From the Chair

The 2007 Annual Meeting is just around the corner. Our section’s reception—at which we will present this year’s winners of our book, article, and student paper awards—will be on Saturday evening, and we will have sessions all day Sunday and on Monday morning. These paper sessions and roundtables—on religious practices, immigrants, religious meanings, and more—promise to be informative and stimulating, and I hope you will join us for all of them. (See pages 3-6 of the newsletter for details.) Many thanks to John Evans and Mansoor Moaddel, who served with me on the program committee, and also to Elaine Ecklund, for organizing an exciting session on religion and science.

The highlight of every year’s reception is the presentation of our three annual awards. You will have to come to the reception (or peek at the list of winners in your conference packet) to learn who this year’s winners are, but let me take this opportunity to thank the members of our three awards committees. Omar McRoberts chaired the Book Award Committee, joined by Courtney Bender and Penny Edgell. Jen’nan Read chaired the Article Award Committee, joined by Michael Hout and Brian Steensland. And John Bartkowski chaired the Student Paper Award Committee, joined by Elaine Ecklund and Mark Shibley. Many thanks to these colleagues for serving the Section in this way.

This newsletter is the last that Kevin Dougherty will edit. Kevin has done an outstanding job during his three years in this position. He has kept us informed, solicited and published provocative essays, and oversaw a seamless transition to an electronic newsletter. We thank him for his service, and we are sorry to see him go.

At the same time, I am pleased to announce that Richard Flory, at the University of Southern California, has been appointed by Council to succeed Kevin for a three-year term as newsletter editor. Richard will take the reins this summer, and we look forward to working with him in this capacity.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve as Section Chair. I look forward to seeing you in August.

MARK CHAVES, Duke University

Editor’s Note: After nine years at the University of Arizona, Mark joined the faculty of Duke University in June as Professor of Sociology, Religion, and Divinity. Best wishes, Mark!
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ASA Sociology of Religion Section Chair Mark Chaves and I have tried to make it possible for members of ASA and the Association for the Sociology of Religion (ASR) to maximize their participation in both annual meetings. We think we have succeeded. There are no serious conflicts in the scheduling of major events at either meeting.

The ASR meeting is being held at the Marriott Marquis Hotel from 8:30 am Friday, August 10, through 4:45 pm Sunday, August 12. If you have not yet registered for the ASR meeting, I invite you to do so at www.sociologyofreligion.com. In addition to having access to a full slate of regular sessions, ASR registrants are entitled to the following special events:

- **Friday, August 10, 5:00 pm**: ASR Presidential Address: “Religious Stratification: Its Origins, Persistence, and Consequences,” by James D. Davidson, followed by a reception from 6:00 to 8:00 pm

Association for the Sociology of Religion Annual Meeting Highlights

By JAMES D. DAVIDSON (ASR President), Purdue University

ASA Sociology of Religion Section Chair Mark Chaves and I have tried to make it possible for members of ASA and the Association for the Sociology of Religion (ASR) to maximize their participation in both annual meetings. We think we have succeeded. There are no serious conflicts in the scheduling of major events at either meeting.

The ASR meeting is being held at the Marriott Marquis Hotel from 8:30 am Friday, August 10, through 4:45 pm Sunday, August 12. If you have not yet registered for the ASR meeting, I invite you to do so at www.sociologyofreligion.com. In addition to having access to a full slate of regular sessions, ASR registrants are entitled to the following special events:

- **Friday, August 10, 5:00 pm**: ASR Presidential Address: “Religious Stratification: Its Origins, Persistence, and Consequences,” by James D. Davidson, followed by a reception from 6:00 to 8:00 pm

- **Saturday, August 11, 12:15 pm**: Paul Hanly Furfey Lecture: “The Influence of Religion and Politics: Religious Political Action Organizations in State Legislatures,” by Joseph Micon (Democrat), House of Representatives, Indiana General Assembly, followed by reception from 1:30 to 2:30 pm

ASR and ASA also have arranged three joint sessions related to the themes of this year’s meetings. Persons registered at either the ASR meeting or the ASA meeting are urged to attend. These sessions are held at:

- **Saturday, August 11, 10:30 am**: “Race, Class, and Gender: Religion’s Role in Existing Institutional Arrangements”

I look forward to seeing you in New York.
Religion Sessions at 2007 Annual Meeting

The 2007 ASA annual meeting includes a plethora of religion-related presentations. Details on religion sessions and Section roundtables follow (in chronological order). For more complete information, please consult the Meeting link on the ASA website at www.asanet.org.

Joint ASA/ASR Session: Debating Church and State: Religious-Political Groups Advocating Different Versions of a ‘Better World’ (Saturday, August 11, 8:30-10:10 am)
Organizer and Presider: William V. D’Antonio, Catholic University

• Evangelical/Republican: Rhetoric and Organization in the Emergence of a Political Identity, Nancy Ammerman, Boston University
• Remembering that Politics Shapes Religion: The Contemporary U.S., Gene Burns, Michigan State University
• Religion, Culture Wars, and Polarization in the U.S. Congress, 1971-2006, Steven A. Tuch, George Washington University; William V. D’Antonio, Catholic University

Joint ASA/ASR Session: Race, Class, and Gender: Religion’s Role In Existing Institutional Arrangements (Saturday, August 11, 10:30 am-12:10 pm)
Organizer: Darren E. Sherkat, Southern Illinois University
Presider and Discussant: Margarita Mooney, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

• Lessons from the Field: The Intersections of Gender, Family, and Social Class in American Religious Institutions, Penny Edgell, University of Minnesota
• Racial Differences in the Impact of Religious Conservatism on the Transition to Adulthood, Jennifer Glass, University of Iowa
• Doubly Disenfranchised? How Race/Ethnicity and Religiosity Shape Muslim American Political Engagement, Jen’nan Read, University of California Irvine
Regular Session: Religion and Health  
(Saturday, August 11, 2:30-4:10 pm)  
Organizer: Gene Burns, Michigan State University  
Presider and Discussant: Michele Dillon, University of New Hampshire  
- Formal Religious Participation and Daily Spiritual Experiences: Separate, but Equal, Linkages with Psychological Well-Being? Emily Anne Greenfield, University of Wisconsin, Madison; George E Viallant, Harvard University; Nadine F. Marks, University of Wisconsin, Madison  
- What’s Spirituality Got To Do With It? A Comparison of the Effects of Spirituality and Religion on Health, Robin D. Moremen, Northern Illinois University; Krista Marie Cline, Purdue University  
- Looking Inside the Black Box of “Attendance at Services”, Ellen Idler, Rutgers University; David Boulifard, Rutgers University; Richard J. Contrada, Rutgers University  
- Low-Income Urban Mothers on Welfare: The Role of Religion in Confronting Challenges, Susan Crawford Sullivan, College of the Holy Cross

Regular Session: Religion and Family  
(Saturday, August 11, 4:30-6:10 pm)  
Organizer and Presider: Gene Burns, Michigan State University  
Discussant: Penny A. Edgell, University of Minnesota  
- Examining the Direct and Indirect Effects of Religiosity on Tolerance of Same Sex Marriage: New Findings, Melissa Ann Powell, Southern Ilinois University, Carbondale; Darren E. Sherkat, Southern Illinois University; Gregery R. Maddox, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale  
- Better Fathers for all Children? How Child’s Gender Matters for Paternal Interaction within Protestantism, Laura Ann Hunter, University of Arizona  
- The Influence of Family and Religion on Trajectories of Delinquent Behavior, Richard J. Petts, Ohio State University  
- The Religious Right and Its Constituency: Separating Myths and Reality Using GSS Data, Stephen A. Hart, Frontier Science Foundation

Religion Section Session: Religion, Immigrants, and Religious Minorities  
(Sunday, August 12, 8:30-10:10 am)  
Presider and Discussant: Rhys Williams, University of Cincinnati  
- Contextualizing Immigrant Religious Participation: A Test of Religious Heterogeneity and Religious Concentration, Giovani Burgos, McGill University; Phillip Connor, Princeton University  
- Islam and Ethnic Identity Formation: A Case Study of Second Generation Iranian Muslims in Southern California, Golnaz Komei, University of California, Irvine  
- Take the Best of Both Worlds: Segmented Assimilation Among Second-Generation Muslim Americans, Christine Sheikh, University of Arizona  
- “There’s the Jewish Culture and Then There’s the Religion”: Jewish Adolescents Engaging Cultural Identity, Maria Van Ryn, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Religion Section Session: Religious Practices  
(Sunday, August 12, 10:30 am-12:10 pm)  
Presider: Mark Chaves, Duke University  
Discussant: David Smilde, University of Georgia  
- High Heels and Headscarves: Women’s Clothing and Islamic Piety in Indonesia, Rachel Rinaldo, University of Chicago  
- Divine Confidence: Explaining Variations in Religious Commitment, Katie Corcoran, University of Washington  
- Baptizing Drug Dealers as Citizens: Explaining the Emergence of the Tulia Drug Sting Scandal, Lydia Bean, Harvard University

Religion Section Session: Religion and Science  
(Sunday, August 12, 2:30-4:10 pm)  
Presider: Mark Chaves, Duke University  
Discussant: Thomas Gieryn, Indiana University  
- Religion and Science: Beyond the Hydraulic Conflict, John Evans, University of California, San Diego; Michael Evans, University of California, San Diego  
- The Medicalization of Religion: Double Blind Clinical Trials of Intercessory Prayer, Wendy Cadge, Brandeis University  
- The Coherent Spirituality of Scientists, Elaine Howard Ecklund, SUNY University at Buffalo; Elizabeth Long, Rice University  
- Gathering Intelligence on Intelligent Design, Amy Binder, University of California, San Diego

Religion Section Session: The Social Organization of Religion  
(Monday, August 13, 8:30-10:10 am)  
Presider and Discussant: Nancy Ammerman, Boston University  
- Class, Hierarchy and Color: A Comparison of the Black Methodist Episcopal and Baptist Churches, Ruth Burke, University of Pennsylvania
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- Personal and School Religiosity for Understanding Young Women's Abortion Decisions, Amy Adamczyk, Wayne State University
- Religious Change in the Name of Tradition: Jewish Menstrual Laws and the Negotiation of the Face and Future of Jewish Orthodoxy, Orit Avishai, University of California, Berkeley

Joint ASA/ASR Session: Comforting the Afflicted and Afflicting the Comfortable: Service and Advocacy at the Grassroots
(Monday, August 13, 8:30-10:10 am)
Organizer and Presider: James C. Cavendish, University of South Florida
Panelists:
P. Paul R. Lichterman, University of Southern California
Milagros Peña, University of Florida
Ram A. Cnaan, University of Pennsylvania

Regular Session: The Nature and Components of Religion
(Monday, August 13, 10:30 am-12:10 pm)
Organizer and Presider: Gene Burns, Michigan State University
- A New Approach to the Classification of Chinese Religions, Anna Sun, Princeton University
- The Mantle of Joseph: Divine Revelation and Dynamic Endurance in the LDS Church, Nathan D. Wright, Bryn Mawr College
- Paranormal Beliefs: Conceptualization and Measurement of an Illusive Concept, Jeffrey S. Debies-Carl, Ohio State University

Special Session: The Politics of Muslim Immigrant Communities
(Tuesday, August 14, 10:30 am-12:10 pm)
Discussant: Habibul Khondker, Zayed University
Panelists:
Philip Eade, University of Surrey Roehampton
Jen’nan Read, University of California, Irvine
Bryan Turner, National University of Singapore

ASA Religion Section Roundtables
(Saturday, August 12, 12:30-1:30 pm)
Roundtable #1: Religion and Politics
Presider: David Yamane, Wake Forest University
- Do American Evangelical Christians Differ from Mainline Christians in Forms of Political Participation? Deborah Coe, Purdue University
- Religion, Dialogue, and Revolution: Militant Christians in the Nicaraguan Revolution, Jean-Pierre Reed, University of Memphis; Sean Chabot, Eastern Washington University

Roundtable #2: Making Religious Meanings
Presider: Michael Emerson, Rice University
- Experiencing Christian Collective Memory on Group Pilgrimage in Jerusalem, Vida Bajc, University of Pennsylvania
- The Sacred and the Profane: The Symbolic Ecology of a First Year Retreat, Chris J. Hausmann, University of Notre Dame
- SpiritChurch: A Case Study of Consumer Ritual Symbolic Practices, J. David Knottnerus, Oklahoma State University

Roundtable #3: Macro Studies of Religious Change
Presider: Richard Wood, University of New Mexico
- Religion and Regulation, James Beckford, University of Warwick; James Richardson, University of Nevada, Reno
- Modernization and Malaysian Islam, Joseph Tamney, Catholic University of America
- Investigating the Role of Pentecostalism and Economic Development in Latin America: A Quantitative Approach, Christine McVay, Florida International University

Roundtable #4: Studying Congregations
Presider: Kevin Dougherty, Baylor University
- Coping with Conflict, Confronting Resistance: Emotions and Identity Management during Fieldwork in a South Korean Evangelical Community, Kelly Chong, University of Kansas
- Gendering Ritual Practice in a Seeker-Oriented Evangelical Church, Kevin McElmurry, University of Missouri, Columbia
- Religion and Race: The Impact of Evangelical Beliefs on Chinese Immigrants’ Understanding of Practice of Race, Xuefeng Zhang, Westmont College
Roundtable #5: Religion, Health, and Family

**Presider:** Mark Regnerus, University of Texas, Austin

- *Religion, Health, and Family Planning Decisions in Uzbekistan,* Jennifer Barrett, University of Texas, Austin
- *Religious Commitment and Perceptions of Household Equity in Early Marriage,* Julia Wilson, Emory & Henry College

Roundtable #6: Minority Religion

**Presider:** Jenny Trinitapoli, Arizona State University

- *Religion: The Effects of Immigration on Three Generations of Dominican and Puerto Rican Women,* Stefan Bosworth, Hostos Community College; Rosie M. Soy, Hudson County Community College
- *Finding Mecca in America: Islam and Codification of America,* Mucahit Bilici, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
- *Mindfulness and Morality: The Intersection of Science and Spirituality in the United States,* Kaelyn Stiles, University of Wisconsin

Roundtable #7: Doubly Minority Religion

**Presider:** Melissa Wilde, University of Pennsylvania

- *Queer and Feminist Muslims in the U.S. and Their Struggle with Traditional Islam,* Mahrur Khan, Loyola University Chicago

Roundtable #8: Catholic Roles and Identities

**Presider:** Christian Smith, University of Notre Dame

- *“The Church is Our Mother”: The Role of Community in Constructing Catholic Identity,* Grace Yukich, New York University
- *“Catholic Guilt” or Just Moving On? Why People Join and Stay in Support Groups for Separated and Divorced Catholics,* Anna Bruzese, Los Angeles Pierce College
- *Shepherd in “Greener” Pastures: Motivations for Shifting Affiliation,* Stephen Fichter, Rutgers University

Roundtable #9: Japanese Religion in Japan and the United States

**Presider:** Wendy Cadge, Brandeis University

- *Untangling the Enigma of Religious Affiliation in Contemporary Japan,* Michael Roemer, University of Texas, Austin

**Other Conferences**

**The Critical Theory of Religion: The Dialectic between the Religious and the Secular,** joint session of the International Society for the Sociology of Religion (ISSR) and the International Sociological Association (ISA) Research Committee 22; July 25, 11:30 am-1:30 pm; Leipzig, Germany.

**Organizer and Presider:** Warren S. Goldstein, University of Central Florida

- **The Golden Rule,** Rudolf J. Siebert, Western Michigan University
- **Liberational Perspectives for the Creation of a More Reconciled Future Society in the Critical Theory of Religion,** Michael R. Ott, Grand Valley State University
- **Adorno and the Secular,** Christopher Craig Brittain, University of Aberdeen
- **Religion in a Consumer Culture: Lessons from Bourdieu,** Andrew M. McKinnon, University of Toronto, Scarborough
- **The Dialectic between Religion and the Secular: Focusing on Symbolism and Values,** Reimon Bachika, Bukkyo University

Abstracts can be found at www.criticaltheoryofreligion.org/events.htm.

**The ‘Otherness’ of Jewish Perspectives,** co-sponsored by the Association for the Social Scientific Study of Jewry and the Berman Institute; Sunday, August 12, 12:30-2:10 pm, Hilton New York.

**Organizers:** Arnold Dashefsky, University of Connecticut; Harriet Hartman, Rowan University

**Panelists:**
- Allen Glicksman, Philadelphia Corp. for Aging
- Harriet Hartman, Rowan University
- Moshe Hartman, Ben Gurion University
- Debra Renee Kaufman, Northeastern University
- Shlomit Levy, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
- Bruce A. Phillips, Hebrew Union College
- Gabriel Sheffer, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

**Request for Proposals**

United Jewish Communities, the national representative agency of the North American Jewish federation system, seeks to engage a researcher or team of researchers to conduct a major study of mobility among American Jews. The researcher will conduct secondary analysis of selected local Jewish community studies and national Jewish studies to understand the impact of mobility on local federation and communal systems; develop policy implications, and facilitate focus groups with communal leadership to discuss the findings; and policy implications; write a 80-100 page monograph on both the survey data findings and policy implications; and present the report at a communal conference.

Please respond to Jonathon Ament at research@uic.org if interested in receiving the full RFP.
Public Christianity in the Venezuelan Revolution

By DAVID SMILDE, University of Georgia

After his landslide reelection December 3, Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez declared, “The Kingdom of Christ is the kingdom of love, of peace: the kingdom of justice, of solidarity, brotherhood, the kingdom of socialism. This is the kingdom of the future of Venezuela.”

“Hardly words of a hard core leftist, Chávez’s pronouncements were part of the increasingly religious flavor that he has given his ‘21st Century Socialism,’” wrote Miami Herald reporter Steven Dudley December 6. The next day, Herald columnist Andres Oppenheimer expressed concern over “the growing political manipulation of religious fervor in the region”—not only by Chávez but also by the leftist president of Ecuador, Rafael Correa, and by the recently elected Nicaraguan president, former revolutionary Daniel Ortega.

In this article I will suggest that the journalistic focus on Hugo Chávez’s religious discourse and whether or not it manipulation leads us away from more substantial sociological issues having to do with the increasing public profile of religious discourse in Venezuelan, indeed Latin American, democracy.

On a personal level, Hugo Chávez’s religiosity largely conforms to that of the average Venezuelan; he has a vibrant belief in the supernatural but rarely practices religion within formal ecclesiastical institutions. Venezuelans tend to use words and images taken from Christian, Afro-Venezuelan, and indigenous traditions eclectically, as they are needed to meet concrete challenges.

More interesting for sociologists is to ask why religion is suddenly being brought into the public sphere after decades of quiescence, what role it is playing in political events and trajectories, and what this role means for churches, movements and participants. Chávez’s use of religious language needs to be seen as part of a region-wide shift in political contention from discourses of socio-economic development to discourses of culture such as ethnic identity, nationalism, and religion.

Chávez’s use of religious language needs to be seen as part of a region-wide shift in political contention from discourses of socio-economic development to discourses of culture such as ethnic identity, nationalism, and religion.

enhanced political importance of the highly esteemed Catholic Church.

The Search for New Allies

Contrary to the view presented in the North American press, the religious character of Chávez’s political project has not increased in recent years. Since his emergence on the Venezuelan political scene in the early 1990s, religious discourse and engaging religious leaders and organizations has been central to his efforts to mobilize an alternative movement capable of challenging a pragmatic, technocratic political elite lacking any aspiration to moral or ethical leadership. Chávez and his movement embraced any alternative moral visions available including nationalist, indigenous, feminist, Marxist and Christian discourses.

After leading an unsuccessful coup attempt in February 1992, Chávez (a lieutenant colonel in the army) spent two years in jail where he and other coup-leaders were frequently visited by evangelical pastors. With a strategy of establishing a base among what they called “new social and political forces,” they set out to make alliances with nongovernmental organizations of “recognized honesty and public morality,” including “Christian and evangelical churches with a progressive orientation.”

Pardoned by President Rafael Caldera in 1994, Chávez and company immediately began to mobilize support for their Bolivarian Revolutionary Movement (named for the famed hero of Venezuelan independence, Simon Bolivar). They frequently used Biblical imagery in combination with war rhetoric and nationalist slogans borrowed from Bolivar and other Venezuelan founding fathers in order to frame their cause as a historic struggle for the salvation of the country. This language struck a chord in a population disillusioned by two decades of political and economic decline and has been one important source of Chávez’s continuing popularity.

In the run-up to the 1998 presidential election, Chávez met with Catholic bishops several times, and the church responded to his overtures in an open and friendly if cautious manner. Although he did not at the time meet with leading evangelicals, he continually made positive remarks about their movement, earning himself enormous popularity among the evangelical
laity and leading some to believe that he himself had become, or was becoming evangelical.

After winning the presidency, Chávez drew closer to the evangelicals, and farther away from the Catholic Church. Representatives of both groups were invited to participate in the constitutional assembly, but while the evangelicals accepted the invitation (putting up several candidates but winning no seats), the Catholic Church demurred, saying it would act as a sympathetic critic.

In the early morning hours of April 12, the president, Chávez, drew closer to the evangelicals, and farther away from the Catholic Church. Representatives of both groups were invited to participate in the constitutional assembly, but while the evangelicals accepted the invitation (putting up several candidates but winning no seats), the Catholic Church demurred, saying it would act as a sympathetic critic external to the process. True to its word, the church raised its voice against the new government’s expansion of religious freedom, increased control of education, and refusal to prohibit abortion.

Challenging the Social Hierarchy

The constitutional process provided a glimpse of what would come as Chávez’s progressive assault on existing social hierarchies and institutions inevitably included the Catholic Church. In 1999 this relation began to sour with a series of moves that disfavored the church, beginning with a reduction of its state subsidy. (While it is difficult to know exactly how much the church receives annually, a reasonable estimate is $150 million.) In July 1999, the Chávez administration announced that, as part of across-the-board budget cuts, it would be cutting the church’s subsidy by 80 percent, a number later reduced to 50 percent. Since then, the size of the subsidy has been a point of almost continual conflict.

Meanwhile, Chávez made a number of policy moves that had the effect of enhancing the place of evangelicals in Venezuelan society. In 1999, he put into effect a law permitting evangelicals to provide religious education in the public schools—a role formerly reserved exclusively to the Catholic Church. Although this law had been passed and signed during the Caldera administration, it had never really been put into effect.

The two years following the constitutional assembly saw not only increasing attempts on the part of the government to reduce the social dominance of the Catholic Church in favor of evangelicals and other new religious movements, but efforts to develop a new religious hegemony. From November 2000 to May 2001, the administration’s Office of Human Rights attempted to organize what they called the “Bolivarian Inter-religious Parliament” that would bring together representatives of all of the different religions with the goal of devolving governmental social projects and funds to them.

The Catholic hierarchy criticized this initiative, calling it an attempt to “make the church into an appendage of the government under the awning of social programs.” The main evangelical associations also rejected the initiative, bristling at being lumped together with Afro-Venezuelan and New Age groups as well as the Rev. Sun Myung Moon’s Unification Church. The initiative survived but, without the participation of Venezuela’s main religious associations, has accomplished little.

All of these moves led to frequent speculation about Chávez’s personal religious commitments in the Venezuelan press. Not only is Venezuela officially Catholic, but the Church is associated with civilization, integrity, and morality. In this context, for educated opinion to suggest that Chávez was an evangelical was tantamount to indicting him as ignorant, lacking in cultivation, and personally unstable.

In January 2002, just before traveling to Bolivia for a meeting of the Andean Community, Chávez himself told reporters he was “a proactive member of the Christian Evangelical Church.” “The [Catholic] church leadership was dumbfounded,” wrote opposition newspaper columnist Nelson Bocaranda. “Knowing him well, they think perhaps it was not so much an error but a way of sidestepping a possible excommunication.”

Catholic officials later denied there was any discussion of excommunicating Chávez. But journalists kept the story alive, interviewing evangelical pastors to ask whether Chávez had ever attended their services. Upon his return to Venezuela, Chávez declared that while he strongly sympathized with evangelicals, he was in fact a practicing Catholic. Indeed he had not misspoken as the concept of “Evangelical Church” simply refers to an orientation towards spreading the “good news.”

Diversity in Conflict

The growing political role of Christianity in Venezuela has differentiated the spectrum beyond the Catholic-Protestant dyad. It was during the intense conflict of 2002-2004 that this internal diversity came to the fore.

The Catholic Church gave its support to the oil workers’ strike that preceded the short-lived coup of April 2002—and, indeed, appears to have had prior knowledge of the coup (though CIA documents suggest that church officials initially acted to discourage it). In March some Catholic leaders, including the rector of the Catholic University, participated in meetings of opposition groups that included eventual coup leaders, in which the groundwork was laid for a transition government. And the archbishop of Caracas, Cardinal Velasco García, received several visits from the conspiring generals in the days before the coup.

In the early morning hours of April 12, the president of the Venezuelan bishops’ conference and the bishop...
of Barquisimeto met with the conspirators on a military base to receive Chávez when he was escorted out of the presidential palace. Cardinal Velasco himself was present and signed the decree naming business leader Pedro Carmona interim president (a position he occupied for two days, before the interim government was overturned).

Nevertheless, the Jesuit “Faith and Joy” radio network (Radio Fé y Alegría) refused to participate in the news blackout organized by the interim government, interviewing people in the street as well as Chávez cabinet ministers who insisted that Chávez had not resigned, as was claimed. This reporting was critical to the counter-movement that overturned the coup.

As for the evangelicals, on April 12, just before Carmona’s swearing in, the president of the Venezuelan Evangelical Council, Samuel Olson, participated in a nationally televised service for those who had died and been injured in the violence the day before. Although Olson denied that this signified his backing for the coup, the location of the service at a plaza where the anti-Chávez forces had mobilized, and the fact that TV coverage went directly from that service to Carmona’s swearing-in, gave that impression.

Yet when forces loyal to the Chávez government recaptured the state television station, evangelicals quickly responded to their call for religious leaders to come to the station to offer words of peace and reconciliation. One of the first to arrive, Bishop Jesús Pérez of the neopentecostal Renacer Church in downtown Caracas, said that “by divine intervention, today we live in a free Venezuela that belongs to all Venezuelans.” The government received particularly strong support from this “neopentecostal” wing, which emphasizes prosperity and a “dominion theology” that highlights the need for strong leadership to prepare nations for Jesus’ return.

In the aftermath of the coup, attempts at reconciliation failed, and in early December the opposition called a general strike. This lasted almost two months and included numerous marches, protests, and acts of violence. Catholicism was a central part of this movement.

For the duration of the strike, the Catholic hierarchy played a prominent public role, calling frequently for non-violent solutions while criticizing the government more than the opposition. No less important, lay members of the opposition came to rely on Catholic practices and beliefs for fortitude and feelings of legitimacy for the fight against political marginalization.

But at the same time, popular Catholic communities sympathetic to Chavez pushed back. In December 2002, 11 Catholic organizations working in Caracas’s barrios made public a letter entitled, “We, Christian Men and Women of Caracas, Also Exist!” The letter declared, in part: “We feel deeply hurt because the president of the Venezuelan bishops’ conference, along with the cardinal archbishop of Caracas, frequently speak and act in name of the Catholic church without consulting with us, and without taking into account, in any sense, the deepest sentiments of a good portion of its members.”

After the strike ended, Chávez’s opponents worked to collect enough signatures to force a recall election, which was finally scheduled for August 2004. At their annual meeting in July, the Catholic bishops urged Catholics to vote, suggesting that they remember that the “solutions to big and serious problems cannot be improvised, do not happen by chance, nor do they come from political messianism. The country demands authentic, responsible and forward-looking leadership.”

This was taken by members of the Chávez government as evidence of the church’s partiality for the opposition. Vice President Jose Vicente Rangel urged the bishops to back off, citing Pope John Paul II’s injunction that the Church stay out of “circumstantial politics.” Rangel argued that the hierarchy needed to respect the breadth and diversity of the Venezuelan church.

Meanwhile, at the end of July, several neopentecostal groups received $400,000 from the government to organize two large rallies—“Clamor for Venezuela” and “Million Prayers for Peace.” At the rallies, the organizers claimed to speak for the entire evangelical movement in throwing their support behind the Chávez government. Chávez himself gave a 40-minute speech in which he called Jesus the “original comandante” and referred to himself as a “soldier of Christ.”

In probably the clearest public demonstration of the division within the evangelical movement, the evangelical council released a statement insisting that it was officially apolitical and rejecting the attempt of the neopentecostal organizers to speak for all evangelicals. The organizers were accused by evangelical council president Olson of having forgotten the “healthy separation of church and state.”

In a public reply, one of the rally organizers, Apostle Elias Rincón, asserted that the council itself represented only a small percentage of the evangelical population, that it had no more right to speak in the name of evangelicals than he did, and that the Venezuelan evangelical church had never been apolitical.

**Discursive Tensions from Within**

From the beginning the Chávez movement and government has been based on multiple cultural...
Robertson, speaking on his 700 Club television show in August, the American religious broadcaster Pat Robertson, pointed to the mutual accommodation of the Chávez government and conservative Christian evangelicals in the US and the tendencies. The contradiction between politically conservative Christian evangelicals and the Chávez government grew tense in 2005. In August, the American religious broadcaster Pat Robertson, speaking on his 700 Club television program, called on the U.S. government to assassinate Hugo Chávez. Not surprisingly, this caused a sensation in the Venezuelan press, and evangelicals, Catholics, and representatives of other churches rushed to denounce Robertson. For its part, the Chávez government confirmed that the United States indict Robertson for terrorism.

Robertson apologized and the issue died down. But it was closely followed (probably not by chance) by another clash based on the contradiction between Chávez’s alliance with evangelicals and his courting of indigenous groups. On October 12, 2005, the former Columbus Day now celebrated as the National Day of Indigenous Resistance, Chávez announced a decision to expel the “New Tribes” missionaries that have long worked with indigenous groups in Venezuela’s lightly populated Amazon region. These missionaries, he said, were spying and represented an “imperialist invasion.”

Such accusations against evangelical missionaries, which have been commonplace since the 1970s, are as a rule unaccompanied by evidence, and this case was no exception. But the presence of such missionaries in an area where the Venezuelan state has little presence has long been a hot-button issue for both secular progressives (who look towards indigenous groups as a source of national identity) and Catholic conservatives (who see working with indigenous groups as their historical charge). Catholics thus applauded Chávez’s action. The major evangelical associations, on the other hand, immediately condemned it.

During 2006, relations between the Chávez government and the Catholic Church became calmer, thanks in no small part to new, less confrontational church leaders. After the election, however, the tension between Christianity and Marxism came to the fore. In the weeks after the election the Catholic Hierarchy asked Chávez to clarify what he meant by “21st Century Socialism,” beyond his frequent suggestion that it would not repeat the errors of the 20th century. Chávez then surprised even supporters by saying he would send them some books by Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin.

All told, the events of 2004 and 2005 led mainstream evangelical groups to distance themselves from Chávez. For example, Venezuela’s main evangelical newspaper, Truth and Life (Verdad y Vida), accentuated its oppositional editorial line, repeatedly criticizing the missionary expulsion and the government in general.

Later, in February and March 2006, the paper ran a series of interviews with evangelical leaders called “Christianity and Socialism” that came to conclusions generally critical of the Chávez project. Typical was evangelical journalist Jorely de Meza’s interview of pastor Modesto Rivero González, in which Rivero was quoted as saying that “although President Chávez has tried to present his ‘revolution’ as Christian, the demonstrations he has given of a lack of love, of discrimination, of poor application of justice and authoritarianism, are characteristics that speak of a lack of love of God and of one’s neighbor which are the essences of Jesus Christ’s teachings.”

Then, during the run-up to the 2006 national elections, evangelical leaders received a nationally televised visit from opposition presidential candidate Manuel Rosales. While they continued to claim political neutrality, this sent a strong signal of sympathy for the opposition.

For their part, Chávez’s neopentecostal supporters, still smarting from the evangelical council’s public rebuke of their political participation, moderated their tone and stayed away from making political pronouncements. Nevertheless, they steadily increased their collaboration with the government.

The neopentecostals receive ample public funds for their many social projects and Apostle Rincón serves as the evangelical representative on the national communications review board that evaluates television—including news programs—for content and “veracity.” Bishop Jesús Pérez has multiple programs on several state television channels.

In conclusion, there is every reason to think that religious discourse and engagement with religious groups will continue to be a critical element of Venezuela’s “democratic revolution.”
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During 2006, relations between the Chávez government and the Catholic Church became calmer, thanks in no small part to new, less confrontational church leaders. After the election, however, the tension between Christianity and Marxism came to the fore. In the weeks after the election the Catholic Hierarchy asked Chávez to clarify what he meant by “21st Century Socialism,” beyond his frequent suggestion that it would not repeat the errors of the 20th century. Chávez then surprised even supporters by saying he would send them some books by Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin.

All told, the events of 2004 and 2005 led mainstream evangelical groups to distance themselves from Chávez. For example, Venezuela’s main evangelical newspaper, Truth and Life (Verdad y Vida), accentuated its oppositional editorial line, repeatedly criticizing the missionary expulsion and the government in general.

Later, in February and March 2006, the paper ran a series of interviews with evangelical leaders called “Christianity and Socialism” that came to conclusions generally critical of the Chávez project. Typical was evangelical journalist Jorely de Meza’s interview of pastor Modesto Rivero González, in which Rivero was quoted as saying that “although President Chávez has tried to present his ‘revolution’ as Christian, the demonstrations he has given of a lack of love, of discrimination, of poor application of justice and authoritarianism, are characteristics that speak of a lack of love of God and of one’s neighbor which are the essences of Jesus Christ’s teachings.”

Then, during the run-up to the 2006 national elections, evangelical leaders received a nationally televised visit from opposition presidential candidate Manuel Rosales. While they continued to claim political neutrality, this sent a strong signal of sympathy for the opposition.

For their part, Chávez’s neopentecostal supporters, still smarting from the evangelical council’s public rebuke of their political participation, moderated their tone and stayed away from making political pronouncements. Nevertheless, they steadily increased their collaboration with the government.

The neopentecostals receive ample public funds for their many social projects and Apostle Rincón serves as the evangelical representative on the national communications review board that evaluates television—including news programs—for content and “veracity.” Bishop Jesús Pérez has multiple programs on several state television channels.

In conclusion, there is every reason to think that religious discourse and engagement with religious groups will continue to be a critical element of Venezuela’s “democratic revolution.”
Getting To Know You: The 2006 Survey of Section Members
By CHRISTOPHER G. ELLISON, University of Texas at Austin

During October-December of 2006, the ASA Sociology of Religion Section undertook an online survey of its membership, with the aim of collecting data and eliciting feedback on member satisfaction, as well as opinion on several important sets of issues facing the section and its leaders. The survey instrument was developed with input from members of the executive council, and it was administered by section member Marc Musick of The University of Texas at Austin. There were no costs to the section.

According to the ASA, during the period in which the survey was conducted the section had 632 members. In all, we gathered 242 responses, yielding a response rate of 38.3%. Although this figure is clearly less than optimal, the survey nevertheless provides an interesting and potentially useful snapshot of section members and their attitudes. Assuming – as the data seem to suggest – that the most committed and active section members were more prone to respond to the survey, these data may provide valuable feedback for section leaders as they consider policy options and plan for future meetings. Thanks are due to all the section members who took the time to respond to this survey.

1. Characteristics of respondents
Approximately 61% were male, with an average age of 44. There was considerable variation in terms of occupation and rank: 30% of the respondents were graduate students (as compared with the ASA calculation of 34%); 26% were untenured faculty members or postdocs; 8% were tenured associate professors; and 26% were full professors. The remaining 8% worked in non-academic positions. In all, nearly two-thirds (63%) of the respondents were employed at 4-year, PhD-granting institutions.

Members of the ASA sociology of religion section hold a variety of affiliations with other religion specialty groups. For example, a majority of respondents also belong to the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion (SSSR, 67%) and/or to the Association for the Sociology of Religion (ASR, 57%). A smaller percentage reports affiliation with the Religious Research Association (RRR, 37%), while a handful of members (8%) belong to the American Academy of Religion (AAR), and to a range of other specialty groups, including international organizations. These patterns suggest that the ASA sociology of religion section occupies a somewhat distinctive niche among the various religion-focused groups, without tremendous overlap with most of the other specialty associations. Contrary to the initial worries of some persons at the time of the section’s founding (1993-94), there is no evidence that the establishment of an ASA section has dampened enthusiasm for, or superseded, other major specialty organizations.

When asked to rate the section in terms of its relative importance among their affiliation with religion specialty organizations on an ascending scale of 1-7, members’ average rating was almost exactly in the middle: 4.3. Happily, nearly all respondents (90%) indicated that they were “very likely” or “virtually certain” to renew their section membership; only 5 of the 242 respondents were “somewhat unlikely” or “very unlikely” to renew.

As mentioned at the outset, it appears that survey respondents are among the more active and committed section members. For example, 44% reported attending the most recent [2006] ASA meetings, in Montreal, and 50% reported attending the 2005 and/or 2004 meetings. A significant minority of respondents indicated that they attended at least one session or roundtable sponsored by the section (33% in 2006, and 40% in 2005), while a smaller proportion presented papers at section-sponsored events (10-15% in each year), attended the business meetings (15-17% in each year), and attended the reception (22-29% in each year).

2. Overall member satisfaction
Overall, survey respondents express considerable satisfaction with the section and its activities. The survey instrument inquired about the level of satisfaction with a number of section functions and activities, including the current direction of the section, the candidates nominated for section offices, the sessions sponsored at the annual meetings, the receptions, and the newsletter. Only a handful of respondents – in most cases numbering only in single digits – expressed outright dissatisfaction with any of these areas. At the same time, significant minorities of respondents (30-40%) gave “neutral” responses to these items, and only a minority of respondents were “very satisfied” with the current direction (25%), candidates (33%), sessions (23%), and the newsletter (36%), suggesting the desirability of some continued improvement in at least some of these areas. Tenured faculty members were relatively satisfied with the overall current direction of the section; levels of overall satisfaction were lower among students than other members. Gender differences also surfaced on some items. Compared with their male counterparts, women were less satisfied with the slate of candidates for section leadership, and somewhat more satisfied with the sessions sponsored by the section in recent years.

3. Reasons for section membership
The survey asked a number of items about respondents’ reasons for joining and remaining involved in the section. Clearly three reasons are paramount for most of these respondents: (1) Approximately 80% of respondents indicated that it was important as a means of expressing...
identity with the sub-discipline; most of these persons viewed this as a “very important” reason for membership.

A slightly smaller percentage (74%) noted the value of information from the section newsletter, and interestingly, only 10 of 242 respondents indicated that this was not an important reason for their affiliation. The opportunity for networking with colleagues also emerged as an important motivation for section membership, highlighted by a large majority (68.5%) of respondents. By contrast, very few persons have joined the section in order to attend the reception, or to have an outlet for submitting papers to the ASA program; these may not be important reasons at least partly because non-membership in the section is not a barrier for persons wishing to participate in these ways. We also find that very few respondents belong to the section in order to vote in elections.

On closer investigation, there are notable subgroup differences in the relative importance of these reasons for section membership. Compared with their male counterparts, women assigned much greater significance to the role of the section in providing opportunities for networking, and to a lesser extent they also placed greater emphasis on receiving information from the newsletter. There were also clear differences by rank and seniority. The importance of accessing the newsletter to gain information was greater for younger section members, as was the role of the section in promoting networking. On the other hand, senior faculty members placed greater value on the opportunity to vote in elections for section officers.

4. Opinions regarding the newsletter

One specific topic probed in the survey was the section newsletter. Given recent changes in the format of the newsletter, e.g., the move from paper to online publication, and the significance of the newsletter as a motivation for section membership among many persons, several patterns in the data are especially interesting. As noted earlier, respondents expressed generally high levels of satisfaction with the newsletter; indeed, respondents express somewhat higher levels of satisfaction with the newsletter than with most other areas of section activity. This satisfaction was even greater among students than other segments of the membership. A significant majority of persons (63%) reported reading the newsletter regularly; this figure was significantly higher among junior faculty members, who apparently read this as an important source of professional and career information. Only 11 persons indicated that they rarely or never read the newsletter. Moreover, despite some initial discomfort and debate over the switch to online publication, it appears that these levels have not changed much overall. Of 217 valid responses to this item, slightly more than 50% of respondents say this change has not affected their reading habits, while nearly even numbers of persons report that their attention to the newsletter has increased (n=52) and decreased (n=47) as a result of the switch to online publication. Another issue that has been raised in the Executive Council concerns the naming of the newsletter. Noting that some other sections (e.g., International Migration, Collective Behavior and Social Movements) have chosen distinctive, attention-grabbing names for their newsletters, we put this question to our members. The idea generated a collective yawn; only 20% of respondents prefer that we (re)name our newsletter, while nearly as many explicitly reject this proposal and more than 50% of the respondents believe this does not matter.

5. Planning for future meetings

The survey also included items designed to gauge member opinions concerning various proposals for activities at upcoming meetings. For example, members were asked whether they prefer to have mostly or entirely open sessions (i.e., organized according to the types of papers submitted), or a mix of open sessions and sessions with themes that are predetermined by the section chair or program committee, or mostly or entirely sessions with preset themes. Respondents clearly preferred a mix of the two types of sessions; this was the choice of 63% of respondents who answered this question. Fewer than 10% of the respondents preferred mostly preset themes. Given the recent increase in section membership, which has now risen above the 600 threshold, the section will gain an additional session for future meetings. Thus, another question concerns how best to use this “extra” session. One option would be to invite an address from a major academic figure, perhaps someone who is not associated primarily with our subfield. Respondents to the survey expressed considerable ambivalence about this proposal. Of 232 valid responses to this item, roughly 40% approved (but only 26 persons did so “strongly”), while approximately 28% disapproved (but only 14 persons did so “strongly”). Most of the remaining respondents were unsure, and a number of persons indicated that their opinion would depend upon the identity or type of speaker selected, or on other factors.

A second proposal that could be implemented at future meetings involves using the “extra” slot on the program to co-sponsor a topical session with another ASA section. Here again, members were quite divided, and expressed considerable uncertainty about this idea; 50% if respondents agree (but only a handful of persons “strongly” support this idea), while 13% disagree, and the remaining 37% are not sure, indicating that this depends upon the specifics of the plan. Interestingly, both proposals garnered somewhat greater support among men than women. Junior faculty members expressed more support for open sessions and for using our additional program space to co-sponsor sessions with other ASA section(s), while their senior counterparts were more enthusiastic about inviting lecture(s) from prominent intellectuals.
6. Receptions

Yet another topic broached in the survey instrument was the reception held at each annual meeting. There are a number of difficult issues surrounding the reception. For example, some members – including most members of the Executive Council in recent years – have expressed a strong preference for holding the reception onsite, i.e., at the ASA convention hotel, rather than moving offsite or collaborating with the Association for the Sociology of Religion (ASR), which holds its meetings (and sponsors a reception) during the same period. The main reasons for preferring an onsite reception include convenience for members and greater visibility for the section and the subfield. However, the key problem with onsite receptions has been the extremely high cost of space, as well as food and refreshments. To deal with this issue, we have routinely partnered with other sections; this practice can also promote contacts with sociologists from other subfields. Although the practice of sharing receptions has lowered our expenses, several additional pitfalls have become clear. For example, it is not always easy to identify other sections willing or able to co-sponsor receptions with us. In addition, larger receptions require more space, and may make interaction among attendees more difficult. And there are also potential coordination problems among the section leaders, with ASA personnel, and so on.

Given these dilemmas, the survey inquired about members’ preferences for future receptions. Only a handful of respondents (slightly over 10%) want the section to hold its own reception, regardless of the added costs, without partnering with any other group(s). Roughly 30% of respondents prefer the status quo, and want section leaders to continue seeking opportunities to co-sponsor receptions with other ASA sections. However, an even more popular option, with support from nearly half of the respondents, is to share the reception with the Association for the Sociology of Religion, an organization that holds its annual meetings at the same time and in the same city as the ASA, and to which a majority of the survey respondents belong. A small number of respondents (n=20) volunteered other answers to this question. If these responses are indeed representative of the views of section members – or at least the most committed and active members – future chairs and executive councils may wish to revisit the issue of the annual reception, and explore the possibility of working more closely with the ASR.

7. Policies concerning graduate students

As noted earlier, a significant minority of section members are graduate students; this proportion is somewhat (but not dramatically) higher in the sociology of religion section than in many other ASA sections. This may bode well for the future of the section; if student members can be retained, then they may well continue to belong to, and participate in, the section in the years following completion of graduate school, as professionals. Thus, cultivating a strong base of student members can help to socialize the next cohort(s) of sociologists of religion, and may also insure the long-term health of the section. With these issues in mind, the survey included several items about potential policies aimed at making it easier for students to join, participate in, and benefit from the section. Overall, these proposed initiatives garnered strong support. Approximately 77% of the respondents agreed that “the section should look for ways to subsidize student membership dues ...” while only 8% of the respondents expressed opposition to this idea. A slightly higher percentage (80%) of respondents approved with the sponsorship of an event [e.g., reception, breakfast, happy hour] that is geared especially to graduate students for welcoming and networking; only 6 of 230 respondents rejected this suggestion. A somewhat more controversial proposal involved greater graduate student representation on section committees, such as the program committee and the nominating committee. (The executive council already includes one voting graduate student representative, who is elected by the section membership.) Although a majority (56%) of respondents agreed with this proposal, slightly over 10% disapproved (the largest percentage for any of the student-related items). Approximately one-third of the respondents expressed uncertainty or ambivalence over this proposal. Taken together, these results suggest at least two clear policy directions for future section leaders. These should enable the section to serve its substantial graduate student membership more effectively, and also to recruit and retain more student members.

Final note

It is important to remember the limitations of these data. The response rate was better than many online surveys, but well below what we had hoped for. Although these findings may not be representative of the entire membership, respondents appear to be among the most active and committed members. Viewed from this perspective, we think these data offer a potentially useful snapshot of the perceptions and opinions of core members. Hopefully these data will be useful to section leaders as they contemplate policy changes and make plans for future meetings. Voluntary associations depend on the commitment and good will of their members. For this reason, given the relative ease of surveying members, it may be wise to solicit feedback from members on a regular basis.
Member News and Notes

Helen A. Berger, West Chester University, and Douglas Ezzy, Teenage Witches: Magical Youth and the Search for the Self (Rutgers University Press, 2007).


Fumiko Fukase-Indergaard successfully defended a dissertation in the Department of Sociology at Columbia University on “Communities of Discourse and Networks of Action: Protestantism and the Making of Democratic Movement Leaders in Modern Japan, 1868-1930.”


Margarita Mooney has accepted a tenure-track assistant professor position in the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Her appointment begins in the fall.

Dan Olson is moving from Indiana University South Bend to Purdue University, where he has accepted a position as associate professor of sociology.

David Smilde, University of Georgia, Reason to Believe: Cultural Agency in Latin American Evangelicalism (University of California Press, 2007).

Jenny Trinitapoli successfully defended a dissertation with the Department of Sociology at the University of Texas at Austin. Her dissertation was on “The Role of Religious Congregations in the AIDS Crisis of Sub-Saharan Africa.” She will join the School of Social and Family Dynamics at Arizona State University as an assistant professor in the fall.

Steve Warner has retired from full-time teaching at the University of Illinois at Chicago but not from the field of sociology of religion. His latest research, with Stephen P. Davis and Juan R. Martinez, both UIC graduate students, is part of the Immigrant Mobilization Project (IMP), an interdisciplinary effort to document events that occurred in Chicago in March 2006 and soon spread to other cities across the country. Davis, Martinez, and Warner highlight the role of the Catholic Church in this mobilization effort.

Dissertation in the Pipe

Michael K. Roemer, “Religiosity and Subjective and Psychological Well-being in Contemporary Japan,” Department of Sociology, University of Texas at Austin.

Roemer is evaluating the intersection between Japanese religious practices and beliefs and psychological and subjective well-being. By applying a multi-methodological approach and focusing on a non-Christian East Asian society, he aims to provide a broader interpretation of the religion-health connection, and it is expected that both the process and results of asking culturally specific questions will be applicable to the scientific study of religion in other societies as well. The research is funded by an NSF Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant, a Jacquet Award (Religious Research Association), a Jack Shand Research Award (Society for the Scientific Study of Religion), and a Mitsubishi Graduate Research Fellowship (UT-Austin).

From the Editor

The spring newsletter is my final as editor. I enjoyed my three years reporting your news and that of the section. It was fun to serve a section where exciting things are happening. I would like to believe that the newsletter plays a part in our section’s vitality. Findings from the 2006 member survey are encouraging (see Ellision article, pages 11-13). I am grateful that you continued to read despite changes in design and distribution. Editing the newsletter reinforced my appreciation for our subfield and for the many wonderful people who sustain it.

Richard Flory, formerly of Biola University and now at the Center for Religion and Civic Culture at the University of Southern California, takes over editorial duties. He will do a fine job. For those of you eager to share your input for the future of these pages, you can contact him at richard.flory@gmail.com. I wish him well, and thank all of you making my time as editor a positive one.

KEVIN D. DOUGHERTY, Baylor University
Employment Announcements

Associate Director, Center for the Economic Study of Religion

The Center for the Economic Study of Religion at George Mason University seeks a full-time Associate Director. The employee will work closely with the Center’s Executive Director and oversee the work of the office manager and other staff. The Associate Director will manage and hire staff, draft grant proposals and reports, oversee the Center’s budget and accounting, manage the workshop series, and assist with conferences and other special events. The ideal candidate will have the following qualifications: experience managing a budget and staff, excellent interpersonal, writing, and computer skills, academic training in the social sciences, and two to three years experience in a similar position at a university or policy center. For details concerning CESR’s mission, activities, and staff, see: www.theCESR.org. Salary is competitive and commensurate with experience. Benefits include full health and dental insurance, a flexible spending account, long-term disability and life insurance, a 403(b) retirement savings program, a parking permit, and one course per semester at George Mason University. Interested parties should email Christine Brickma at cbrickma@gmu.edu.

Coordinator of Research Services, Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.]

The Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.] seeks applicants for the position of coordinator of its Research Services office. Responsibilities include coordinating research operations, supervising staff, conducting surveys and other research, disseminating findings, and working with other church leaders. An M.A. degree in a social science or related area is required; a Ph.D. is preferred. A minimum of five years’ experience (with a Ph.D.) or ten years (with an M.A.) in social science research is also required, preferably in an applied setting, with experience directing projects and managing other researchers. Requisite skills include knowledge of research methods and familiarity with data analysis software (e.g., SPSS); report writing and oral presentation skills; ability to interpret research results for persons with limited knowledge of research methods or statistics; understanding of and respect for Christian principles. Applicants should send a letter of interest along with a curriculum vitae to Antissa Riley, Human Resources, Presbyterian Church [U.S.A.], 100 Witherspoon St, Louisville KY 40202. For more information on Research Services, go to www.pcusa.org/research; for more information on the coordinator position, contact Jack Marcum, jmarcum@ctr.pcusa.org or 502-569-5161. Screening begins immediately and will continue until the position is filled. Starting date is January 2, 2008.

Project Manager, National Study of Youth and Religion

The National Study of Youth and Religion at the University of Notre Dame is seeking to hire a Project Manager (official ND title is Program Manager) to run the post-wave 3 respondent tracking and other project-related tasks. The job involves working with the Principal Investigator of the National Survey on Youth & Religion (Christian Smith) to supervise data collection activities, communicate with and track survey respondents, and manage grant budgets, interfacing with the co-investigators, budget staff, programmer, student research assistants, and programs and research specialist. She or he will also write research and annual reports for public dissemination, manage press inquiries, and keep the project website updated. Research and data management experience a must. The position is funded to last for 2-3 years at least. Here is a chance to work with a team of scholars on a major, national, panel study of American religion among (now) young adults. A more detailed explanation of the tasks and salary range can be found at the ND HR website: http://hr.nd.edu/employment/job_opportunities.shtml (search on NSYR Project Manager). Specific questions about the job can be emailed to Chris.Smith@nd.edu.

Research Associate, Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate

The Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) at Georgetown University is seeking a research associate to join an interdisciplinary team of researchers who conduct social scientific research related to the Catholic Church. The position involves survey and/or demographic research and data analysis and requires strong analytical and writing skills. Applicants with a Ph.D. in sociology, political science, demography, economics, psychology, or education and knowledge about the Catholic Church are especially well suited for this position. The ideal candidate also has an understanding of Hispanic/Latino culture and proficiency in Spanish. Ph.D. level appointments will be made as Georgetown research faculty at the appropriate rank. Applicants seeking a part-time position will also be considered. Send curriculum vitae and writing sample to Mary E. Bendyna, RSM, Ph.D., Executive Director, CARA, 2300 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20007; FAX: 202.687.8086; email: cara@georgetown.edu.