Let us begin with a correction, coupled with sincerest apologies to both the author and our readers. Mea culpa. In the February issue (35/1), in place of the final, edited version, I mistakenly published an earlier, draft version of the essay by Kurt R. Schaeffer, “Future Directions for Modern Tibetan Studies: Religion/History” (pages 17-19).

Next, some introductions are in order. Beginning with this issue, you will note that, alongside J. E. Lewellyn, three new associate editors have joined our humble operation: Kirstin Munk, Rick Bohannon, and Craig Martin. These editors will be assisting me primarily with soliciting content for publication. Each brings an exceptional set of scholarly interests and professional contacts to the bulletin, and I am excited about what their involvement will mean for the publication and our readers.

Kirstin is wrapping up her dissertation at the University of Southern Denmark. Her background is in the history of religions, but her work shares much in common with anthropology. She has been teaching at two Danish universities for the past ten years in a variety of subjects. Her current research is concerned with the use and continued meaningfulness of Western astrology in the modern, globalized world. Her methodological focus is empirical and draws on diverse theoretical orientations such as ritual studies, cognitive research, narratology, aesthetics, and phenomenology in order to better understand the meaning-creating processes that relate to this popular and widespread phenomenon. Some of her previous work has involved Southern Africa and has centered on divination and healing, acculturation, and religion and politics, and has focused on matters of practical concern (e.g., HIV/AIDS intervention, religion and health, children’s rights, minority issues, etc.).

Rick’s work is in the area of religion and society, sociology of religion, and social ethics. Broadly speaking, his most active interests are in religion and the environment, including both religious responses to the environmental crisis, as well as symbolic constructions of nature within religions. He is also very interested in architecture, especially religious and/or sustainable, urban planning, race and racism, gender, and science studies. His dissertation centers on constructions of human/nature in religious environmental architecture. Rick also works for an interfaith environmental organization in New Jersey.

Craig is writing on religion, political philosophy, and liberal democracy at Syracuse University. His areas of interest include Christian thought, modern religious and philosophical thought, contemporary philosophy and critical theory, religion and politics, feminism and discourses on gender, and theories and methods in the study of religion. Modern thought, political theory, and methods and theories in religion intersect with one another in his research as he explores such questions as: how was/is “religion” thought to be “separated” from the state? How was this separation justified? And how were/are the two conceived as different? Moreover, what would it mean if the justification for a separation of the two was based on Christian thought?

Finally, we do not receive very many Letters to the Editor for publication in the bulletin (though I sincerely wish we did). The few we do receive, at least of late, all have to do with Reed M. N. Weep. After discussing the matter with Professor Weep, it seems best to take a poll. Therefore, I am calling for a vote on whether or to what extent to retain the services of this cantankerous, self-professed critic-at-large. Has he run his course? Or is he the reason you open the mailbox? Now is the time to decide. Rumor has it that not too many readers care one way or the other. Records indicate that a vote of this sort may have been taken in the past, but the response was too negligible to generate a meaningful report on the large mainframe computer we keep housed at the CSSR office to calculate these matters. (Said computer is also very helpful when it comes to figuring out tips for pizza deliveries and such, but I digress.) Now, something tells me that if a book on textual criticism can make the New York Times Bestseller List (I am speaking of Bart Ehrman’s fine new volume, Misquoting Jesus [HarperSanFrancisco 2005], which sincerely is a great read), then we could certainly stand to hear a few more words from Weep. But that’s just one man’s opinion, and my last effort to “defend” Weep’s work was called “laborious” by one reader. In any case, the only remarks I ever receive on Weep are generally angry ones, so here’s your chance to go public and
work for change and progress. Maybe you think you can do a
c better job. Maybe you think humor is inappropriate in this
context. Maybe you think the bulletin simply cannot afford to
sacrifice a page or two to such drivel given the wealth of
quality submissions we receive month after month. Who
knows? Tell us! (Note that letters received will be published at
the editor’s discretion.)

This issue features a collection of reflections from a group
of professors participating in a “Post-Holocaust Midrash Read­
ing Group.” The intended purpose of their essays is to (i)
demonstrate a pedagogical model based on dialogue, (ii) to
illustrate Jewish-Christian dialogue focused on their shared
texts, and (iii) to reflect a particularly post-Holocaust herme­
neutic in relation to both biblical criticism and religious re­
sponses to “natural disaster.” David Wright follows with a

fascinating exploration of the so-called “wolf-girls of Mid­
napore” that considers how categories of self and other are
unsettled by the presence of beings situated at the boundary
between those categories. The article questions the implica­
tions of such a disturbance of categories for phenomenology.
Finally, John Parrish revisits the long-standing “dying and ris­
ing gods” category to investigate the underlying assumptions
and, at times, apologetic interests behind the debate over
whether or to what extent such a category furthers the ana­
lytical interests of scholars of religion. Professor Weep is tak­
ing this issue off. He is holed up in his spacious oak-paneled
office, wearing his favorite cardigan sweater from days of
glory when he lettered in varsity religious studies, and looking
out over the lush university quad while he patiently waits for
the polls to close.