Interest

Barack Obama's Endorsement of Faith-based Initiatives: Bringing Religion to the Public Square in the Context of the Separation of Church and State

Andrew Flescher, California State University, Chico

O BAMA'S announcement this past June that he would expand the scope and commitment of George W. Bush's policy of steering federal social service dollars to religious groups has been greeted with mixed feelings by traditional supporters and detractors of faith-based initiatives. Moreover, it has renewed debates over the appropriateness of the foray of religion into the public square in a secular American society, bringing the governmental support of religious organizations, even organizations that serve the public good, legitimate in a democracy such as ours, which is committed to upholding the disestablishment clause of the First Amendment. Conversely, does it make pragmatic sense to restrict the means by which leaders of faith-based organizations are allowed to implement their programs if they choose to do so? This is all to ask: is Obama's plan to support faith-based initiatives a tenable one, in spirit with the First Amendment, and still able to deliver the pragmatic benefits it is intended to deliver?

The pragmatic benefits it is intended to deliver:

In his proposed Council for Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships, Obama outlines a few guiding principles that he thinks will address those worries about the disestablishment clause. First, organizations receiving a federal grant will not be allowed to use that grant money to proselytize to anyone that their initiatives target for help. This means that while participants in a particular faith-based initiative may all be members of the same religion, none of them are allowed to attempt to convert recipients of their aid to their way of life. Second, any organization receiving a federal grant cannot discriminate against anyone in their hiring practices. Whether one is already a member of a particular religious community can have no bearing on whether one is hired to participate in that community's federally funded faith-based initiative. Discrimination is disallowed on the basis of religious preference, for example if one happens to be pro-choice or against the teaching of creationism in the schools. Third, in the Obama plan, federal dollars that go directly to sectarian organizations can be used only for secular programs. Finally, these programs will be scrutinized by a federal oversight body, and the funding for them will remain contingent upon the manifest demonstration of their success. In other words, checks will be put in place to ensure the government is providing service of the state, and not in service of itself. The proposal put forward under the Council for Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships thus shows respect for the descriptive truism that in some corners of society religion remains the impetus through which social reform can realistically occur while preventing the disrespect of any of its participants or recipients.

Is Obama's plan to support faith-based initiatives a tenable one, in spirit with the First Amendment, and still able to deliver the pragmatic benefits it is intended to deliver?

In his proposed Council for Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships, Obama outlines a few guiding principles that he thinks will address those worries about the disestablishment clause. First, organizations receiving a federal grant will not be allowed to use that grant money to proselytize to anyone that their initiatives target for help. This means that while participants in a particular faith-based initiative may all be members of the same religion, none of them are allowed to attempt to convert recipients of their aid to their way of life. Second, any organization receiving a federal grant cannot discriminate against anyone in their hiring practices. Whether one is already a member of a particular religious community can have no bearing on whether one is hired to participate in that community's federally funded faith-based initiative. Discrimination is disallowed on the basis of religious preference, for example if one happens to be pro-choice or against the teaching of creationism in the schools. Third, in the Obama plan, federal dollars that go directly to sectarian organizations can be used only for secular programs. Finally, these programs will be scrutinized by a federal oversight body, and the funding for them will remain contingent upon the manifest demonstration of their success. In other words, checks will be put in place to ensure the government is providing service of the state, and not in service of itself. The proposal put forward under the Council for Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships thus shows respect for the descriptive truism that in some corners of society religion remains the impetus through which social reform can realistically occur while preventing the disrespect of any of its participants or recipients.

A subsequent result, well, of course, not guaranteed supportive conservators of faith-based initiatives, who applied Obama's expansion of the Bush agenda but vehemently object to the idea of government oversight of these ear-marked resources will be allocated. For them, as the saying goes, "the good dams the perfect." The prohibition against discrimination alone has many sectarian organizations up in arms. When Obama was asked by Rick Warren if those organizing faith-based initiatives under his administration would be allowed to favor "like-minded" people in the hiring process and Obama answered "no," commentators from the Christian Right pounced. Just earlier in the month of August, Obama had stated that in his view some pas-sages from the Bible ought not to be given constitutional authority, such as those from Leviticus that countenance slavery or consensual eating shellfish. This is, of course, a distinction that left many religious leaders unequipped for a response, or without the religious imperative. But following Jesus's example does not mean narrowing or come to the aid of impoverished. Moreover, the nonreligious critic will additionally be alarmed that the money going towards faith-based initiatives could be more efficiently applied to programs more narrowly focused on the criti-cal services. Finally, some of the religious organizations may help needy students in underfunded school systems or come to the aid of impoverished impregn-ated teens, and so on, they will not do so to the exclusion of the furtherance of their own ambitions. And precisely this difference will unduly cost the taxpayers money.

Andrew Flescher (Ph.D., Brown University) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at California State University, Chico, where for five years he also served as the director for the Center for Applied and Professional Ethics. He specializes in the field of contemporary religious thought, with particular interest in ethics, comparative religion, and the theory and philosophy of religion. He is the author of Heroes, Saints, and Ordinary Morality (Georgetown University Press, 2003); The Altruistic Species: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Human Altruism (Ivanow Fellowship Foundation, 2007); and the forthcoming Four Models of Moral Evil (Georgetown University Press).
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ARRIVE AT the hospital at 9:00 AM to meet Karen, a staff chaplain. Her day started at 6:30 AM when she made rounds in the pre-op surgical unit, the place where patients having same-day surgeries wait for their operating rooms to be ready. A few minutes after 9:00 AM, Karen and I are sitting at a palliative care meeting. Just before the meeting starts, a nurse sticks her head in the door and asks Karen to see a patient who "just won't die. . . . He wants to die, the family is ready for him to die, everyone who needs to be in has been in but still he won't let go."

Karen says no problem, and after the meeting ends we go speak with this patient's family. We then go, at their request, to pray with the patient. Although he is unconscious, Karen introduces herself and speaks with him briefly before saying a prayer: "I lay my hands on you in the name of God the Father and his son Jesus." Karen talks to God in the prayer saying that "in God's mansion there are many rooms and we know that you have a room, God, with those who have come before, God, we know you have things in store that are greater than our imagination and we ask you to prepare them for us." She concludes the prayer in the name of "God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," crosses the patient on the forehead, and sits with him for a few minutes before leaving the room.

Karen then visits a few more patients before she is paged by Joanne, a social worker, who asks for help in the viewing room. We descend to the basement of the hospital in the service elevator as Karen explains that the hospital has been working to create a space where family members who could not be at the hospital when a loved one died can see the person's body before the funeral home picks it up. A case has come up this morning and Joanne wants Karen to help her train two other social workers.

We meet them in the morgue where they discuss logistics about the key to the viewing room and how you sign out a body. They then retrieve the body of a woman who died that morning. Joanne goes upstairs to escort the family, and Karen shows the other two social workers — both of whom seem uncomfortable in the presence of a dead body — how to move the gurney, take off the top sheet, and uncover the woman's face. After the body is prepared, Karen sits down in one of the two chairs in the small viewing room and tries to put the social workers at ease.

When the family members arrive, all of us, save Karen, leave the room. Karen stays with the family in the viewing room for about twenty minutes until they are finished, and Joanne escorts them back upstairs. Karen, the two social workers, and I return the body to the morgue. We remove the gloves worn for transporting bodies and wash our hands. Karen announces it is time for lunch, and leads me towards the cafeteria.

The time I spent with Karen, other chaplains, and intensive care unit staff at academic hospitals across the country helped me see the formal and informal ways religion and spirituality is present in hospitals.

GIFTS IN HONOR

Celebrate graduation, publishing, tenure, retirement, or any occasion with a gift to the American Academy of Religion in the name of a friend or colleague. An honor gift is a unique way to recognize those special people around you in a meaningful way. Charitable gifts of $25 or more will be personally acknowledged with a letter informing the recipient of your generosity and thoughtfulness.

GIFTS IN MEMORY

Celebrate the life and memory of friends or colleagues through a memorial gift. Recognize his or her lifetime contributions to the academic study of religion with a gift in his or her memory.

To make a gift in honor or in memory of someone, please contact the Development Office at 404-727-7928, make an online donation at www.aarweb.org/about_AAR/Support_AAR or mail a check to:
American Academy of Religion
825 Houston Mill Road, Suite 300
Atlanta, GA 30329
DURING A RECENT radio interview addressing the lack of diversity in divinity schools, I was confronted with the question “Why are so few minorities attending and teaching at theological schools today, and what are the consequences of this chronic underrepresentation of minorities in higher religious education?” As my title suggests, my tenure as a professional jazz musician before I began my PhD in biblical studies has provided me with an aesthetic framework and an interpretative lens with which to begin to respond to this daunting question.

Throughout their history, African-American jazz musicians have endured extreme bias and scathing critiques from the larger white musical establishment, which questioned their legitimacy. Nonetheless, they have withstood these criticisms — and emerged as pioneers of the first American “classical” music. The global renown of black jazz musicians is sufficient for the realization of the tempo at which progress occurs remains a lingering concern. While underrepresented people long for an allegro tempo (swift, with cheerful expression), the reality of change is often closer to largo (slow and lachrymose). In music, a time signature is what quantifies and regulates the volume of information allowed within each bar or section of music. In an academic context, the time signatures of our era are often publishing venues, which serve as gatekeepers regulating the inclusion of divergent voices into an ongoing conversation. When the innovations of provocative individuals, ideas, and events are excluded, it robs us of the revolution of ideas that could contribute to the development of a multidimensional consciousness.

As a minority scholar confronted with the reality of navigating intellectual terrain that is inherently kinder and gentler to that which is familiar, I’m reminded of an encouraging anecdote from the jazz community. In the 1970s, when Miles Davis had transitioned from playing the brand of jazz that he had become renowned for, he began a concert by performing a new style of music unfamiliar to the audience. They responded by throwing debris onto the stage. When he noticed his young percussionist about to react to this hostility, he quietly walked over and whispered to him, “Play through it.” By the end of the performance, the audience gave them a ten-minute standing ovation. One cannot be certain if a parallel appreciation for the emergence of different voices will ever be fully realized in the academy in our lifetime. In the meantime, we will continue to “play through it.”
Record Attendance at Leadership Workshop

The Academic Relations Committee addressed student learning at its Leadership Workshop during the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion in Chicago. The daylong workshop, “Taking Religion(s) Seriously: What Students Need to Know,” had a record registration of sixty participants and speakers. Attendees explored the common goal of religion courses: that all students learn to think critically about the ways religion impacts public life and their role as citizens.

Participants investigated what this goal entails and were then invited to consider how the curriculum they oversee addresses this objective; and how the objective might contribute to an assessment of their program’s effectiveness.

Krista Tippett opened the meeting in an interview format with Chester Gillis of Georgetown University, who led the workshop. Tippett is the American Public Media host of “Speaking of Faith” and author of the book of the same name. Attendees were given a free copy of her book, which she signed at the end of the workshop.

“We were very fortunate to have her participate in the workshop,” Kyle Cole, AAR Director of Professional Programs, said. “The members appreciated her wit, candor, and knowledge.”

Following a breakout session, panelists discussed “How does this objective interact with the mission and culture of your institution?” The panelists represented a variety of institutions: Steve Young, McHenry County College; Elle LeVee, Spertus College; L. DeAne Lagerquist, St. Olaf College; and Edwin David Aponte, Lancaster Theological Seminary. Participants were then divided into groups according to institutional type to discuss specific obstacles and solutions.

“The Academic Relations Committee strives to speak to the multitude of institutional contexts influencing the study of religion,” said Kyle Cole.

The concluding plenary concentrated on a principal question: “How should this objective be assessed and how do you assess it?” Dianne Oliver, University of Evansville, led the plenary and Timothy Renick, Georgia State University, responded. Evansville is one of the few religion departments beginning to address student assessment, but there is gathering interest among other religion departments and leaders. The Academic Relations Committee believes assessment issues and student learning will be explored in future workshops.

The Academic Relations Committee plans the Leadership Workshops for the Annual Meeting: Fred Glennon, chair; Chester Gillis; L. DeAne Lagerquist; Steve Young; Rosetta Ross; Edwin David Aponte; and Kyle Cole, AAR staff liaison.

Prison Chaplaincy Directors Meet with AAR Members in Chicago

Prison Chaplaincy directors from ten states and the Federal Bureau of Prisons participated in a two-day gathering during the 2008 AAR Annual Meeting in Chicago. Topics covered included Asatru, Buddhism, Daoism, House of Yahweh, Moorish Science Temple, Satanism, Shi’ism, Wicca, and recent United States court decisions regarding inmate practice of religion. The chaplaincy directors attended in order to better understand various religious practices they encounter. The scholars participating were Helen Berger, Frederick Denny, Graham Harvey, Barbara McGraw, Gordon Melton, Vivian-Lee Nyitray, and Thomas Tweed. AAR staff and Patrick McCollum, a prison chaplain and AAR member, co-organized the gathering.

With Gratitude!

The AAR congratulates the following institutions for their generous cosponsorship of South Asian scholars. Such support immeasurably strengthens the international dimension of our Annual Meeting.

Lafayette College
Muhammad Khalid Masud, Council of Islamic Ideology
Missouri State University
Premakumara De Silva, University of Colombo

Media Attend Annual Meeting

Media interest in the 2008 Annual Meeting in Chicago was high, with some forty-five journalists in attendance. Most journalists came to interview scholars and pick up story ideas, while some came to cover the meeting itself. The media outlets represented included A&E/The History Channel, Beliefnet, Boston Globe, Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago Tribune, Christian Century, Christian Science Monitor, Christianity Today, Ebror TV, Minnesota Public Radio’s Speaking of Faith, Ottawa Citizen, Publishers Weekly, Time, U.S. Catholic magazine, and PBS’s WGBH.

Boston. Several foreign reporters — from Finland, France, Germany, and Spain — in Chicago to cover the presidential election, also attended the Annual Meeting.

The AAR hosted its fifth annual reception for journalists after Sunday evening’s awards ceremony. Three of the winners of the 2008 AAR Awards for Best In-Depth Reporting were in attendance and were honored for their outstanding contributions to in-depth religion newswriting during 2007.
ALMOST 6,000 PEOPLE gathered together in Chicago, Illinois, last November for the AAR’s first independent Annual Meeting in decades. Total registration for the meeting was 5,995. This number reflects a 4 percent increase from the AAR’s share of registration at the 2007 joint AAR and SBL meeting in San Diego. However, it was still 6.5 percent less than attendance at the record-breaking 2006 meeting in Washington, D.C. Chicago’s accessible Midwest location with its vibrant big city energy (not to mention the overlap with the victory celebration of Barack Obama) made it a big draw for AAR members.

The 2008 Annual Meeting was the largest in terms of programming. Over 600 AAR and Additional Meetings sessions occurred during the six-day time period from Thursday, October 30 to Tuesday, November 4. AAR continued to expand its program and hosted 398 sessions, making it the largest program ever.

Responses to the post-Annual Meeting survey reflect positive experiences by the members in attendance. Survey results are posted online at www.aarweb.org.

An overwhelming 88 percent of survey respondents thought the 2008 Annual Meeting was a satisfactory or very satisfactory experience. Satisfaction with this year’s sessions was high; 90 percent of survey respondents said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the quality. The opportunity to network with other colleagues also received high marks; 90 percent reported satisfaction. Respondents rated the Chicago Annual Meeting location very favorably, giving positive feedback about its hotel facilities (84 percent) and meeting room space (72 percent).

Once again, Annual Meeting registration and housing was handled by Experient. Satisfaction with the registration and housing process was very high; 92 percent of respondents rated the process positively. The peak hotel night was Saturday, November 1, with over 2,500 hotel rooms in use. Overall more than 9,000 room nights were occupied during the meeting.

The comments from survey respondents were generally positive. The most frequent complaint was about the dates of the meeting coinciding with Halloween and Election Day. When the AAR Meeting staff realized that the election dates were an issue and that we could not hold sessions on Tuesday, November 4, we brought it to the Board of Directors. We asked them to consider two models for the meeting: 1) A footprint shift, moving the meeting to Friday–Monday; and 2) A compression, scheduling all sessions from Saturday–Monday. The Board opted for the compression model in order not to further interfere with Halloween. The 2009 Annual Meeting will be held a week later, November 7–10, and will not overlap with Halloween. The second main complaint was the exhibit hall space and hours. AAR’s exhibit hall in Montréal will be in a more amenable space in the Palais des Congrès. We are working with exhibitors to consider keeping the exhibit hall open during nonsession hours to improve traffic.

The Annual Meeting Satisfaction Survey is sent via E-mail to all Annual Meeting attendees at the conclusion of each meeting and is offered online at the AAR website. The number of responses this year was 1,437, which represents about 24 percent of attendees. Respondents did not answer each question, so the values were measured from the number of respondents who did. The survey is voluntary and open to all attendees. The executive office staff would like to thank everyone who participated in the post-Annual Meeting survey. It continues to be valuable to the Annual Meeting process, for it provides the AAR’s Program Committee, Board of Directors, and executive office staff with an important measure of member satisfaction. We value this opportunity to hear your comments and suggestions on how we can continue to meet your needs and to offer an excellent meeting.
AAR would like to thank the following outgoing Program Unit Chairs whose terms ended in 2008.

Paula K. R. Arzu, Louisiana State University (Japanese Religions Group)
Kathleen Bishop, Drew University (Psychology, Culture, and Religion Group)
Marcia Bunge, Valparaiso University (Childhood Studies and Religion Consultation)
Pamela Cooper-White, Columbia Theological Seminary (Psychology, Culture, and Religion Group)
Lisa Dahill, Trinity Lutheran Seminary (Bonhoeffer: Theology and Social Analysis Group)
Lois Farag, Luther Seminary (Coptic Christianity Consultation)
Stacey M. Floyd-Thomas, Vanderbilt University (Black Theology Group)
Lynn Faber Lorenzen, Augsburg College (Open and Relational Theologies Consultation)
Robert P. Kennedy, St. Francis Xavier University (Augustine and Augustinianisms Group)
Joerg Rieger, Southern Methodist University (Theology and Religious Reflection Section)
Lisa L. Stenmark, San Jose State University (Science, Technology, and Religion Group)
Laura Hobgood-Oster, Southwestern University (Animals and Religion Consultation)
Kurtis Schaeffer, University of Virginia (Tibetan and Himalayan Religions Group)
Deepak Sarma, Case Western Reserve University (Comparative Theology Group)
Arthur G. Holder, Graduate Theological Union (Christian Spirituality Group)
Martin Kavya, Florida State University (Study of Judaism Section)
Robert P. Kennedy, St. Francis Xavier University (Augustine and Augustinianisms Group)
Julie J. Kilmer, Oliver College (Lesbian-Feminist Issues and Religion Group)
Kwok Pui Lan, Episcopal Divinity School (Theology and Religious Reflection Section)
Sarah Heeter Lancaster, Methodist Theological School, Ohio (Wesleyan Studies Group)
Lynne Feder Lottis, Augsburg College (Open and Relational Theologies Consultation)
Kathryn McClymond, Georgia State University (Comparative Studies in Hinduisms and Judeisms Group)
June McDaniel, College of Charleston (Mysticism Group)
Barbara A. Mcgrew, Saint Mary's College of California (Religion and Politics Section)
Lawrence Mamiya, Vassar College (Religion and Cities Consultation)
Vincent J. Miller, Georgetown University (Roman Catholic Studies Group)
A. Charles Muller, University of Tokyo (Buddhist Philosophy Group)
James Nieman, Hartford Seminary (Practical Theology Group)
Rebecca Sachs Norris, Merrimack College (Anthropology of Religion Group)
Willemien Otten, University of Chicago (Platonism and Neoplatonism Group)
Kim Paffenroth, Iona College (Augustine and Augustinianisms Group)
Joe Pettit, Morgan State University (Religion, Public Policy, and Political Change Consultation)
Michael Prent, Harvard University (Confinced Traditions Group)
Jong Rieger, Southern Methodist University (Theology and Religious Reflection Section)
Melissa Rogers, Wake Forest University (Religion, Public Policy, and Political Change Consultation)
Deeprk Sarma, Case Western Reserve University (Comparative Theology Group)
Elizabeth Say, California State University, Northridge (Religion, Public Policy, and Political Change Consultation)
Kurtis Schaeffer, University of Virginia (Tibetan and Himalayan Religions Group)
Gregory Shaw, Stonehill College (Platonism and Neoplatonism Group)
Lisa L. Steenman, San Jose State University (Science, Technology, and Religion Group)
Daniel B. Stevenson, University of Kansas (Chinese Religions Group)
Pau Waldau, Religion and Animals Institute (Animals and Religion Consultation)
Kerry Wynn, Southeast Missouri State University (Religion and Disability Studies Group)
Nelly Van Doorn-Harder, Valparaiso University (Study of Islam Section)
Koock Lee Nuck, University of Amsterdam (Critical Theory and Discourses on Religion Group)
Robert A. Yelle, University of Memphis (Law, Religion, and Culture Group)
Laurie Zoleth, Northwestern University (Women and Religion Section)

Job Center 2008 Statistics
Reveal Employment Trends in the Field

The 2008 Annual Meeting Job Center, the first to be hosted independently by the AAR, saw a total of 568 candidates and 107 open positions. Though there was an expected decrease in candidate and employer registrations from previous years given the independent meeting and early meeting date, the AAR maintained 85 percent of the number of candidates registered for the center in 2007 and 74 percent of the number of institutions registered for the center in 2007. The ratio of registered positions to registered candidates was 1:5.5. All of these numbers indicate that, as in previous years, the number of candidates significantly exceeds the number of positions available.

The Annual Meeting Job Center is designed to ease the communication process between candidates for academic positions and employers seeking to fill available positions. The Job Center features an Annual Meeting edition of Job Postings, candidate credentials for review, a message center, and an interview facility.

Each year, the AAR gathers data about job positions and candidates registered for the Center. Each position and candidate is required to choose a primary classification from a provided list. They may also select additional classifications (candidates are limited to a total of three). The “primary” columns indicate the number of times each classification was chosen as a primary classification (see chart on next page).

When drawing conclusions from this data, it is important to think of the motivations that guide employers’ and candidates’ choices. Employers tend to choose more broad classifications that correspond to the classes needing to be taught. They are likely willing to consider candidates from an array of specializations, as long as each person can teach general courses. In contrast, a candidate’s primary choice is usually his or her area of research; they can teach more broadly. Take Christian Studies as an example — one need not specialize in this area to teach a course. Despite the fact that the classification had a 1:1 primary ratio in 2008, candidates who chose this classification did not have a 100 percent chance of getting a job.

Another example is Asian Religions. From looking at the number of times this classification was chosen as primary in 2008, it might seem that each candidate in that field had about a 71 percent chance of getting a job. However, many candidates who chose Hinduism or Buddhism as their specialty had the ability to teach Asian religions. So employers needing an Asian religions teacher are not limited to only those candidates who consider it to be their specialty.

This is where the “all” columns come into play. These columns indicate the total number of times a classification was chosen as either primary or “additional.” These columns often give better indications of the ratio of positions to candidates within a particular subfield. Take the example from above. Many of the candidates who chose Hinduism or Buddhism as their primary classification likely chose Asian Religions as an additional choice. Therefore, the position-to-candidate ratio of 1:5.2 (or 1:4) is a better indicator of how many candidates might have sought a particular position.

Still, because of the different motivations guiding choices and because many of the classifications are interrelated, the candidate to job ratios shown below cannot give a clear indication of a candidate’s chances of getting a job. Rather, they serve mainly to identify trends in position openings and candidate specializations.

The AAR has been compiling registration data since 1990. This data is available upon request from Jessica Davenport at jdavenport@aarweb.org

Job Center Registration 2006–2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positions Registered</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Institutions Registered</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preregistered</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Onsite</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Positions to Candidates</td>
<td>1:5.3</td>
<td>1:4.4</td>
<td>1:4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Registered</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preregistered</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Onsite</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Participants</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Participants</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Report Gender</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Female to Male</td>
<td>1:1.7</td>
<td>1:2.1</td>
<td>1:2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See additional 2006–2008 registration data in the chart on next page.
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#### Job Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Classification</th>
<th>2008 Employers</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>2007 Employers</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>2006 Employers</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration (e.g., President, Dean, Director, Program Director, Coordinator)</td>
<td>3 3 2 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4 3 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 6 1 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Near Eastern Languages</td>
<td>0 0 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 6 2 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 4 1 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology — Ancient Near East</td>
<td>0 0 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 3 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 3 1 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology — Greco-Roman</td>
<td>0 0 3 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Literature, and Religion</td>
<td>3 8 24 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 19 9 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 20 8 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Religions (general or not listed separately)</td>
<td>10 13 14 52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 9 4 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 13 5 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Languages</td>
<td>0 0 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 17 22 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 16 21 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>2 8 22 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 11 0 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 6 2 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Studies</td>
<td>1 8 0 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 21 18 41</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 14 18 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Theology (all areas)</td>
<td>10 16 27 48</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 7 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 3 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and South American and Caribbean Religions</td>
<td>1 5 1 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 18 39 74</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 18 38 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Ethics</td>
<td>6 13 34 64</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 12 4 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 7 1 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Studies</td>
<td>3 6 3 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 11 22 79</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 15 35 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Theology (general or not listed separately)</td>
<td>6 12 31 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 7 16 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 9 12 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Theology: Practical/Praxis</td>
<td>1 7 12 38</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 14 58 102</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 9 65 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Theology: Systematic/Constructive</td>
<td>3 11 58 99</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 1 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 9 0 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>1 1 1 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 32 6 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 18 6 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Religions</td>
<td>1 13 8 54</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 16 5 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 11 7 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Studies/Theory/Methods in Religion</td>
<td>1 9 14 56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 17 33 81</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 10 38 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Christianity/Church History</td>
<td>1 3 10 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 9 3 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 4 1 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Judaism</td>
<td>0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 18 6 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 22 13 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Religions (general or not listed separately)</td>
<td>2 6 10 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 9 1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial</td>
<td>0 0 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 5 1 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epigraphy</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian Studies in Religion</td>
<td>0 1 0 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 29 81 134</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 17 39 133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Bible/Old Testament</td>
<td>1 5 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 13 7 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 9 7 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>0 4 8 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 20 42 91</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 15 39 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Christianity/Church History</td>
<td>7 10 43 93</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 19 5 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 16 4 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Religion (general)</td>
<td>2 10 5 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 10 3 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 4 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous/Native/Traditional Religions</td>
<td>1 4 4 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 16 1 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 12 0 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Religion</td>
<td>0 6 1 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 32 23 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 29 26 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>17 22 37 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 17 12 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 16 7 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>6 9 10 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 0 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 3 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missiology</td>
<td>0 1 1 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 6 1 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 2 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Religious Movements</td>
<td>0 4 6 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 30 83 127</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 39 96 148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament</td>
<td>1 2 5 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 14 28 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 12 29 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Religions</td>
<td>2 4 47 59</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 5 5 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Care</td>
<td>1 2 6 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 10 22 62</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 10 22 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Religion</td>
<td>1 3 23 71</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3 3 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 2 0 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching/Ministry</td>
<td>0 2 1 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 8 5 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7 3 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinic Judaism</td>
<td>0 2 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 16 4 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 11 3 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/Ethnic Minority Studies in Religion</td>
<td>1 6 3 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 6 4 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 8 18 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and Science</td>
<td>0 2 4 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 8 16 48</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 8 18 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion/Theology: Two or More Subfields</td>
<td>0 2 15 53</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 10 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 6 0 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions of Africa/Oceania</td>
<td>0 1 1 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 14 10 41</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 13 9 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Ethics</td>
<td>2 3 11 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 7 8 51</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 5 7 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Temple Judaism</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septuagint</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 11 11 48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 14 16 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences and Religion (e.g., Religion and Society, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology)</td>
<td>0 6 16 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 10 11 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 15 11 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian Religions (general or not listed separately)</td>
<td>2 6 14 32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 11 7 46</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 22 4 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies in Religion</td>
<td>0 20 6 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 26 2 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 9 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Religions</td>
<td>5 13 4 49</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 9 92</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 13 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 11 30 97</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reporting</td>
<td>0 N/A 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 N/A 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 N/A 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114 285 568 1,642</td>
<td></td>
<td>150 627 669 1,903</td>
<td></td>
<td>174 543 747 2,057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To get a more accurate picture of employment trends in the field, the AAR and the SBL have expanded our data collection efforts. Employment Information Services (EIS) created a web-based, anonymous survey to track hirings by specialization and to collect demographic information on job candidates.

In spring 2008, surveys were sent to all candidates who had registered for the joint AAR/SBL 2007 EIS Center in San Diego, California, and to all employers who had advertised a position in *Openings* in 2007. Presented here are highlights of the data received. Complete results can be found at www.aarweb.org/jump/jobcenter. This ongoing project will provide longitudinal data.

### Employer Data

Out of 531 employer solicitations, 148 responses were received (28 percent response rate). Eighty percent of those who responded filled the position which they had advertised in *Openings*. Of the 118 positions filled, 76 percent of the employers report interviewing the appointee at the EIS Center. The majority of the positions were filled at the assistant professor level (67 percent), followed by full professor (13 percent), visiting professor (6 percent), associate professor (4 percent), lecturer (4 percent), and instructor (3 percent), with 3 percent of the positions ranked as “other.” Sixty-two percent of the positions were tenure-track, 20 percent were nontenure-track, 13 percent were tenured, 4 percent were limited, and less than 1 percent were joint appointment. None were reported as adjunct.

Fifty-seven percent of the appointees were male; 43 percent were female. The racial/ethnic distribution of the appointees was as follows: 76 percent Caucasian or Euro-American, 2 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, 2 percent Latin@ or Hispanic, 2 percent multiracial, and 8 percent reported “other.”

### Candidate Data

Out of 669 candidate solicitations, 209 responses were received (31 percent response rate). When asked to indicate employment status during the search, 47 percent reported being a graduate student, 34 percent reported part time/adjunct faculty, and 15 percent reported full time/nontenure-track faculty (candidates could select more than one response). Seventy-one percent held a PhD or planned to have completed them by August 2008, while 15 percent would be ABs going into fall 2008.

### Job Offers

Of the 209 candidates who responded, 34 percent received one or more job offers. Of those, 64 percent received one offer, 19 percent received two offers, 13 percent received three offers, and 4 percent received more than three offers. Of those candidates who did not receive or accept a new position, 68 percent planned to continue in the same employment status, the top four of which were: part time/adjunct faculty (42 percent), graduate student (41 percent), full time/nontenure-track faculty (12 percent), nonacademic employment (11 percent), and other religious related employment (11 percent) (candidates could select more than one response). Twenty-one percent did not know at the time of the survey what they would do the following academic year.

### Position Data

Of the 67 candidates who accepted an offer, 35 percent will work in a church-related college, 26 percent will work in a public college/university, and 10 percent will work in a university-related divinity school. None reported working for a free-standing seminary. Seventy-two percent will work as full time/tenure-track faculty, 20 percent as full time/adjunct faculty, and 1 percent in administration (e.g., dean, chair). One percent reported “other.” None reported working as full time tenured faculty.

Of the 67 candidates who accepted positions, 59 percent report being thrilled with the new position, 38 percent report feeling satisﬁed with the position, and 3 percent report feeling unsatisﬁed. None reported feeling deeply unhappy about the position.

### Salary of Appointment

Of the 67 candidates who accepted an offer, 52 percent plan to continue in the same employment status, the top four of which were: part time/adjunct faculty (43 percent), graduate student (42 percent), full time/nontenure-track faculty (12 percent), and other religious related employment (11 percent). The racial/ethnic distribution of those candidates who did not receive or accept a new position, 68 percent planned to continue in the same employment status, the top four of which were: part time/adjunct faculty (42 percent), graduate student (41 percent), full time/nontenure-track faculty (12 percent), and other religious related employment (11 percent). (Candidates could select more than one response). Twenty-one percent did not know at the time of the survey what they would do the following academic year.

### Candidate Demographics

Sixty-three percent of the candidates who registered for the 2007 EIS Center were male; 36 percent were female. Regarding race/ethnicity, 86 percent of the registrants reported their race/ethnicity as Caucasian or Euro-American, 5 percent African-American or black, 5 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, 2 percent multiracial, and 1 percent Latin@ or Hispanic. Two percent chose “other.” None reported their race/ethnicity as American Indian or Alaskan native. In terms of citizenship, 91 percent were United States citizens, 5 percent were citizens of Canada, 2 percent were noncitizen residents of the United States, and 1 percent reported their citizenship as “other.”

### Search Experience

Eighty-seven percent of responding candidates reported that interviewers did not exhibit unprofessional or inappropriate behavior. Those that did encounter such behavior reported offensive remarks and offensive actions.

Seventy-six percent of candidates reported that interviewers did not ask questions or broach topics of an inappropriate nature. Of those who did encounter such questions/topics, the three most common were in regards to religious beliefs, marital status, and partner’s career. Forty-five percent reported that the interviewer directly asked an inappropriate question. Forty-one percent stated the interviewer indirectly broached an inappropriate topic. Seventy-four percent of the respondents answered the question truthfully, while 13 percent changed the topic in order to avoid the question. Fifty-three percent are not sure whether their response was to their advantage or disadvantage. Twenty-eight percent believe their answer was to their disadvantage and 19 percent believe it was to their advantage.
A Message from the President

Dear AAR Colleagues and Friends:

2008 was an exciting year for the American Academy of Religion. Membership in the Academy remained strong, at well over 11,000. Our 2008 Annual Meeting in Chicago set an attendance record; nearly 6,000 AAR members attended the meeting. The Board launched several new initiatives (a Sustainability Task Force, a Governance Task Force, and a Job Placement Task Force). Working together, the Executive Staff and the Board updated and revised our Strategic Plan. And we formed a Centennial Advisory Committee, chaired by former AAR President Peter Paris. This group will help finalize a number of initiatives and strategies of the long-range planning process. A second, the Executive Committee brought a recommendation to the board that AAR hold concurrent, but independent, meetings with the Society of Biblical Literature and other interested professional societies at the earliest feasible time. The Board approved this recommendation and gave Jack Fitzmier, AAR’s Executive Director, the authority to begin negotiations with SBL and other interested professional societies.

I represented the AAR as a plenary speaker for the Southwest Commission for Religious Studies in Dallas, Texas, in March. During July 13–20, I represented the AAR at an international conference and workshop hosted by Shanghai University. The conference, “Globalization, Values, and Pluralism,” featured papers by Chinese and international scholars. A workshop composed of teaching sessions for graduate students from Shanghai University and other universities followed the conference. Jack Fitzmier and I led the final session for the workshop. Jack presented an overview of theological education and I held a condensed discussion of stereotypes in the United States and explored some of the ways in which this translates in the Chinese context. The students engaged us with thoughtful and probing questions. It is my hope that we will continue to build bridges internationally with other professional societies. Many thanks to AAR member, Changgang Guo, for organizing this informative conference.

My final role as President of the AAR included the pleasure of presiding over the first independent annual meeting in Chicago, Illinois. The strong program and incredible planning brought nearly 6,000 participants to Chicago, making it the second largest AAR meeting in history. I am grateful to Nikky Finney, Charles Long, and Nokan Williams for accepting my invitation to present at our plenaries. Their extraordinary talent and unique views enhanced the meeting for everyone who attended their addresses.

As has been the case with every president before me, my role and responsibility has been made easier to fulfill by an incredibly talented and professional staff in the AAR office. I close by noting the many ways that the staff and those who serve on the board and our various committees and task forces give their time and energy to AAR to help build a stronger and more vibrant professional society.

Many and deep thanks to you all.

Emile M. Townes
President

A Message from the Executive Director

Dear AAR Colleagues and Friends:

The February Executive Committee meeting was productive as we welcomed Ann Taves as the newly elected vice president. There are two important areas we covered in the meeting. First, we had a good discussion of the long-range planning process. A key thing we noted was that when we looked at the Centennial Strategic Plan’s vision and mission statements and the eight-point goals and objectives, we needed to simplify the mission statement. We were clear that we were not trying to re-do the strategic plan, but think of how we could use the mission statement as a foundation for a clear map from which to develop a long-range plan. This engendered good conversation on the Sunday morning of the board meeting as we began to look ahead to AAR programs and structures. Second, the Executive Committee brought a recommendation to the board that AAR hold concurrent, but independent, meetings with the Society of Biblical Literature and other interested professional societies at the earliest feasible time. The Board approved this recommendation and gave Jack Fitzmier, AAR’s Executive Director, and the staff the authority to begin negotiations with SBL and other interested professional societies.

I represented the AAR as a plenary speaker for the Southwest Commission for Religious Studies in Dallas, Texas, in March. During July 13–20, I represented the AAR at an international conference and workshop hosted by Shanghai University. The conference, “Globalization, Values, and Pluralism,” featured papers by Chinese and international scholars. A workshop composed of teaching sessions for graduate students from Shanghai University and other universities followed the conference. Jack Fitzmier and I led the final session for the workshop. Jack presented an overview of theological education and I held a condensed discussion of stereotypes in the United States and explored some of the ways in which this translates in the Chinese context. The students engaged us with thoughtful and probing questions. It is my hope that we will continue to build bridges internationally with other professional societies. Many thanks to AAR member, Changgang Guo, for organizing this informative conference.

My final role as President of the AAR included the pleasure of presiding over the first independent annual meeting in Chicago, Illinois. The strong program and incredible planning brought nearly 6,000 participants to Chicago, making it the second largest AAR meeting in history. I am grateful to Nikky Finney, Charles Long, and Nokan Williams for accepting my invitation to present at our plenaries. Their extraordinary talent and unique views enhanced the meeting for everyone who attended their addresses.

As has been the case with every president before me, my role and responsibility has been made easier to fulfill by an incredibly talented and professional staff in the AAR office. I close by noting the many ways that the staff and those who serve on the board and our various committees and task forces give their time and energy to AAR to help build a stronger and more vibrant professional society.

Many and deep thanks to you all.

Emile M. Townes
President
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GIVEN the important task forces begun by Jeffrey Stout, I chose to concentrate on staff and member resources as their work being done by our current committees and task force structure. The three newest task forces — Sustainability (chaired by Sarah McFarland Taylor), Job Placement (chaired by Tim Renick), and Governance (co-chaired by Jeffrey L. Stout and Emilie M. Townes) — have begun their work. The Sustainability and Job Placement task forces are making good progress. The Governance task force has proceeded with more deliberate speed and has now secured the services of Bill Ryan as a consultant. Ryan is a research fellow with the Hauser Center for Non-Profit Organizations in the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. A meeting with Ryan took place in the fall as the task force moved ahead with its charge.
AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION
STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES AND NET ASSETS
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2008 AND 2007

REVENUES AND GAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily Restricted</th>
<th>Permanently Restricted</th>
<th>Total 2008</th>
<th>Total 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues</td>
<td>$772,897</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$772,897</td>
<td>$768,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>413,249</td>
<td>415,749</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual meeting</td>
<td>1,209,315</td>
<td>1,209,315</td>
<td>1,229,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career services</td>
<td>184,357</td>
<td>184,357</td>
<td>163,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label sales</td>
<td>53,676</td>
<td>53,676</td>
<td>62,385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and publications</td>
<td>18,613</td>
<td>18,613</td>
<td>32,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td>23,412</td>
<td>5,146</td>
<td>28,558</td>
<td>25,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>34,882</td>
<td>34,882</td>
<td>51,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions and gifts in kind</td>
<td>45,250</td>
<td>4,503</td>
<td>49,753</td>
<td>104,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luce Center income</td>
<td>107,792</td>
<td>107,792</td>
<td>107,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and dividends</td>
<td>154,967</td>
<td>65,947</td>
<td>220,914</td>
<td>229,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets released from restrictions</td>
<td>167,878</td>
<td>167,878</td>
<td>140,569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues and gains</strong></td>
<td>2,779,074</td>
<td>320,967</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,100,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES

| Research and publications | 166,169 | 166,169 | 148,476 |
| Membership services | 621,270 | 621,270 | 453,023 |
| Professional development services | 283,426 | 283,426 | 262,882 |
| External relations | 276,548 | 276,548 | 300,065 |
| Annual meeting | 1,095,469 | 1,095,469 | 1,068,005 |
| Luce Center expenses | 116,450 | 116,450 | 99,059 |
| General and administration | 337,473 | 337,473 | 347,255 |
| Fundraising | 112,355 | 112,355 | 96,356 |
| **Total expenses** | 2,963,980 | 0 | 0 | 2,963,980 | 2,775,301 |

Change in net assets before investment gains, (losses), and depreciation

| Change in net assets before investment gains, (losses), and depreciation | 184,906 | 320,967 | 136,061 | 125,554 |
| Depreciation | 77,527 | 77,527 | 75,633 |
| Investment gains (losses) | 447,996 | 212,428 | 660,424 | 789,040 |
| Change in net assets | 710,429 | 108,539 | 601,890 | 838,961 |

Net assets Beginning of the year

| 6,713,733 | 1,243,183 | 1,100,000 | 9,056,916 | 8,217,955 |

Net assets End of the year

| $6,003,304 | $1,351,722 | $1,100,000 | $8,455,026 | $9,056,916 |

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF RELIGION
STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION
JUNE 30, 2008 AND 2007

ASSETS

| Cash and cash equivalents | $426,160 | $613,526 |
| Marketable securities | 6,568,793 | 7,187,244 |
| Accounts and grants receivable, net | 425,680 | 40,322 |
| Prepaid expenses | 116,580 | 79,971 |
| Furniture and equipment, net | 82,295 | 73,587 |
| Share of Luce Center assets, net | 2,137,932 | 2,234,746 |
| **Total assets** | $9,757,444 | $10,229,396 |

LIABILITIES

| Accounts payable and accrued expenses | $319,853 | $253,991 |
| Accrued vacation | 49,971 | 45,323 |
| Deferred revenue - memberships | 352,310 | 345,834 |
| Deferred revenue - annual meeting | 576,595 | 300,065 |
| **Total liabilities** | 1,302,418 | 1,172,480 |

NET ASSETS

| Unrestricted | 6,003,304 | 6,713,733 |
| Temporarily restricted | 1,351,722 | 1,243,183 |
| Permanently restricted | 1,100,000 | 1,100,000 |
| **Total net assets** | $8,455,026 | $9,056,916 |

Total liabilities and net assets

| $9,757,444 | $10,229,396 |

Sources of Revenue

- Membership dues 25%
- Contributions and Grants 15%
- Publications/Advertising 15%
- Employment information services 6%
- Annual Meeting 37%
- Luce Center rental income 3%
- Interest income 7%

Distribution of Expenses

- Annual Meeting 37%
- Luce Center expenses 4%
- General and administration 11%
- Fundraising 4%
- Research and publications 6%
- Member services 21%
- Professional development services 8%
- External relations 9%
MEMBERSHIP remained above the 11,000 mark in 2008, although this reflects a 2 percent decrease from the previous calendar year. When looked at over a ten-year period, membership has grown a robust 29 percent. The percentage of our student members continues to make up about 33 percent of our membership; regular members make up approximately 62 percent of our membership; retired members comprise the remainder.

### 2008 Annual Meeting

The AAR ANNUAL Meeting brings together scholars, students, religious leaders, authors, publishers, and anyone with an interest in the disciplined study of religion. The AAR Annual Meeting is large both in size and complexity, from the number of registrants, sessions, and exhibitors to the number of special workshops and conferences of related scholarly organizations. It is the largest scholarly conference on religion and, for the four days of the conference, the largest exhibition of publications focused on the study of religion.

The Annual Meeting program is largely member-driven, being developed by a program structure comprising sixteen sections, seventy-one groups, four seminars, and forty consultations for a total of 131 program units. Plenary lectures, arts series, tours, business meetings, professional development sessions, and a whole range of special events for various constituencies enhance the program. Thirty scholarly organizations have formal ties with the Academy, and some 145 other organizations and departments hold their meetings at the AAR Annual Meeting.

#### 2008 Sessions by Program Unit Type:
- **Sections**: 97
- **Groups**: 204
- **Consultations**: 59
- **Special Topics Forums**: 26
- **Wildcards**: 12

#### New Program Units
AAR’s Program Committee approved the following new program units for the 2008 Annual Meeting:
- Cognitive Science of Religion Consultation
- Comparative Philosophy and Religion Seminar
- Liberation Theologies Consultation
- Martin Luther and Global Lutheran Traditions
- Music and Religion Consultation
- Religion and Humanism Consultation
- Religion Education in Public Schools: International Perspectives Consultation
- Religion in the American West Seminar
- Religion, Food, and Eating Seminar
- Sex, Gender, and Sexuality in Premodern Christianity Consultation
- Sikh Studies Consultation
- Theology and the Political Consultation
- Transformative Scholarship and Pedagogy Consultation
- Transhumanism and Religion Consultation

#### Annual Meeting Statistics
We are pleased to report that our first independent Annual Meeting in decades in Chicago, Illinois, was a resounding success. Total registration for the meeting was 5,995. This number reflects a 4 percent increase from the AAR’s share of registration at the 2007 joint AAR/SBL meeting in San Diego. Chicago’s accessible Midwest location with its vibrant big city energy (not to mention the overlap with the victory celebration of U.S. Presidential candidate Barack Obama) made it a big draw for AAR members.

The 2008 Annual Meeting was the largest in terms of programming. Over 600 AAR and Additional Meetings sessions occurred during the six-day time period from Thursday, October 30 to Tuesday, November 4. AAR continued to expand its program and hosted 398 sessions, an increase of 4 percent from 2007. The exhibit hall was approximately 60 percent of the size of the 2007 joint meeting in San Diego. There were 199 booths in the hall, representing 131 companies.

This reduction in size was due to the independent meetings of the AAR and SBL; some publishers reduced their booth size, while those with exclusively biblical titles participated only in the SBL meeting. The Annual Meeting attracted attendees from around the world; 49 nationalities were represented. Canadians made up the largest international group with 245 attendees, followed by the United Kingdom (139), Germany (36), Japan (29), the Netherlands (29), Belgium (19), Denmark (19), India (12), and Norway (12). Illinois was the best-represented state in 2008 with 721 attendees, followed closely by California (549), New York (436), Massachusetts (310), Pennsylvania (272), and Ohio (218). AAR’s 2008 international focus was on South Asia, and the Annual Meeting hosted seventeen attendees from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka, including seven AAR travel subsidy recipients.

### Table: Annual Meeting Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting Total Registrants</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>5,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Total Registrants</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>4,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Member</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>2,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Student</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Retired</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Spouse</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Registrants (nonmembers, press, exhibitors)</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR number of sessions</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meetings</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor companies</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor booths</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These numbers reflect the total at the 2007 meeting, which was held concurrently with SBL.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Memberships 2008</th>
<th>Memberships 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Members</td>
<td>3,032</td>
<td>2,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>4,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Memberships</td>
<td>9,499</td>
<td>8,304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Membership Trends

#### 2008 to 2007
- **New Members**: 3,032
- **Retired**: 198
- **Regular**: 5,260
- **Student**: 1,879
- **Total Memberships**: 9,499

#### 1998 to 2007
- **New Members**: 7,139
- **Retired**: 198
- **Regular**: 5,260
- **Student**: 1,879
- **Total Memberships**: 9,499

### 1998 to 2008
- **New Members**: 10,177
- **Retired**: 198
- **Regular**: 5,260
- **Student**: 1,879
- **Total Memberships**: 9,499

### 1998 to 2008
- **New Members**: 13,316
- **Retired**: 198
- **Regular**: 5,260
- **Student**: 1,879
- **Total Memberships**: 9,499

- **Annual Meeting**
- **Publications/Advertising**
- **Label sales**
- **Membership dues**
- **External relations**
- **Research and Publications**
- **Professional development**
- **Publications**
- **Label sales**
- **Fundraising**
- **Interest Income**
- **Rental income**
- **Expenses**
- **Luce Center services**
- **Employment**
- **Information**

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>5,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Total Registrants</td>
<td>5,460</td>
<td>4,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Member</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>2,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Student</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>1,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Retired</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR Spouse</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Registrants (nonmembers, press, exhibitors)</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR number of sessions</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meetings</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor companies</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor booths</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These numbers reflect the total at the 2007 meeting, which was held concurrently with SBL.
In 2003, the AAR’s “Centennial Strategic Plan, 2004–2009” set out our mission statement, identified a series of goals for our organization (e.g., to promote research and scholarship in the field, to facilitate members’ professional development, to encourage diversity within the Academy), and listed a set of strategic objectives to which we were committed (e.g., attract new members, clarify the identity of the AAR vis-à-vis other scholarly societies in religion, hold stand-alone Annual Meetings, and in the work of the AAR, and prepare for our Centennial Celebration).

Recently the AAR staff, working with AAR members, the Executive Committee, and the Board, have sharpened the mission statement, prioritized goals, reiterated objectives, and put in place concrete implementation plans that can be measured and assessed. We want to remind all of our members of our central commitments and strategic objectives. These spring from our original “Centennial Strategic Plan, 2004–2009,” and were approved by our Board as the “Updated Strategic Plan” in April 2008.

Our Statement of Purpose and Values

The purpose of the American Academy of Religion derives from two principal goals:

1) To promote understanding of and critical reflection on religious traditions, issues, questions, values, texts, practices, and institutions. To this end, we foster communication and exchange among teachers and scholars and the public understanding of religion.

2) To serve the professional interests of AAR members as students, teachers, and scholars.

The AAR is committed to promoting equity, responsibility, and democratic accountability within the academic study of religion and in the work of the AAR itself.

Our Near-term Objectives (to be accomplished in eighteen to thirty-six months)

• Facilitate membership development by increasing membership, members’ satisfaction, and member participation.

• Enhance our Annual Meeting with a successful meeting in Chicago that will set the stage for the Centennial kickoff in Montreal; to use our “stand alone” status to develop the AAR’s unique program.

• Foster international exchanges by building global connections and by positioning the AAR to be a resource to our international partners.

• Reimagine our governance structures to better suit our current situation, and in this seek an ideal balance among competing values.

• Celebrate the AAR’s 100th anniversary with a fundraising campaign and special programming and events.

• Enhance the public understanding of religion with new programming.

• Experiment with and deploy new technologies in scholarly communication.

• Enhance the work of the AAR’s ten regions.

The AAR has a bright future. As we plan our Centennial Celebration, look for more news about progress on our Updated Strategic Plan.
Unity Institute Presents...

Lyceum 2009
at Unity Village

September 30—October 3

“Science and Religion: An Evolving Dialogue”

The Lyceum at Unity Village is an annual educational symposium open to teachers, writers, and students of spiritual and theological studies. Guest speakers, visiting scholars, Unity Institute faculty, and selected students will present scholarly papers and participate in panel discussions on groundbreaking, provocative topics in religious studies. This year’s Lyceum is the second annual symposium sponsored by Unity Institute.

Major Presentations ...

“The Future of Space Flight”
with Dr. Edgar Mitchell
The sixth man to walk on the moon, Dr. Mitchell’s extraordinary career personifies humankind’s eternal thrust to widen its horizons as well as its inner soul. He has devoted the last 35 years to studying human consciousness and psychic and paranormal phenomena in the search for a common ground between science and spirit. In 1972 he founded the Institute of Noetic Sciences to sponsor research into the nature of consciousness as it relates to cosmology and causality. He is a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom and, in 2005, was a nominee for the Nobel Peace Prize. His books include *Psychic Exploration* and *The Way of the Explorer*.

“What Is the Nature of a Healthy Dialogue Between Science and Religion?”
and “The Dangers and Opportunities of Bringing Science Into Faith”
with Dr. Margaret Wheatley
Dr. Wheatley writes, teaches, and speaks about how we might organize and accomplish our work in chaotic times. She is cofounder and president emerita of The Berkana Institute, a charitable global foundation that works in partnership with a rich diversity of people around the world who strengthen their communities by working with the wisdom and wealth already present in their people, traditions, and environment. Her books include *Leadership and the New Science* and *Finding Our Way: Leadership for an Uncertain Time*.

“What if Extraterrestrials Really Do Exist? Towards a Cosmic Faith”
with Dr. Richard Randolph
An associate professor and chair of the bioethics department at the Kansas City University of Medicine and Biosciences’ College of Biosciences, Dr. Randolph is the first academically trained ethicist to address ethical issues related to space exploration. He has shared his knowledge of ethical issues around the world and regularly engages his students in discussions on ethics. Dr. Randolph is a recipient of a John Templeton Foundation teaching award for course work in science and religion.

Registration

$299* (includes all sessions, evening events, and welcome packet with Lyceum 2009 t-shirt)
(Accommodations priced separately)
*Plus processing fee
Register by August 31 and SAVE $50!

www.unity.org/education/lyceum.html

For more details, e-mail Lyceum 2009 coordinator Victoria Cromwell at cromwelly@unityonline.org, or call 816-251-3535, Ext. 2065.