Dear Colleagues and friends,

Welcome to a new year which is going to be a highlight for sociologists of religion. As this newsletter covers, our next meeting will be part of the XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology which will take place in Yokohama, Japan, July 13–19. Jim Spickard and Esmerlada Sanchez are coordinating this event and I thank them for all their hard work and vision. You can find the sessional list in this newsletter and it looks exciting. I can't wait to listen to as many papers as possible and learn more about what's happening in the sociology of religion from around the world. I am also looking forward to seeing many of you at what will become a memorable event.

It is with regret that the Research Committee 22 has recently lost one of its long-time members, Otto Maduro. This Venezuelan born academic was a RC22 board member in 1978–82 and 2006–2010. I thank Jim Spickard and Laurel Kearns who have given permission to reproduce in this newsletter their personal memorial of this public sociologist who was at Drew University a Professor of World Christianity & Latin American Christianity. Otto is not only a great loss to his family and friends, but also to our field of study.

There are many conferences of great interest this year such as the Inform Anniversary Conference on Minority Religions in London (January 31 – February 2), the 11th International Study of Religion in Eastern and Central Europe Association conference in Kaunas, Lithuania (April 24-27), the 6th African Association for the Study of Religions conference in Cape Town, South Africa (July 30–August 3), the 76th Association for the Study of Religion annual meeting in San Francisco, USA (August 14–15) and the 2014 Society for the Scientific Study of Religion annual meeting in Indianapolis, USA (Oct 31 – November 2). There is also the XXth World Congress of the International Association for the History of Religion in Erfurt, Germany (August 23–29, 2015). Information about these events is listed in this newsletter. No doubt, the field of sociology of religion is very strong and is growing from year to year. I am glad to see so much research going on in all parts of the world.

I now invite you to turn the pages of this new issue of the RC22 newsletter prepared by our secretary/treasurer, Afe Adogame. As always, Afe provides in these newsletters new and stimulating information in the sociology of religion. You will for example be able to read an account of the McNamara Centre for the Social Study of Religion, and the Centre for Critical Research on Religion, and read an interview between Afe Adogame and Jim Spickard on ethnography.

Do not forget to check our blog at http://www.isa-rc22.org/blog/ which stores all the information about events and other activities in the sociology of religion posted on the RC22 e-mailing list.

See you in a few months in Japan!

Sociologically yours,
Otto Maduro (1945-2013); A personal memorial

He studied briefly for the priesthood but soon left seminary to get a philosophy degree. He quickly realized that conservative Venezuelan Catholicism was just one strand of an extremely complex tradition. This led him to study philosophy and sociology at the Catholic University of Louvain, where he received a Masters in the sociology of religion and a Masters and PhD in the philosophy of religion, writing his dissertation on Karl Marx. His first major book, Religion and Social Conflicts, published after his 1977 return to Venezuela, grew out of his interest in a more complex understanding of the Marxian perspective on religion. It quickly received much attention for its analysis of religion’s role, both positive and negative, in social and economic development; it is still in print. Otto soon became an important voice in discussions of what religion could do to help improve the lives of the Latin American poor.

He remained committed to this task throughout his career. He also remained committed to the discipline of the sociology of religion, serving on several organizational councils – including the ISA RC22 – on editorial boards, and as an editor of journal special issues. He was nominated for the prudency of several social science disciplinary societies, including the ASR. At the SISR/ISSR, he was part of the famous multi-national “Class of 1973”, which included Jim Beckford, Meredith McGuire, Jim Richardson, Daniele Herveau-Léger, Ole Riis, Cristián Parker, and other sociologists of religion prominent on several continents.

In the early 1980s, Otto was invited to the United States to teach at the University of Notre Dame and in the Maryknoll School of Theology’s “Justice and Peace Studies” program. Anthony Blasi remembers that Otto immediately became interested in the lives and work conditions of workers at Notre Dame, and others remember how he always made a point to know the names, and jobs, of all those who make a university run. He taught at Maryknoll for some years. While there, he nurtured the study and practice of Liberation Theology and encouraged Catholicism’s prophetic voice. Not just Catholicism: Marc Ellis writes of how Otto supported his own development of a Jewish theology of liberation. Otto was never parochial in his religious outlook, though in this case he found a personal interest: his father was of Jewish descent, from a family driven from Spain by the Inquisition.

Otto returned to Latin America at several points in the late 1980s, teaching and working in Venezuela, Brazil, and Central America. He moved to Drew University in 1992 with his wife Nancy Noguería (now an Associate Professor of Spanish there), to become Professor of World Christianity at the Drew Theological School. Their son Mateo was born in 1995. He retired from that post just before his death May 9, 2013. While there, he began to focus on the social and religious situations of U.S. Latino/as, as well as founding the Hispanic Theological Institute with his Drew colleague, Ada Maria Isasi-Díaz and actively contributing to the Hispanic Theological Initiative. He later directed the Summer Program – an independent program for enhancing the education of American Latina/o graduate students in religion and theology.

Two grants (from the Ford Foundation and the ATS/Luce Fellows in Theology Program) helped fund a study of Latina/o Pentecostal churches in Newark, NJ. These projects attracted a number of graduate students, many of whom are now active in scholarly and/or church settings. Inclusion and social transformation have always been at the top of his agenda.
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His more recent work, widely read in Spanish, *Mapas Para La Fiesta* has been translated into English, with an introduction by Eduardo Mendieta, and will be published by Fordham Press in 2014. At Drew, Otto and his colleagues developed several creative programs to give their students more than a traditional intellectual education. These included bringing students into a prison for semester-long courses alongside inmates; taking students abroad to live amid a different culture; connecting Drew courses with struggling nearby communities to discover what they can contribute to and gain from community members’ life experiences; team-teaching courses and otherwise modeling a collaborative instructional style. In an interview after he was elected President of the American Academy of Religion, he described his main teaching goal as “mentoring students in a way that helps them grow as writers, presenters, researchers, authors, teachers, public intellectuals, and team-workers.”

“I see myself as a sort of agent provocateur in the classroom; not so much transmitting knowledge as eliciting doubts, questions, and quests and not so much judging how much a student has learned from me or from the readings I assign as rather, how far a student has dared to go on her/his own search for knowledge. If I am useful in stimulating and nurturing that search, that is the greatest joy in my own teaching labor.”

The numerous postings from friends, colleagues, and students worldwide on Drew’s website honoring Otto on his retirement certainly attest to the impact that he had on those who knew him [http://www.drew.edu/otto/]. It is still open for posting remembrances; his wife Nancy Noriega and his son Mateo value these greatly.

Otto taught Jim that love is indeed enough. In the end, the best we humans can do is stand together in solidarity, facing the abyss. A few years later, Otto played cupid, saying to Meredith (Jim’s future spouse), “Jim is the only one of my male friends to whom I would trust my female friends.” It worked, and Otto called on every anniversary to wish us well.

Laurel remembers most the comradeship of teaching together at Drew for 19 years. Having met Otto almost ten years earlier as a new graduate student, she found it very rewarding to team-teach with and learn from a master. Otto’s fluency in multiple languages was reflected in his careful choice of words, when he would pause to paint a more nuanced and complex picture of any social concept he was explaining to the class. His teaching and work emphasized the interconnections between class, race, ethnicity, gender, nationality, and sexuality, as well as the importance of understanding how these dynamics produce complicated religious worlds.

He constantly reminded students that people have multiple religious identities, not just one, and that they juggle these as they walk through life. His students at the ASR gathering remembered that he was always pushing them to understand social phenomenon in its messy complexity, never allowing them to rest easy with simple or reductionist views. He taught this with a gentle heart. One student commented that he taught her the value of choosing words of caring, not judgment. Another spoke of his ability to listen carefully to others, with generous and humane attention.

Otto was known among us for being willing to change his mind, for listening intently and taking into consideration other viewpoints.
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As a result, no one could ever entirely predict his position on something. We could, however, count on him to give voice to the larger context of all our work, a prophetic call reminding us of our responsibility as scholars and people of faith to think, understand and act, that politics, relations of power, privilege and injustice are always present in what we chose to study, and how we chose to act based on what we know, or have chosen to forget, indeed present in what we acknowledge as religion, theology, orthodoxy.

In his remarks for the 2003 Paul Douglass lecture for the Religious Research Association and the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, a lecture that received a standing ovation, Otto challenged his colleagues:

“May our research and reflections on ‘religion’ contribute to, rather than hinder, the counter-imperial struggles of people everywhere to have their lives, and those of their children, neighbors, friends, and other loved ones recognized as sacred, worthy of tender care and respect, rather than consistently threatened, busted, bombed, or trampled by the this-worldly powers and principalities.”

He said something similar in his AAR Presidential Address last year. After reminding his audience of the power of the American imperial Establishment to ruin ordinary people’s lives, to punish those who oppose it, and to make such violence seem ‘normal’, he called intellectuals and scholars to our responsibilities:

As intellectuals, we brandish a special kind of power. How do we use that power, with whom, for whom, what for? Power is an ethical issue. And it is a more urgent ethical issue when human lives are at stake, ... in the ever more inhuman environment where immigrants to the U.S. find themselves after 9/11. This is an urgent invitation for us as researchers, teachers, academics, scholars of religion – but also as plain citizens and simple human beings – to hear the cry of the oppressed and to respond to that cry, with our power, our ethical responsibility, and our role in the production and dissemination of knowledge, in any and all forms within our reach. May we live up to Otto’s call as we travel our roads without him.

-- Laurel Kearns, Associate Professor of the Sociology of Religion, Drew Uni.
-- Jim Spickard, Professor of Sociology & Anthropology, University of Redlands

Of further interest:

Before his death, Otto’s students and colleagues at Drew created a web page in his honor, to share their messages and reminiscences. It is still open for postings at http://www.drew.edu/otto/.

Marc Ellis has written a personal remembrance of his work with Otto in the Justice and Peace Studies Program at Maryknoll in the early 1980s: http://mondoweiss.net/2013/05/prophetic-encountering-maduro.html
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James Spickard is North American Representative to the ISA Research Committee 22 (Sociology of Religion) Board & Webmaster, RC22. He is Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Redlands, USA. His contact email: jim_spickard@redlands.edu

Afe Adogame is Secretary/Treasurer of the ISA Research Committee 22 (Sociology of Religion). He is Associate Professor of Religious Studies / World Christianity at the University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom. His email: a.adogame@ed.ac.uk

In Conversation with James Spickard: Ethnography is like using a Camera!

Interview by Afe Adogame

Afe Adogame [AA]: Who are you?

James Spickard [JS]: That’s a more complex question than it appears. To answer in a traditional Euro-American manner: I’m Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Redlands, where I teach courses on theory, research design & methods, the sociology of religion, homelessness, world hunger, etc. I’ve published about 60 journal articles and book chapters on various aspects of the social study of religion, plus more reviews than I can count. I’ve edited or co-edited three books, the most recent with you on the transnational dynamics of contemporary African religions (Religion Crossing Boundaries Brill 2010). The most significant of these was Personal Knowledge and Beyond (NYU 2002), on reflexive ethnography in the sociology of religion. I’ve also published a book called Thinking Through Statistics (Torooverde 2005, 2014), designed to demystify quantitative reasoning in social science. I’ve been Program Chair or co-Coordinator for three major conferences, including the upcoming RC22 program in Yokohama. I’m currently one of two North American representatives to the RC22 Board, for which I created a website and events blog (http://www.isa-rc22.org). I’m also the U.S. representative on the Council of the International Society for the Sociology of Religion, whose website I created (and have thankfully now passed on to a younger scholar).

Were I to answer this as an 11th-century Confucian, however, I would say that I am the son of Donald Spickard and Mary Adkins, the grandson of Vernon Spickard, Mildred Beim, Russell Adkins, and Mary Wrightson. My brother, Paul Spickard, is a well-known historian of ethnic identity. My wife, Meredith McGuire, is a well-known sociologist of religion and of the sociology of health & illness. My children, Janaki & Dmitri Spickard-Keeler, are just finding their way as young adults. My teachers include Charles McCoy, James McClendon, Michelle Rosaldo, and Clare Fischer. My students include Julia Pazzi, Kate Avansino, Jonathan Marion, and Javier Espinoza. I have been colleagues (and friends) with (among many others) Mary Jo Neitz, Tekle Woldemikael, Barnett Pearce, and Otto Maduro. Etc, etc.

Notice the difference? The first of these is all about “I”: who I am as an individual. The second is all about the relationships that shaped me. Both express core truths, but Euro-American academic culture emphasizes the first and plays down the second. Yet we know that our teachers, colleagues, partners, students, and children make us who we are. It matters that I spent my teen years living on the edge of an African American community in Seattle. It matters that I have spent a lot of time in Europe and Latin America, and that I have close connections to international currents in the sociology of religion.

These shape who I am and what I do intellectually.

I can be specific about this. Right now, I’m in the midst of writing a book exploring some non-Western approaches to the sociology of religion. Tentatively titled After Colonialism, I argue that mainstream sociology is too dependent on Christian assumptions about what constitutes religion. Had we all been born Navajo, for example, we would see things much differently. Or were we followers of Ibn Khaldun, we would see religion and ethnicity as parallel sources of social solidarity. In the Confucian case, what would the sociology of religion look like, were we to take the relational notion of self seriously?

In that notion, virtue (yi) grows out of sacred care for our relationships (li). Who maintains social relationships in contemporary religions? In America, it’s the women in the church kitchen cooking suppers for the congregants. If we want to understand actual church life, we ought to pay a lot more attention to them and a lot less attention to pastors and theologians. Interestingly, that’s precisely the conclusion that Robert Putnam and David Campbell found in their recent book American Grace. They found that community-building is usually more important to everyday religious life than sermons. So you can learn this without considering li and te, but the Confucian insight gets you there faster.

After Colonialism pulls together 8-10 of the articles I’ve written over the last 20 years, plus new material, into a seamless argument. I’m about 2/3 done with it and expect to finish it by the end of Spring Semester. That will be a bit of a trick, because I work at a university that highly values teaching, so semesters are rather full. That’s why I’ve mainly written articles and edited collections. Those are easier to do with my kind of teaching load.

AA: In your book ‘Personal Knowledge and Beyond’ (2002), you alluded to a methodological divide in the social-scientific study of religion. What is this in concrete terms and how did you arrive at that conclusion?

Cont. on page 6
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JS: You’re talking about my distinction between ‘generalizers’ and ‘particularizers’ in the study of religion. There are other pairs of terms that cover this territory: ‘ethnological’ versus ‘ethnographic’, ‘non-theoretic’ versus ‘ideographic’, ‘etic’ versus ‘emic’, ‘comparative’ versus ‘descriptive’, etc. Recognizing that these pairs are not identical, ‘generalizers’ wish to uncover law-like regularities in human behavior by finding the patterns that stand behind events.

‘Particularizers’ wish to understand social actors in a particular locale from, as it were, the inside. They want to understand how people think about a particular situation and what motivates their actions in all their complexity. Sociology has traditionally been a generalizing discipline. Anthropology has not. I’m equally trained in both fields, so I can perhaps see the patterns more clearly. (That’s a generalizer’s comment, of course.) I am also familiar with the now-three-decades-long crisis in anthropology, which casts generalizing in a negative light.

AA: Don’t you think you have made a superficial dichotomy here? Don’t we have scholars who transcend these boundaries or at least embody both as ‘generalizers’ and ‘particularizers’?

JS: Sure. People do both. The question is, how well do they do both and how conscious are they of the choices they make in the process? Generalizing typically requires one to presume that certain dimensions of social life are primary, at least for the field of study in which one is engaged. Particularizers understand that such simplifications can be embedded in the investigator’s own cultural milieu, not in the situation under study. Rational choice theories in the sociology of religion, for example, presume a model of human being in which culture is at best epiphenomenal and can typically be ignored. Thus Larry Fannaccone’s honest admission that rational choice theories presume that religious demand is invariant — something that I demonstrated was untrue when I wrote about those theories 15 years ago.

We are now far enough removed from the heyday of the market/rational-choice approach, to see how it paralleled the rise of what Michael Burawoy calls “third-wave marketization”. That’s the ideology that market exchange rules all aspects of human life and always does so for the better. How neo-liberal American can you get? Generalizers have to watch out for such things. Particularizers have to watch out that they don’t get so sunk in the details of their study site that they can’t see anything beyond them.

AA: If Ethnographers are good examples of particularizers, then what are you or where do you situate yourself within this divide?

JS: True be told, I’m primarily a theorist. Yes, I spent a couple of years in the 1970s doing ethnography among the San Francisco-based members of one of the new Japanese religions. And I spent major parts of thirteen years doing fieldwork with a radical Catholic community in Los Angeles. I’ve written about both of these, as well as about religious experiences among Quakers, a group I know rather well. But none of these pieces is purely descriptive. Each is theory-driven. My 2005 article on Catholic Worker house masses, for example, shows how a sensitivity to Navajo concepts of ritual uncovers aspects of Catholic ritual life that a traditionally symbolic analysis would miss. So theory matters, at least in what I write.

On the other hand, my field experiences taught me what you have to do to make sure you get the correct picture. I spent an entire extra year in the field to make sure that my Navajo interpretation was correct. I don’t recommend that to younger scholars; that much double-checking makes it hard to get projects done. But in this case, it made it clear to me (and to my readers) that the house masses were important for maintaining these Catholic activists’ emotional centeredness. And they did so through the ways the ritual shaped group experience. That’s theoretically important. Good generalizing depends on good particularizing, in this case.

AA: If you suggest, particularizers traditionally have held less status than generalizers in the social scientific study of religion, has this trend changed within our discipline? In 2013 could you still see ethnography as holding a second-class status in the study of religion?

JS: It’s still there – certainly in the U.S. Look at the articles in the Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion – arguably the highest status sub-disciplinary journal in our field. Almost every one of them has a data table. The same is true of the American Sociological Review. Particularizing work is still seen as “slow journalism” in institutional sociology. (That’s a direct quote, by the way, from a former President of the SSR).

AA: Is it not an overstatement to assert that quantitative sociologists have historically ruled the world?

JS: Technically yes. But only because no sociologist has ruled the world. Fernando Henrique Cardoso comes the closest, but he was only President of Brazil. They have, however, ruled the discipline, certainly in the U.S. since the 1950s. Talcott Parsons made some interesting critiques of this, by the way, but not from a fieldworker’s point of view.

AA: Your take on ethnography raises a perennial problem in our field – the insider/outsider enigma. Does “being there” and “knowing the natives” not continue to encounter grave epistemological hurdles?

JS: Yes, but so does being human. That’s not just a flip comment. Every kind of investigation is epistemologically problematic. The question is, how does one justify what one thinks one knows, while simultaneously being as cognizant as possible of the partial nature of that knowledge. The problem with old-style ethnography was the fiction of the omniscient narrator. The “this is how life is for the members of the First Church of the Presumptuous Assumption” or whatever group one is seeking to report. A White male ethnographer will have access to some parts of that social scene and a Black
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female ethnographer will have access to others. I have one colleague whose good looks, intelligence, and (at the time) unmarried status got him access to lots of places where a not-so-good looking and married but equally intelligent ethnographer could not have gone. (He acted with integrity; not all do.) The point is: there is no omniscient ethnographer. We all bring out social statuses, personalities, foibles, and limitations with us. The issue is, how can we still paint the right picture?

My answer is that ethnography is a lot like using a camera. You point the camera at something and you take a picture, and that picture displays something true about what you pointed at. Unless you photoshop it – adding extra zebras, two-headed griffins, etc. – you get what you see. However, you don’t get what you don’t point at. A standard camera lens gives you a 46-degree angle of view, so you don’t see most of the 360-degree picture. There’s a lot left out. That’s one problem. The other is that you can only take a photo from a single spot. You can’t be everywhere at the same time. So your photos are inevitably partial – though true to what you see from where you are standing.

Ethnography is like that: you have to leave out a lot and you can only portray what you can see from your social location. Cameras make that obvious, but old-style ethnographies didn’t. Reflexive ethnographers deliberately show us both where they stand and what they choose to frame with their pictures. Then we know how to correct for their point of view. To me, that’s more honest. Shawn Landres’ chapter in Personal Knowledge and Beyond presents a different take on this. He argues that there are eight ‘representational moments’ in any piece of ethnographic research. Each of these is problematic. None of them, however, can be avoided. Every ethnographer needs to read this piece. That’s what reflexive ethnography is all about: make clear the limits of one’s own ability to see and interpret a socio-cultural setting. Short of a God’s-eye view, that’s the best we can do. And none of us is God. That’s one place where Christian theology gets it right – at least in my view.

AA: Another crucial debate is the politics of engaged studies in the sociology of religion. As one who has engaged extensive ethnography in far-flung places and involving non-elite subalterns, I will like to ask a question with a political dimension. Do you keep a strict social and intellectual distance from your subjects of study?

JS: Actually, yes. I follow Max Weber in this, however. First, your own interests shape what you investigate. Growing up where and when I did, I can’t help but see social inequalities and I can’t help but see cultural and sub-cultural differences. Thus my fieldwork on a new Japanese religion and my ongoing projects on religious social activists come with the territory. I imagine I could explore other territories, but I happen to think this one is central to contemporary social life. My empirical work is thus centered biographically.

That said, I am by profession (and calling) a scholar, not a politician. Weber noted the difference between science as a vocation and politics as a vocation. The former is – to use my language – governed by the regulative ideal of ‘truth’. That is, my task is to get the story right. My task is not to accomplish particular social goals, nor motivate people to act in certain ways (except when I am training young scholars). Nor is it to make compromises so as to protect my group. I need to tell the truth, as I see it, even if it sheds bad light on people whose goals I admire.

I also need to be aware of my unconscious biases. As I’ve written elsewhere, only men can imagine that they don’t have gender, only Whites can imagine that they don’t have race, only heterosexuals can ignore people’s various sexualities, and only those who live at the center of the Empire can ignore that empire’s influence. As a White male heterosexual American, then, I’ve had a bit of conditioning to overcome. I can’t get the story right unless I remain vigilant, so that my social conditioning doesn’t lead me down the wrong path. Is that a matter of ‘political’ allegiance influencing my scholarship? Not in Weber’s terms, nor in mine. Yes, I am (as the Germans say) ein acht-und-sechziger. I came to political consciousness in 1968, as the result of social turmoil from Berlin to Paris to Prague to Chicago to Mexico. That shaped me. But it did not, in my view, sway my vocation.

AA: When you argue elsewhere that “postcolonial” ethnography has solved its political malaise by advocating two regulative ideals – “truth” and “equality” – rather than one, what point were you actually making?

JS: The point is a philosophical one. Science is a human activity and as such is governed by ideals. Those ideals regulate our conduct, such that we can actually carry things out. Kant made this point in the Critique of Practical Reason. He thought that people can only be moral if they possess the (unprovable) idea that God rules the universe justly. This ideal helps aim our lives, which makes moral action possible.

Charles Sanders Peirce applied this notion to science in the early 20th century. He pointed out that we can’t ever know for sure whether our theories about the world are true. We can test them – for science is self-correcting. (We reject ‘wrong’ answers and embrace ‘right’ ones.) But we can only grasp the evidence that our tests produce through the lens of our theories, not directly. Thus we can’t compare atheoretic reality to our theoretical predictions, because we have no independent handle on the former; theory operates on both sides. How, then, is a self-correcting science possible?

Peirce’s answer was that scientists act in pursuit of an ideal, called ‘truth’. Truth is not an existing state; it is an attainment. He argued that ‘truth’ is the ideal position at which scientific knowledge would arrive, were scientists to carry out their self-correcting activities for an infinite period of time.
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The scientific community discovers new evidence, revises or rejects old theories, create new theories that the community thinks better match the evidence.

This is only possible if scientists believe there is a ‘truth’ that the scientific community could discover, in some future era. The ideal of ‘truth’ thus regulates scientific conduct. It makes science possible.

Let’s imagine science were to reject this ideal. Were there no truth, then on what basis would one say that scientific evidence is right or wrong? Because it is beautiful? Or because it furthers someone’s career? Maybe. And maybe that’s all there is. But science in fact lives in the faith that its own self-correcting activity is more than just beauty or careerism – or nonsense, wish-fulfillment, or any one of many other possibilities. Peirce argues that ‘truth’ makes science possible, like Kant’s (unprovable) ‘God’ makes morality possible. Both are human activities that need regulation if they are to happen.

My point – in the final chapter of Personal Knowledge and Beyond, in a recent piece I published in the Annual Review of the Sociology of Religion, and in a different form my contribution to the recent Festschrift you edited in honor of Ulrich Berner – is that anthropological ethnography (though not yet its sociological cousin) has discovered a second regulative ideal.

Unlike colonial ethnographers, who went to other parts of the globe to study people and figure out how to rule them, contemporary anthropological ethnographers have realized that they cannot paint a true picture of the people they study unless they presume that those people are equal to themselves. If they treat the ‘natives’ as benighted, they will simply not understand the depths of their culture. They will not capture the truth about them.

Take a look at Durkheim, for example. Yes, he did no fieldwork, but the fieldwork he used in The Elementary Forms portrayed Australian Aboriginal peoples as having the simplest form of society. Yet we now know that Aboriginal religion is as complex as anything in the West, that Aboriginal languages are more complex than Indo-European languages, that Aboriginal kinship systems are far more complex that those of modern peoples, etc. The presumption of inequality got in the way.

Or take a look at Margaret Mead. My concern isn’t whether she was right or wrong about Samoan teenage sexuality. It is that she assumed a primitive-to-modern pattern of social development that kept her from understanding the lives of the people she was studying. Read her New Lives for Old and then read Peter Worsley’s The Trumpet Shall Sound. You’ll realize that Mead completely missed the religious changes that swept through Manus between her two periods of study there. Those changes that created the shifts that she read through a modernization lens.

I could multiply these examples. My point, in Personal Knowledge, was that the leading edge of current anthropological ethnography understands that we have to treat our informants as equals, or else we will misportray their socio-cultural worlds. Sociological ethnographers have been slow to do this. We still get too many sociological ethnographies that focus on social uplift. That’s where sociological ethnography began, after all: with an attempt to bring poor people into the middle class. If anthropological ethnography began in the British Foreign Office and the American Bureau of Indian Affairs (and their French and Russian counterparts), then sociological ethnography began in the Settlement Houses. None of these treated the people they studied as equals. Only by presuming our informants to be our equals can we see enough about their actual lives to describe them accurately.

So: two regulative ideals: ‘truth’ and ‘equality’. Each of them is epistemologically generated. Together they make good ethnography possible. Are there more such ideals? I don’t know. It took us a while to discover these two, and I’m convinced that we have better ethnographies as a result. Let’s see what the future brings.

AA: Are you convinced that there has been a deep and sufficient rethinking of established practices and ethnographic responsibility to rescue the ethnographic study of religion from what you had described in the past as epistemological and political naïveté?

JS: Not yet. But we’re working on it. There’s certainly more consciousness among sociologists of religion than there once was. But the battle is certainly not won.

AA: By the way, why did you dedicate the book “Personal Knowledge and Beyond” (2002) to Otto Maduro?

JS: Otto was my best friend (as he was to many). Just before the book came out, he had a recurrence of the cancer that finally killed him last May. He also knew most of the book’s contributors and was seriously concerned with the issues we raised. It seemed fitting. I’m glad that he lived for another ten years.

AA: If you had another 50 years of research life, what new ethnographic paths will you chart?

JS: I don’t, which is probably good, because I’m a great procrastinator. I’m hoping to finish After Colonialism soon, then a long delayed book called What Is Happening To Religion? Six Narratives, then another long-delayed book on religious experience. (My publisher assumes I’ll finish my book on Basic Research Design before What Is Happening, and I probably will, as I need it for my teaching.) These are the projects I’ve thought through the most, though I’ve still got a lot of writing to do.
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After that, I’ve got two projects at the head of the queue. First, I want to work on a book on late-20th/early-21st century religious peace-and-justice activism. It’s an interested case, because it’s not located in a particular spot; it’s a network phenomenon. Some parts of the network are local, some are national (to the U.S.), and others are international. How do you portray a floating social network accurately? How do you present the ways that network insiders see their work, themselves, and their lives? How do you do that while simultaneously capturing the tenuousness of the network, the fact that you don’t have the kind of bounded communities that ethnographers have traditionally studied, and so on. I don’t have answers for these questions, though I have some ideas. I want to explore those further. I also really like talking with people who take their religious lives seriously. Most religious social activists do.

The second project is theoretical. I take globalization seriously, but I am shifting the way I think about it. Our Introduction to Religion Crossing Boundaries included a 7-fold typology of ways that sociologists have dealt with transnational religion. That’s a nice conceptual system, but I think I’m ready to tackle some harder aspects of the issue. I’ve been reading Jean and John Comaroff’s Theory From the South, and I think I see a new way to talk about the structural element that’s been missing in globalization discussions in our sub-discipline. At this point, it’s just an inkling, but I think it’s a good one. I’d love the chance to work through those ideas in depth.

**AA: Where do you see the social scientific study of religion or ethnographic study of religion going in the next decades?**

**JS:** I’m hoping for more pluralism. That’s why our international societies are so important. It’s the only place where we really encounter and challenge each other. I learn a lot from each such event. That’s why I’ve been so active in the ISSR and the RC22. That’s why I volunteered to co-coordinate the RC22 Yokohama program. I want to see a multi-national, multi-cultural, multi-philosophical, multi-ethnic, multi-theoretical meeting. We could easily have one.

**AA: May I ask you a more personal question: What does Jim do outside academic ethnographic enterprise?**

**JS:** Oh, lots of stuff. My current hobbies are photography and scuba diving – though not at the same time! I’ve been doing landscape and wildlife photography for the past 10-12 years and have put on a small number of shows. I’m quite slow at it, but am developing my eye. I now teach a month-long intensive course called “Visual Ethnography” at Redlands, which isn’t just an excuse to teach photography without the Art Department getting its shorts in a knot. I use the camera analogy I spoke about a few questions back to teach students to think about ethnography in a new way. They – and I – love the field trips. Disneyland is my favorite. That’s one of the advantages of working in southern California.

I also teach undergraduates. Yes, that’s my job, but it’s a bigger part of my job than it is for most professors, and I take it very seriously. In some ways, I apply the ethnographic equality-ideal to the classroom. I try to move my student from child-style education, where the teacher is in charge, to adult-style education, where each student takes responsibility for everyone’s learning, including mine. Most American students don’t know how to do that. They’re used to the standard ‘hidden curriculum’, which is “sit down, shut up, and listen to the expert’. They know how to do that, but it won’t help them in the long run. I try to teach them how to learn in a different way. It’s fun, challenging, and I hope to be doing it for a long time.

**AA: Do you have any regrets with your academic life?**

**JS:** Overall, no. I suppose I could whine about my teaching load and how hard it is to write during a teaching semester. I wish my university appreciated my scholarly side more than it does, but even Jesus seemed to have problems with the hometown folks not appreciating his work. I live simply enough and have enough resources that I was able to switch to a 3/4-time teaching schedule (with pay cut) that let me spend more time on scholarship than was otherwise possible. And I have international colleagues who appreciate my work. So I can’t complain. I have a good life. I hope it continues for a long time.

**AA:** Jim, thanks very much indeed for your time!
The McNamara Center for the Social Study of Religion at Loyola University Chicago supports scholarly activities in the social study of religion, from any disciplinary perspective that examines religion as a social phenomenon. The McNamara Center is home to faculty research projects and grants, supports graduate students working on dissertations in related topics, and sponsors special events and lectures that make social scientific perspectives on religion available to the university and the public.

The McNamara Center was founded in the late 1990s by Dr. Fred Kniss, then of Loyola’s Department of Sociology (and now Provost of Eastern Mennonite University in Harrisonburg, Virginia, USA). It is named for Robert McNamara, Ph.D. who had been chair of Loyola’s Department of Sociology and Dean of Loyola’s College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. McNamara was also a significant figure in the sociology of religion in the U.S., being President of the Association for the Sociology of Religion and a well-known figure in the field.

When Rhys H. Williams came to Loyola from the University of Cincinnati, he became the Director of the McNamara Center. It currently has four on-going regular activities:

The Chicago Area Group for the Study of Religion Communities (CAGSRC) was founded in 1991 by Professor R. Stephen Warner, then of the Sociology Department at the University of Illinois Chicago (UIC). During its first eight years the group met at UIC before moving to Loyola, as Fred Kniss (and now Rhys Williams) and Steve Warner became co-coordinators. CAGSRC meets three times each academic year, once in the fall, once in winter, and once in the spring.

It is a ‘work-in-progress’ type meeting. Before each gathering, usually about two weeks, an author(s) distributes a paper draft that is to be the focus of discussion. The presumption is that all participants will read the paper beforehand and be willing to participate in a collective discussion of it.

At the meeting itself, the author makes a brief presentation, then two pre-designated discussants offer comment, critique, and questions. A general discussion ensues. CAGSRC draws faculty and graduate students from Loyola, University of Illinois, Chicago, DePaul University, Northwestern University, University of Chicago, North Central University, Concordia College, and other schools in the greater Chicago area such as Purdue University, Notre Dame University, Indiana University-South Bend, and Northern Illinois University.

Topics for the meetings vary widely. For example, Dr. Lida Nedilsky of North Park University in Chicago recently presented material for her soon-to-be-published book on Christianity and civil society in Hong Kong, with Dr. Michael Agliardo, SJ (Loyola) and Dr. Fenggang Yang (Purdue) as discussants. Juan Martinez and Stephen Davis, doctoral students in sociology at the University of Illinois, Chicago presented a paper on Catholic activism in the recent pro-immigration marches in Chicago, with Dr. Kraig Beyerlein (Notre Dame) and Dr. Mary Ellen Konieczny (Notre Dame) acting as discussants. Other presentations from the past include Dr. Tricia Redeker Hepner, now of the University of Tennessee on Christianity and Community among Eritreans in Chicago, with Dr. Omar McRoberts (University of Chicago) discussing. A number of the papers have resulted in scholarly publications or have been part of dissertations. In addition, the collective discussions have helped foster social networks and a culture of community among many Chicago-area scholars of religion.

A second regular effort in the McNamara Center is the Sociology of Religion Working Group within the Department of Sociology. The Working Group is a graduate student-organized discussion and reading group that has both graduate student and faculty involvement. Some meetings have a work-in-progress format, in which designated participants present aspects of their current research, or do a ‘rehearsal’ run of an upcoming conference presentation. Graduate students often practice their Masters thesis or dissertation defense presentations before the group. On other occasions, group members decide on a shared reading or readings of already published articles and discusses the pieces collectively. Importantly, while faculty members participate, it is graduate students who organize the meeting, run it, and decide on the agenda. The McNamara Center has also played a role in helping to sponsoring research, as a base for grant funding, graduate student assistance, and as a physical space to house data and research stations. One such project was the “Religion, Immigration and Civil Society in Chicago Project,” whose co-principal investigators were Dr. Fred Kniss and Dr. Paul Numrich.

Cont. on page 11
The project was a three-year study of religion’s role in immigrant social life and civic engagement in metropolitan Chicago, funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts. Studying immigration congregations of Christian, Jews, Muslims, and Sikhs, the analysis looked at both the levels of civic involvement and the different forms that involvement took.

Overall, it showed a vibrant connection between congregations of religious newcomers and education, healthcare, social services, and other types of civic engagement. Several articles, and the book Sacred Assemblies (Kniss and Numrich, Rutgers University Press, 2007) resulted. Another effort is the ongoing “Youth and Religion Project,” with Dr. R. Stephen Warner and Rhys H. Williams, principal investigators. The project has been a multi-year study of youth (from high school age to college-age young adults) and their involvement in religious organizations. Funded by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., the Y&RP has studied religious congregations, church youth groups, campus religious groups, independent religious schools, and private families to see how youth participate in and use religious organizations, what they get from those groups, and how families work to pass on their faith traditions. Along with a number of articles and book chapters, the results of the study will appear in Navigating to Faith (Warner and Williams, forthcoming).

Finally, the McNamara Center regularly sponsors public lectures on the Loyola campus. Again, the topics have varied widely, and not all the presenters are sociologists. For example, media and religion scholar Stewart Hoover of the University of Colorado gave a recent lecture on the ‘mediatization’ of religion in contemporary American society. Sociologist Elizabeth Bernstein gave a recent talk on evangelical Christian involvement in the anti-human trafficking movement. In the past such scholars as Prema Kurien (Syracuse University), Wendy Cadge (Brandeis University) and Jose Casanova (now of Georgetown University) have been McNamara lecturers.

It can easily be argued that there has never been a more interesting time to study religion from a social science perspective. The founding intellects of sociological perspectives on religion — such as Emile Durkheim and Max Weber — were very interested in religion as Western European society was transformed by industrial capitalism. We stand at a similar point as globalizing processes in the world economic, world culture, and international travel and migration transform the world. Where, when, and how religion is relevant to these changes produces many fascinating and important questions.

The McNamara Center for the Social Study of Religion was established to take advantage of a fine university with a proud history in social scientific approaches to religion, Loyola University Chicago, set in one of the world’s great cities with a history of immigration, religious innovation, and social change. Where better to ask these questions, and to see processes of change occur, than in the congregations, temples, and streets of Chicago?

While established in the Department of Sociology, the McNamara Center is receptive to all social scientific perspectives, including anthropologists, political scientists, and religious studies scholars among its associates and affiliates. The Center provides both a setting for sharing work and discussing ideas and a potential resource for helping to sponsor research efforts.

We think of the Center as having a scholarly mission, and while pursuing that purpose, contributing to the knowledge and understanding that can help produce a more humane and democratic society. We urge you to check us out.

An incredibly sensitive community of academics and professionals such as the International Sociological Association, aware of the social transformations taking place in the world, cannot and should not be absent from a debate on inequality.

The great tradition of multi, inter and transdisciplinary works in which the most complex problems of the present day world are addressed; its unique condition of being academically, scientifically, regionally, institutionally and organically plural make it ideally qualified to face the challenge of contributing to this international exchange, from which an intellectual and moral force can emerge in order to achieve drastic changes in the manners, forms of reasoning and scopes of the decisions to be taken in the world to ensure the preservation of human life and societies.

Raquel Sosa
ISA Vice-President, Congress Programme
RC22 Program, World Congress of Sociology, Yokohama, Japan 2014: Final Sessional List (1) and Session Schedule

Jim Spickard & Esmeralda Sanchez, Program Coordinators

Presidential Session: “Facing an Unequal Post-Secular World” – organized by Adam Possamai

Paper Sessions (listed alphabetically by title): each with 4-5 oral presentations and 4-6 distributed papers: The Impact of Neoliberal Policies, Practices and Ideas on Religious Organizations – organized by Tuomas Martikainen

“Locating Religion in Civilizational Analysis” – organized by Edward Tiryakian & Said Arjomand

“Multiculturalism and Religion: Contemporary Challenges and Future Opportunities” – organized by Joshua Starkey

“New Forms of Religious Organization” – organized by Thomas Kern & Insa Pruisken

“Non-Religion in Question: Ethics, Equality, and Justice” – organized by Susanne Schenk & Cora Schuh

“Religion and Countering Gender Inequality” – organized by Anna Halaloff, Emma Tamalin, & Caroline Starkey

“Religion and the Transition to Adulthood” – organized by Kati Niemela

“Religion as a Factor in the Composition and Decomposition of Ethnic Identities” – organized by Mirjoljub Jevtic

“Religion, Immigrants, and Health” – organized by Ephraim Shapiro

“Religion, Nationalism and Transnationalism” – organized by Patrick Michel, Adam Possamai, & Brian Turner

“Religious Diversity and Social Change in Contemporary East Asia” – organized by Michiaki Okuyama

“The Role of Religion in the Public Sphere” – organized by Inger Furseth

“Sociology of Religion in Africa: Challenges and Prospects” – organized by Afe Adogame

“Spiritual and Religious Capital” – organized by Christo Lombard & Maria Haemmerli


“Welfare and Civil Society: The Role of Religion” – organized by Per Pettersson

Roundtable Sessions (listed alphabetically by title): each with 4-6 oral presentations and some also with distributed papers


“Facing Inequality from the Perspective of Islamic Organizations” [two tables] – organized by Kerstin Rosenow-Williams & Matthias Kortmann

“Issues of Secularization” – organized by Jim Spickard & Esmeralda Sanchez

“Lessons for Studying Religion in the African Diaspora” – organized by Jualynn Dodson

“Religion, State, and Law” – organized by Jim Spickard & Esmeralda Sanchez

“Religion and Politics” – organized by Jim Spickard & Esmeralda Sanchez

“Religion and Media” – organized by Jim Spickard & Esmeralda Sanchez

“The Sociology of Orthodoxy: The Study of the Church Life in Contemporary Russia” organized by Igor Ryzantsev & Maria Podlesnaya

Other Sessions:

Poster Session: Topics in the Sociology of Religion – 25 individual presentations in poster format

Film Session: Haifa’s Answer – a film about religious complexity in Haifa, Israel, with a discussion focused on issues related to visual sociology

Business Meeting

RC22 SESSION SCHEDULE

All Sessions are in Harbor Lounge B except the two Roundtables the Poster Session, and the Joint Session on “Religion, Immigrants, and Health”

MONDAY, JULY 14, 2014:
10:30 AM - 12:20 PM, The Impact of Neoliberal Policies, Practices and Ideas on Religious Organizations
New Forms of Religious Organization
03:30 PM - 05:20 PM, Uses of the Past: The Politics of Religion and Collective Memories
07:30 PM - 08:50 PM, Film: Haifa’s Answer

TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2014:
08:30 AM - 10:20 AM, Sociology of Religion in Africa: Challenges and Prospects
10:30 AM - 12:20 PM, RC22 Business Meeting
03:30 PM - 05:20 PM, Religious Diversity and Social Change in Contemporary East Asia
05:30 PM - 07:20 PM, Multiculturalism and Transnationalism

WEDNESDAY, July 16, 2014:
08:30 AM - 10:20 AM, Spiritual and Religious Capital
10:30 AM - 12:20 PM, Religion, Nationalism and Transnationalism
12:20 PM, The Impact of Neoliberal Policies, Practices and Ideas on Religious Organizations

THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2014:
08:30 AM - 10:20 AM, Religion, Immigrants, and Health

FRIDAY, JULY 18, 2014:
08:30 AM - 10:20 AM, Sociology of Religion in Africa: Challenges and Prospects
10:30 AM - 12:20 PM, RC22 Roundtable II
03:30 PM - 05:20 PM, Religious Diversity and Social Change in Contemporary East Asia
05:30 PM - 07:20 PM, Multiculturalism and Transnationalism

SATURDAY, JULY 19, 2014:
08:30 AM - 10:20 AM, Religion as a Factor in the Composition and Decomposition of Ethnic Identities.
Dynamics of Religion: Past and Present

Religion is a human, historical, social and cultural phenomenon. As such, religious ideas, practices, discourses, institutions, and social expressions are constantly in processes of change. The Congress will address the processes of change, the dynamics of religions past, present, and future, on several interconnected levels of analysis and theory, namely that of the individual, community and society, practices and discourses, beliefs, and narrations. These will be addressed within four areas:

Religious communities in society: Adaptation and transformation

Embedded within complex cultures, characterized by social change and intercultural exchange, religious communities constantly adapt to their changing environments, developing practices, discourses, and institutions conceptualized as “religion”. These concepts are subject to social and cultural influences. They also shape political and economic environments. Religious traditions are invented and re-invented, imperceptibly transformed, violently reformed or emphatically defended. How, then, do religious communities and institutions adapt to cultural change? How do they affect social change? Does interreligious contact and dialogue lead to religious change? How do religious communities react to the possibilities and threats of new media? Does globalization transform public religions? To what extent do states and public law affect religions?

Practices and discourses: Innovation and tradition

Founding figures, schisms and revivals characterize the dynamics of religion in past and present. Institutions develop or are dissolved. This, again, poses questions: How are religious traditions established, standardized and canonized? What are the mechanisms and agents of religious innovation? How do religious traditions repel religious change? How is sacred time and space established? Does religious individualization lead to innovation? What are the mechanisms of transformation and innovation of rituals and other practices? Do rituals create and perpetuate religious traditions? Are new religious movements or esoteric currents innovative? Does fundamentalism protect religious traditions? Does the internet lead to religious innovation? What are the dynamics of gender traditions?

The individual: Religiousity, spiritualities and individualization

Individuals, too, are agents of change. Privatization, patchwork religiousity and religious deviance are not restricted to the present. Can “religion” or “spirituality”, popular in many contemporary self-descriptions, be used as descriptive terms of our meta-language? Under what circumstances do individuals obey or deny religious traditions? How and why do individuals converse, or gradually change their religious convictions and affiliations? How can plural religious identities or patchwork religiousities be explained, what effects do they have on religious traditions? How important are religious experiences in religions? What are individual reasons for religious deviance? How do religions control the individual? Is the privatization of religion a modern phenomenon? Do biographic developments explain individual religiousity?

Methodology: Representations and interpretations

Religious change is registered and narrated by outsiders and insiders. Emic representations influence academic interpretations. Scholarly paradigms and theories are there-fore as dynamic as their object. Which master narratives about religious change need to be revised? Are all religious traditions invented? What is the current status of the secularization debate? Is there some scientific value in old paradigms of religious change (e.g. decline, fall, rise, axial age)? How can theories of cultural and religious evolution be applied in historical sciences? How do new approaches in historiography conceptualize religious change (e.g. entangled or trans-cultural history, postcolonial history, discourse analysis)?

Call for Panels

We invite contributions from all disciplines of religious studies and related fields of research to allow for broad, interdisciplinary discussion of the Congress topic. Panels should address one of the areas outlined above. Each panel lasts two hours. Panel papers should be limited to 20 to 30 minutes, depending on the number of panel participants. Panel conveners are asked to approach possible participants from different nations to reflect the scope and internationality of the IAHR Congress. To propose a panel, please submit a general proposal of the panel as well as individual proposals of all papers included in the panel. Both panel and papers of a proposed panel will be evaluated by the Academic Program Committee to ensure a high academic standard of the Congress program. We therefore ask panel conveners to submit the proposals of all prospective panel participants of a proposed panel as indicated by the submission form. Proposals of panels and of papers should not exceed 150 words.

The deadline for submission of proposals is Sunday, September 14, 2014. All proposals must be submitted electronically via the IAHR 2015 website. This site will be available for submissions from Sunday, September 1, 2013 through Sunday, September 14, 2014. As part of the submission process, you will be asked to indicate the area in which you would like your proposal considered. Your proposal will then be forwarded to the appropriate member of the Academic Pro-gram Committee. You will receive notice concerning the status of your proposal as soon as possible and certainly before March 1, 2015. If your panel or paper has been accepted by the Academic Program Committee, please note that you will have to register as Congress participant before May 15, 2015 to be included in the Congress program.

Congress Websites: www.iahr2015.org www.uni-erfurt.de/iahr Contact: iahr@uni-erfurt.de
Religion, Ecology, and the Environment

6TH AASR/IAHR Special CONFERENCE IN AFRICA:
Religion, Ecology, and the Environment

6TH AASR/IAHR Special CONFERENCE IN AFRICA:
(African Association for the Study of Religions)

Religion, Ecology, and the Environment in Africa and the African Diaspora. As scholars of religion, we have an important responsibility, in collaboration with other scholars in other disciplines to study religion, ecology, and the environment. This conference offers participants to present research, engage in dialogue, develop relevant educational curricula and inform public policy on this vital and critical issue.

Religion and the study of religions, ecology, and the environment in Africa are a major concern for reasons that include radical climate change; the disappearance of vegetation and wetlands; extensive exploitation of natural resources; frequent and severe droughts; the impact of climate changes on population density in major cities; water and food crises. The academic study of religions as a field provides an opportunity to examine these issues on different levels: theoretical, methodological, experiential, pedagogical, and the pragmatic.

We invite papers from scholars of religions, the social sciences, the natural sciences, interdisciplinary research groups, and institutes focusing on ecological and environmental issues that will address, among other things, the state of knowledge and science on ecology and environment, ecological and environmental degradation, management and sustainability, and ways of establishing scholarly dialogue on ecological balance. Papers and round tables could also study and analyze current and past projects on the continent that relate to religion, ecology, and the environment.

Examples of these would be the tree planting and ecological ministries of the Christian wing of the Zimbabwean Institute of Religious Research and Ecological Conservation (ZIRRCON), or large national initiatives like the Green Belt Movement. Papers might explore the aims of the projects, current status, their finances, as well as the environmental challenges that may be posed by the projects themselves and the prospects for sustainability.

Sub themes and related topics to be considered include the following:

- Climate change and the debates on climate change
- Nature, nature religions, and sacred spaces and environmental challenges
- Religious authority and environmental challenge
- Eco-feminism and religious dialogue
- Religion, the environment, and food security
- The environment and the crisis of safe drinking water
- Ecology and economics in religious perspective
- Religious, philosophical, and ethical perspectives on ecology
- Comparative religious view of environmental action
- Theology, ecology, and environmental challenges and promise
- Environmental ethics
- Faith Based Organizations and sustainable development
- Ecology, environment, and political responsibility
- Religion and the economics of climate change
- Religious perspectives on pharmacopeia, health, medicine and the environment
- Religion, biodiversity, and global bio-politics
- Religion and environmental pollution
- Religion Education and the Environmental Crisis
- Critical Religious Terms (rituals, myths, spaces) and Ecology

Cont. on page 16
6TH AASR/IAHR SPECIAL CONFERENCE IN AFRICA Cont.

ONLINE SUBMISSIONS

We invite abstracts of proposed panels, papers, and poster presentations. Panels may include a maximum of five presenters and respondents, and a chair. Individual papers or posters should include the title of the presentation and a short description of no more than 500 words. Please include the author’s contact information (institutional affiliation, email address and phone number). All abstracts should be submitted online by November 30, 2013 and full papers and power point presentations are expected by March 30, 2014 on the following:

Panel Proposals - for both the general proposal and individual members
Online Abstract Submission
We have extended the final date for submissions to 31st January 2014. Select papers presented at the conference may be published in peer reviewed publications.

ACCOMMODATION

The Conference will be held in Cape Town at the Conference Facilities of the Breakwater Lodge. A number of rooms have been set aside for the Conference at this hotel at preferential rates. Use this Booking Form when making a reservation directly with the hotel. In order to get the best rate, please use 1763701 or African Association for the Study of Religion as your reference when making your booking.

The following hotels have also offered special rates for participants.
The Commodore Hotel:

Cost of Registration $200.00 or R2000.00
Please note this amount includes: Registration, Opening dinner, daily lunches and teas - but excludes accommodation.
Payments may be made in one of the following ways. In each case, a form may be downloaded, filled in sent as per the instructions contained.

1. Wire Transfer to a the University Cape Town Bank Account.
2. Credit Card Payment to the University of Cape Town.

We look forward to your participation in Cape Town. Please write to us if you have any questions.
Abdulkader Tayob: abdulkader.tayob@uct.ac.za
Madipoane Masenya: Masenmj@unisa.ac.za
Elias Bongmba: bongmba@rice.edu

REGISTRATION

The Breakwater Lodge

Protea Hotel Victoria Junction

The Commodore Hotel:
IAHR African Trust Fund Research & Publication Grant Applications for 2014

Purpose:
The IAHR African Trust Fund seeks to facilitate and promote the advancement of research and the development of scholarship on religion in the African continent (and nearby islands) by encouraging scholarly and contextual research initiatives and practices, as well as publications. The IAHR African Trust Fund aims to encourage and acknowledge the generation of scholars whose research is deemed to hold significant future promise to increase knowledge and contribute to the historical, social and comparative study of religion in the African continent (and nearby islands). Thus, the IAHR African Trust Fund herewith invites young scholars in particular of any ethnic/national origin, working and/or studying in any higher academic or research institution on the African continent (and nearby islands). The relevance of the study to the historical, social and comparative study of religion in the African continent (and nearby islands). Adherence to the best practices of research methodology and theory employed. The relevance of the study to the African continent (and nearby islands).

Grant Amount
The total grant allocation for 2014 is US$4000. The grant application is divided into two categories and successful applicants will be awarded the respective amounts within the specific category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1: Research and/or Publication</th>
<th>Category 2: Research and/or Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 X Award of US$1000</td>
<td>4 X Award of US$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligibility Criteria
Applicants have to be scholars resident in Africa and associated with any higher academic or research institution within this context. We encourage applications from members to the IAHR member associations, namely the African Association for the Study of Religion (AASR), the Association for the Study of Religion in Southern Africa (ASRSA), and the East African Association for the Study of Religion (EAASR). Members of the Nigerian Association for the Study of Religion (NASR), no longer a member to the IAHR, may apply if they are also individual members to the AASR.

Evaluation Mechanism & Criteria
Applications will be evaluated by the Board of Trustees of the IAHR African Trust Fund, and the board will consult specialists in the relevant fields when needed. Applications will be evaluated according to the following criteria:
The originality, quality, importance and impact of the proposed study as it relates to the historical, social and comparative study of religion in the African continent (and nearby islands).

Adherence to the best practices of research methodology and theory employed. The relevance of the study to the African continent (and nearby islands).

Submission Timeframe: Applications are open till 30th January 2014. Grant-winning applicants will be announced on 20th February 2014. Note that all grants will be awarded to the successful applicants at the end of February 2014.

Conditions of Grants:
Applicants who receive the grant should submit a copy of the publication or a research report (of no less than 5 pages) that summarises the project’s findings to the IAHR African Trust Fund. The publication or completed research project should acknowledge the support received in the form of an IAHR African Trust Fund Grant. The IAHR African Trust Fund will be allowed to reproduce or report the summary and parts of the report on the IAHR website, annual reports, and any other document or medium for the purpose of informing its stakeholders on the study findings. In all these publications, the authorship of the research will be clearly attributed to the applicant.

Application Form
Send a brief covering letter addressed to the IAHR African Trust Fund stating that your submission is for consideration for the IAHR African Trust Fund Grant and include the following required materials:

Name of Applicant, Email, Telephone Number, Name of Applicant, Email, Telephone Number and Mailing Address of the Applicant,
Name of University, Department, Research Centre or Institute Name (if of IAHR African Member Association(s), Title of Research/Publication Proposal: A research proposal of no more than four single-spaced pages detailing the aims/objectives, specific research questions, methodology and theoretical issues, the rationale and plan of research (time frame), and a detailed, one-page budget should be attached, indicating the amount being applied for and the exact purposes for which it will be used. If application is for only publication purposes, also indicate to what specific journal or book and evidence of what sum is required for such publication. Brief curriculum vitae and a statement of qualifications that specifically addresses the research project. Include two letters of reference from senior scholars, one of whom MUST be a member, preferably an executive member of the IAHR member associations.

Completed applications forms are to be submitted as an electronic copy file in PDF or MS Word format in an attachment via email to the Secretary of the African Trust Fund Board of Trustees, Dr. Afe Adogame [A.Adogame@ed.ac.uk]. Please include in the electronic copy file the applicant’s last name e.g. Eliza.pdf / Eliza.doc. The subject line in the email should read “IAHR African Trust Fund Application 2014” – Note, no hard copies will be accepted.

For more information on the IAHR African Trust Fund Applications, please contact the Secretary of the African Trust Fund Board of Trustees at A.Adogame@ed.ac.uk.
New Ashgate-Inform Series on Minority Religions and Spiritual Movements

Edited by Eileen Barker, Emeritus, London School of Economics and Honorary Director of Inform, UK

Series Advisory Board: Afe Adogame, University of Edinburgh, UK; Madawi Al-Rasheed, King's College, UK; Eileen Barker, Emeritus, London School of Economics, UK and Chair and Honorary Director of Inform; François Bellanger, l’Université de Genève and Information Centre on Beliefs, Geneva; Irena Borowik, Jagiellonian University, Krakow; Douglas E. Cowan, University of Waterloo, Canada; Adam Possamai, University of Western Sydney, Australia; James T. Richardson, Grant Sawyer Center for Justice Studies and Judicial Studies Program, USA and Fenggang Yang, Purdue University and Center on Religion and Chinese Society, USA.

Series Profile:
Inform is an independent charity that collects and disseminates accurate, balanced and up-to-date information about minority religious and spiritual movements. The Ashgate-Inform book series addresses themes related to new religions, many of which have been the topics of Inform seminars. Each volume will include contributions from a wide range of authors, who may or may not have taken part in the Inform seminars, thus representing a multiplicity of viewpoints. This approach enables each theme to be widely explored while highlighting important debates in the field of the sociology of religion, religious studies and theology.

Recent Books:
Global Religious Movements Across Borders
Stephen M. Cherry, University of Houston-Clear Lake, USA and Helen Rose Ebaugh, University of Houston, USA
Global Religious Movements Across Borders focuses on how religious movements establish structures to assist people with basic human needs such as food, clothing, shelter, education and health. Encompassing various faith traditions with origins in different parts of the world, the collection offers a unique discussion of the intersection between religious transnationalism and social movements.

Revisionism and Diversification in New Religious Movements, Eileen Barker, London School of Economics and Inform, UK
This book explores different ways in which, as NRMs develop, stagnate, fade away, or abruptly cease to exist, certain orthodoxies and practices have, for one reason or another, been dropped or radically altered. Contributors include academics, current and former members of NRMs, and members of ‘cult-watching’ movements. December 2013 270 pages Hardback 978-1-4094-6229-3 £60.00 Paperback 978-1-4094-6230-9 £19.99 Also available in e-book format.

Submitting a Book Proposal:
Book proposals are invited for student/wider readership paperback texts, research monographs and edited collections, if they fit within the series profile. Please send your initial book proposals to either the Series Editor or the Publisher:
Series Editor: Publisher: Eileen Barker, Sarah Lloyd, Professor Emeritus of Sociology of Religion Ashgate Publishing, London School of Economics Wye Court East, Queen Road, Houghton Street Farnham, Surrey, London GU9 7PT, WC2A 2AL
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Inform is celebrating over a quarter of a century of providing information that is as reliable and up-to-date as possible about minority religions with an Anniversary Conference to be held at the London School of Economics, UK.

Registration for the full conference (including Friday Ashgate-Inform book launch and reception with refreshments, Saturday and Sunday tea/coffee/lunch) is £100 standard and £75 concession for students and un-waged.

Tickets booked after January 6th will be £120 or £85. We are offering single day registrations for £45, or £55 after January 6th.

Inform will also be hosting an Anniversary Dinner at Dickens Inn, St Katharine Dock, near the Tower of London on Saturday 1 February.

The cost, which is not included in the registration fee, of the three course set meal and coffee is £38.50. The menu for the dinner can be seen here: http://inform.ac/sites/default/files/Dicken's 20 Inn Inform Dinner.pdf. Dietary requirements can be catered for. Drinks are not included although there will be a cash bar. Booking and payment for the dinner must be done by January 6th and is non-refundable.

How to Pay: Registration for the conference and Saturday evening dinner can be completed online here: http://inform.ac/seminar-payment, using a credit/debit card or through a PayPal account if you have one or by posting a completed booking form: http://inform.ac/sites/default/files/Booking%20Form%20Conference%2020141.pdf and cheque made out to Inform in pounds sterling and sent to; Inform, Houghton Street, London, WC2A 2AE. A full programme will be posted soon. For more on the Ashgate-Inform book series, please see the attached flyer or visit the website: www.ashgate.com/inform.

Draft Programme Outline (20/11/13)

Friday 31 January 2014
15.00: Registration opens
15.30: Tour of the LSE campus
16.30: Introductory talk about the LSE
17.30: Welcome and Plenary Panel A: A Word from our “Stakeholders” when representatives of some of the sections of society that have used Inform will briefly describe what they have gained from their association with Inform and what they would like Inform and students of minority religions to focus on in the future:
The Established Church: The Right Reverend Graham James, Lord Bishop of Norwich
The Media: Dr Damian Thompson, Editor of Telegraph Blogs and a Director of the Catholic Herald
Politics: Stuart Hoggan, Deputy Director, Integration Division, Department for Communities and Local Government
The Police: Ron Gilbertson, former police officer
The Law: Philip Katz QC, Barrister
Academia: Professor Conor Gearty, Professor of Human Rights Law, LSE
19.30: Launch of the Ashgate/Inform Series on Minority Religions and Spiritual Movements and a reception with refreshments

Saturday 1 February 2014
Registration from 9.00
9.30-11.15: Plenary Panel B: Members or former members of new religious movements with high visibility in the 1980s. Richard Barlow, former member of the Unification Church; Abi Freeman, formerly a spokesperson and member of The Family International (TFI); Gauri das, executive secretary of ISKCON; and Terrill Park, Scientology Freezone will talk about how their respective movements have changed over the past 25 years and how they envision their future.
11.15-11.40: tea/coffee
11.40-13.25: Parallel Sessions I
13.25-14.15: lunch
14.15-16.00: Parallel Session II
16.00-16.30: tea/coffee
16.30-18.15: Parallel Session III
19.00: Anniversary Dinner (the cost of this is not included in the registration fee)

Sunday 2 February 2014
Registration from 9:00
9.30-11.15: Parallel Session IV
11.15-11.40 coffee/tea
11.40-13.25: Parallel Session V
13.25-14.15: lunch
16.15: Conference ends
Building Bridges
SSR’s current web site notes:
The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion was founded in 1949 by scholars in religion and social science. Its purpose is to stimulate and communicate significant scientific research on religious institutions and religious experience. Scholars from all fields of study who are interested in the scientific exploration of religion are invited to join the Society. Membership in the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion gives scholars the opportunity to share their research and ideas with other scholars.

Our theme for the 2014 conference is “Building Bridges” between all those interested in the study of religion. This includes any disciplines that focus on the study of religion as well as scholars from various geographical and cultural areas. Our intent is to build bridges between disciplines and cultures that have become isolated and communicate mainly among themselves. Suggestions for contributions include:

* the study of religion in diverse cultures and regions (Eastern, Central Europe, Asia, South America, etc.)
* the study of religion within diverse faith traditions (Islam, Christianity, Paganism, NRMs, etc.)
* inter-disciplinary studies of religion (religious studies & the social and behavioral sciences, etc.)
* new disciplines that study religion (cognitive science, evolutionary psychology, etc.)
* methodology interaction in the study of religion (quantitative, qualitative, All session and paper proposals must be submitted via the on-line submission system that will be available on the SSR’s web site, http://www.sssrweb.org. In addition to the session proposer’s full contact information, a session proposal requires a session title and an abstract of not more than 150 words describing the goal of the session and how the proposer expects the session to contribute to scientific knowledge about religion. Individual paper proposals require the name(s) of the author(s), first author’s full contact information, an abstract of not more than 150 words that succinctly describes the question(s) motivating the research, the data and methods used, and what the paper contributes or expects to contribute to the knowledge or understanding of religion.

NOTE NEW POLICY ON MANDATORY PREREGISTRATION OUTLINED BELOW.
Submissions Open: February 03, 2014
Submissions Close: March 31, 2014
Decision Notification: April 30, 2014

In 2014, the SSR/RRA Annual Meeting will require all program participants to preregister for the meeting, and to pay the non-refundable fees, by May 31, For submitted papers, the presenting author must pre-register, although co-authors not attending the meeting are not required to do so. For submitted sessions, the organizer and all presenters must pre-register and pre-pay.

Online registration will open immediately after decision notifications are emailed. Those presenters and organizers who do not preregister will be dropped from the program.

Please direct questions to: Ralph Hood (UTC), Program Chair (Ralph-Hood@utc.edu)
Co-chair for Asia-Pacific region: Alphia Possamai-Inesedy (Alphia.Possamai@uws.edu.au)
Co-Chair for Western, Central, and Eastern Europe: Elisabeth Arweck (Elisabeth.arweck@warwick.ac.uk)
Special assistant for developing sessions on Islam: Besheer Mohamed (BMohamed@PewResearch.org)
Graduate Student Representative: Christopher F. Silver (Christopher.Silver@utc.edu)
The Center for Critical Research on Religion (CCRR)

The Center for Critical Research on Religion (CCRR) (http://www.criticaltheoryofreligion.org) is dedicated to the development of critical frames in the analysis of religion and the publication of scholarly work employing these frames. It fosters communication between critical scholars of religion and helps to disseminate their research with other academics and the general public.


Both the journal and the book series publish research on religion, which uses a critical approach meaning it examines religious phenomena according to both their positive and negative impacts. This research draws on methods including but not restricted to the critical theory of the Frankfurt School, Marxism, post-structuralism, feminism, psychoanalysis, ideological criticism, post-colonialism, eco-criticism, and queer studies. The aim of the CRR and SCRR is to enhance an understanding of how religious institutions and religious thought may simultaneously serve as a source of domination and progressive social change.

They attempt to understand the role of religion within social and political conflicts. These conflicts are often based on differences of race, class, ethnicity, region, gender, and sexual orientation – all of which are shaped by social, political, and economic inequity. The journal and the book series encourage submissions of research on current issues as well as research with historical interest using a wide range of methodologies including qualitative, quantitative, and archival. They invite submissions from all academic disciplines, which focus on religion. This includes theology and religious studies, as well as the other social sciences and humanities which study religion such as philosophy, sociology, anthropology, psychology, history, and literature.

Critical Research on Religion is a peer-reviewed, international journal. It provides a common venue for those engaging in the critical analysis of religion. It publishes articles, review essays, book reviews, thematic issues, symposia, and interviews. Articles and review essays must be submitted through the on line system: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/crrreligion.


Aside from publishing the journal and book series, the Center has a listserve, which you can subscribe to at: http://box545.bluehost.com/mailman/listinfo/ctr_listserv_criticaltheoryofreligion.org. The journal has a Facebook page, which you can “like” (follow) at https://www.facebook.com/CriticalResearchOnReligion

Book reviews for the journal, proposals for the book series, and all other inquiries should be sent to Warren S. Goldstein goldstein@criticaltheoryofreligion.org .
RELIGION AS A SOCIAL FORCE

August 13-15, 2014
JW Marriott San Francisco Union Square
San Francisco, California

PROGRAM CHAIR: Jeremy Uecker, Baylor University, Jeremy_Uecker@baylor.edu

NOTE: Our annual meetings take place immediately prior to the meetings of ASA’s Religion Section, but will not overlap with those sessions. This will allow members to attend sessions at both meetings in a shorter window than previous years.

THEME: Over the past three decades, a number of scholars have underscored the apparent role of religious institutions, practices, beliefs, and values in shaping social institutions and human behavior. This strand of work has been collectively labeled the “strong paradigm” in the sociology of religion. Theorists and researchers working within this paradigm have explored the role of religion with regard to a wide array of domains, including social movements and politics, social stratification, immigration, health and well-being, and many others. Notable contributions have come from scholars whose main specialization is the sociology of religion, and from others who are known for their scholarship in other areas, but who have come to recognize the relevance of religion for their own work. Others have critiqued the “strong paradigm” on a number of important grounds.

The 2014 ASR meeting will explore what can be learned by viewing religion and approaches that flourish within the highly pluralistic sociology of religion. Papers and discussion sessions on all topics within the sociology of religion are welcome, but especially those related to the meeting theme, including, but not limited to the following:

- Religion and demographic processes;
- Religion and globalization;
- Religion and politics;
- Religion and social movements;
- Religion and education; Spirituality and religion;
- Religion and socioeconomic inequality; Religion, spirituality, and health/well-being;
- Religion, race, and ethnicity; Religion, gender, and sexualities;
- Religion and immigration; Nonwestern religion and social change;
- Religion, terrorism, and violence;
- Religion and pro-social attitudes and behavior;
- Religion in adolescence and emerging adulthood; Religion, marriage, and family life; Religion, biology, and the body;
- Religion, crime, and deviance;
- Religion, spirituality, and emotions.

DEADLINES:

- Session Proposals are due by March 31, 2014 (submit to Jeremy_Uecker@baylor.edu)
- Paper Proposals and abstracts are due by April 30, 2014 (submit through the Member Portal of this website)
- Meeting registration is due by July 1, 2014 (complete registration using the Member Portal of this website)
- Hotel registration is due by July 1, 2014

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES:

1. Because 2014 membership in ASR is required for program consideration (one author, for multi-authored papers), if you haven’t joined or renewed your membership in the Association, please do so before attempting to submit a proposal. Please DO NOT submit a proposal if you cannot arrange to be available during any of the time slots that the Program Chair may assign your paper presentation during any of the days of the conference. Anyone who will present a paper or serve as a panelist or discussant during the conference must be an ASR member and be willing to register for the conference. Session organizers should make this clear to anyone they invite to participate in a session or serve on a panel.

2. Email your session/panel proposals to Jeremy_Uecker@baylor.edu by March 31, 2014, using the following format: Place the title of the proposal first, followed by a one paragraph description of the panel proposal, then names, affiliations, and email addresses of all presenters/authors. Also provide titles for all the papers in the panel and a 300-word abstract of each paper, in which each presenter/author describes the paper’s research question(s), research methodology, and preliminary results.

Cont. on page 17
MEETING REGISTRATION:
Everyone whose paper or session has been approved by the Program Chair must submit their registration fee ($60 for general members; $25 for student members) using the Member Portal on this website by July 1, 2014, to guarantee their place on the program. Registration fees are nonrefundable.

We also invite everyone, especially the new members of our Association, to sign up for the New Attendees Welcoming Breakfast, which will be held the first morning of the conference. This is a great way to meet members before the sessions begin! You can sign up for this breakfast using the same registration form available in the Member Portal of this website. Tickets for this breakfast, which are $10 for first time attendees and $25 for others, will be distributed to members at the ASR registration desk upon their arrival at the hotel.

Although everyone is asked to complete their registration using the Member Portal on this website before July 1, 2014, those who are not members and those who do not make the July 1 deadline may register by mail or on-site by using this Registration Form for Non-Member and On-Site Registration. Please note that registration fees are higher for non-members and on-site registrants.

HOTEL REGISTRATION:
*Rare exceptions to the membership requirement are made: (a) when the person is part of a session that is jointly sponsored with ASA or another academic association and he/she is a member of that other association; (b) when an undergraduate student is the co-author or co-presenter of a paper with a faculty adviser who is an ASR member, or (c) when a session panelist or discussant does not specialize in the sociology of religion or a cognate field but nevertheless is believed to contribute uniquely to the session. Exceptions are determined by the Program Chair and Executive Officer in consultation with each other and the President, if necessary.

Future ASR Meetings 2015 - 2019

2015 Chicago, August 21-22, Chicago’s Essex Inn
2016 Seattle, August 20-21, hotel to be determined
2017 Montreal, August 13-14, hotel to be determined
2018 Philadelphia, August 9-10, hotel to be determined
2019 San Francisco, August 16-17, hotel to be determined
Religion and Society: 11th ISORECEA Conference

ISORECEA in cooperation with Vytautas Magnus University and Lithuanian Society for the Study of Religions.

RELIGIOUS DIVERSIFICATION WORLDWIDE AND IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Kaunas, Lithuania, April 24-27, 2014

The conference will take place in Kaunas, Lithuania, April 24-27, 2014. It will be organized by ISORECEA in cooperation with the Vytautas Magnus University and the Lithuanian Society for the Study of Religions.

For a long time the secularization thesis dominated the field of studies of religions in contemporary societies. Many definitions and even more explanations of the process of secularization in contemporary societies led scholars of religions to search for new theoretical insights about the rapidly changing global social situation. Opponents of this paradigm claim that we are witnessing growing religious vitality at religious market or change in religion itself – here we find the privatization thesis, precarious religion or religious bricolage. Independently of how we approach it from theoretical perspective religious diversification is the process that is evident in the majority of contemporary societies. It is manifested through numerous religious traditions and new emerging religious communities not only within the religious traditions, but also at the individual level, as well as by the increasing number of non-believers and non-adherents, etc.

In many cases Central and Eastern European societies have been analyzed as places where the monopoly of scientific atheism was replaced by the monopolies of national churches. But after more than twenty years of the post-communist period, religious diversification processes within these societies is visibly emerging, despite the fact that the dominance of the so-called national churches is still obvious.

How do worldwide and CEE societies adapt to religious diversification? How do religious communities approach the diversification of religion? How do states react towards the changing situation? How do worldwide and CEE societies differ from each other in relation to religious diversification?

We would like to approach these questions in the forthcoming international conference and to encourage scholars from various parts of the world to share their theoretical and empirical insights about religious diversification.

In this conference we also invite discussion of the following topics:

- Religious diversification and Church and State relations;
- Religious tolerance and discrimination;
- Religious minorities and majorities;
- Religious diversification and human rights;
- Religious diversification and social participation;
- Religious diversification and social exclusion;
- Religious diversification and media;
- Religiosity or Spirituality – within or outside religious institutions.

Cont. on page 25
Religion and Society: 11th ISORECEA Conference Cont.

- Religious diversification and social exclusion;
- Religious diversification and media;
- Religiosity or Spirituality – within or outside religious institutions.

Special events
Participants of the conference will be offered two field trips – to (1) the Hill of Crosses (near Šiauliai city) and (2) the Pyramid of Merkinė (near Druskininkai city) for special prices not included in the registration fee.

Miklós Tomka Award
The ISORECEA Board has established the Miklós Tomka Award to honour Miklós Tomka, the internationally acknowledged and widely esteemed scholar of religion specializing in the Central and Eastern European region who died unexpectedly in 2010.

The Award is granted based on a competitive basis for the best conference paper submitted to the award committee. The paper should refer to the conference theme.

The competition is open to early career scholars, with a special focus on PhD students.

The Award comprises:

- the publication of the paper in the ISORECEA on-line journal Religion and Society in Central and Eastern Europe;
- exemption from the conference fee;
- covering accommodation costs at the conference.

The competition is open to early career scholars, with a special focus on PhD students. The Award comprises:

- the publication of the paper in the ISORECEA on-line journal Religion and Society in Central and Eastern Europe;
- exemption from the conference fee;
- covering accommodation costs at the conference.

Early career scholars interested in entering the competition are invited to submit their full papers to the email address isorecea2014@smf.vdu.lt by January 10, 2014. The winner will be announced by January 31, 2014, which is the final date for registration for being on the program of the ISORECEA conference. Papers submitted for the Award should be between 5,000 and 7,000 words long and should strictly follow the rules applying to papers submitted to the ISORECEA journal Religion and Society in Central and Eastern Europe. For details see:

http://www.rascee.net/index.php/rascee/about/submissions#authorGuidelines

ISORECEA President
Sinisa Zrinscak
President of the Local Committee
Milda Alisauskienė
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