

Approved
in accordance
with the
policy

Letter,

Thanks for your note on the Institute. It looks refreshing and sounds optimistic.

I fully agree with your ideas

My only difficulty is that I didn't envision the Institute as an 'experimental learning center'

— but ~~this is not my~~ you have certainly your idea and from this perspective it is worth while I remain at your disposal

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—(Letterhead for Interdepartmental Use)

tooling agency, perhaps for teachers who have been in the field for some time without opportunity to become fully acquainted with the profusion of new information about religion which has come to light in recent years, perhaps for others who seek time and place to develop new skills or to pursue new interests. I am also thinking particularly about dramatic increase in knowledge of Asian religions, recent developments in the fields and disciplines (philosophy, literary criticism, psychology, sociology, etc.) which have to do with interpreting and sorting information about religion, and, of course, with the shifts in approach which accompany the transfer of religious studies to the state-university environment. These large developments in the comprehension of religion should make retooling intriguing to persons in religious studies as well as to persons in fields which are coming in greater and greater contact with religious phenomena. Putting the two sides of the thrust together, I envision a situation in which innovation, experimentation, and retooling could occur in group terms, and perhaps to the benefit of the undergraduate and graduate curricula in religious studies.

There are no guarantees, but I know financial assistance is available for some such purpose as this if, as J. Edward Dirks of the Danforth Foundation put it, there is both commitment and feasibility on our part. If these two ingredients are present, and by careful conception, I think we might be able to bring the program off in a

Q

Institute of Religious Studies
February 16, 1973

TO: Faculty in Religious Studies and Advisors to the Institute
FROM: Walter H. Capps
RE: A Possible New Direction for the Institute

Dear Colleagues:

During the past several months I have been in consultation with persons in foundations and extra-mural funding agencies regarding the work, both actual and contemplated, of the Institute. From these many conversations, and from our experience over the past six-plus years, I have reason to believe that the time may be ripe for developing an experimental learning center in religious studies on this campus.

As I see it, such a center could have a twofold thrust. From the one side, it could be employed for experimentation and innovation in teaching and learning. This would include development of curricula, explorations of resources within the humanities and the social sciences, extensive uses of multi-media resources, and ongoing evaluation and reporting concerning all of these. As you may know, multi-media resources are available in unusual and expansive abundance on this campus. From the other side, the center could function as a re-tooling agency, perhaps for teachers who have been in the field for some time without opportunity to become fully acquainted with the profusion of new information about religion which has come to light in recent years, perhaps for others who seek time and place to develop new skills or to pursue new interests. I am also thinking particularly about dramatic increase in knowledge of Asian religions, recent developments in the fields and disciplines (philosophy, literary criticism, psychology, sociology, etc.) which have to do with interpreting and sorting information about religion, and, of course, with the shifts in approach which accompany the transfer of religious studies to the state-university environment. These large developments in the comprehension of religion should make retooling intriguing to persons in religious studies as well as to persons in fields which are coming in greater and greater contact with religious phenomena. Putting the two sides of the thrust together, I envision a situation in which innovation, experimentation, and retooling could occur in group terms, and perhaps to the benefit of the undergraduate and graduate curricula in religious studies.

There are no guarantees, but I know financial assistance is available for some such purpose as this if, as J. Edward Dirks of the Danforth Foundation put it, there is both commitment and feasibility on our part. If these two ingredients are present, and by careful conception, I think we might be able to bring the program off in a

page two

way that would enhance our own teaching, give us maximum benefit from visitors to the campus, and support our own individual research efforts. In addition, through a scheme for released time for faculty members participating in the learning experiment, we ought to be able to increase the FTE ratio in religious studies and even garner additional salary revenue. At any rate, the hint of this is present.

I should like to get your reactions soon so that we can give the matter the proper attention, if you think the notion is worth pursuing.

Walter

To: Walt Capps

From: Gerry Larson

Re: Response to "A Possible New Direction for the Institute"

I was interested in your recent memo and find myself intrigued by one aspect of your proposal but skeptical about another. My skepticism first. From the perspective of my own field of Asian religion and thought, I do not think that UCSB at the present moment is able to offer much by way of retooling for those interested in moving in ^{to} Asian religion. I say this for two reasons. (1) The UCSB library is still totally inadequate in the Asian area, and there simply are not enough resources there to provide a base for professional retooling. Our secondary holdings are fairly good, but our primary texts and the range of our journals are unfortunately quite limited. (2) For those desiring to improve their primary competence in Asian religion, the UCSB curriculum in support areas (e.g., Islamics, Sinology, Japanology, Indology on the undergraduate as well as graduate level) is on the weak side. The "knowledge explosion" going on in Asian religion is basically in the area of greatly expanding primary competence for which high-powered language institutes are prerequisite. We are able, I think, to offer good professional training for carefully selected graduate students, assuming they come within our faculty specializations and assuming that they can be farmed out when necessary for gaining requisite language skills (at UCLA, Berkeley, etc.), but I would hesitate to claim for the department or the institute that we are in a position to offer professional retooling that touches upon Asian religion.

What appears workable to me is the idea of establishing an "experimental learning center" for undergraduate and secondary level teaching in Religious Studies which is non-technical and non-specialized. It could serve the needs of those college teachers who have the unpleasant task of teaching various introductory courses in Religious Studies for which they have not been trained (especially in the use of such resources as films, tapes, teaching machines, etc.). Also, it could serve junior college teachers and even secondary school teachers who are completely untrained in Religious Studies.

Institute of Religious Studies
February 16, 1973

TO: Faculty in Religious Studies and Advisors to the Institute
FROM: Walter H. Capps
RE: A Possible New Direction for the Institute

Dear Colleagues:

During the past several months I have been in consultation with persons in foundations and extra-mural funding agencies regarding the work, both actual and contemplated, of the Institute. From these many conversations, and from our experience over the past six-plus years, I have reason to believe that the time may be ripe for developing an experimental learning center in religious studies on this campus.

(1) As I see it, such a center could have a twofold thrust. From the one side, it could be employed for experimentation and innovation in teaching and learning. This would include development of curricula, explorations of resources within the humanities and the social sciences, extensive uses of multi-media resources, and ongoing evaluation and reporting concerning all of these. As you may know, multi-media resources are available in unusual and expansive abundance on this campus. From the other side, the center could function as a re-tooling agency, perhaps for teachers who have been in the field for some time without opportunity to become fully acquainted with the profusion of new information about religion which has come to light in recent years, perhaps for others who seek time and place to develop new skills or to pursue new interests. I am also thinking particularly about dramatic increase in knowledge of Asian religions, recent developments in the fields and disciplines (philosophy, literary criticism, psychology, sociology, etc.) which have to do with interpreting and sorting information about religion, and, of course, with the shifts in approach which accompany the transfer of religious studies to the state-university environment. These large developments in the comprehension of religion should make retooling intriguing to persons in religious studies as well as to persons in fields which are coming in greater and greater contact with religious phenomena. Putting the two sides of the thrust together, I envision a situation in which innovation, experimentation, and retooling could occur in group terms, and perhaps to the benefit of the undergraduate and graduate curricula in religious studies.

There are no guarantees, but I know financial assistance is available for some such purpose as this if, as J. Edward Dirks of the Danforth Foundation put it, there is both commitment and feasibility on our part. If these two ingredients are present, and by careful conception, I think we might be able to bring the program off in a

page two

way that would enhance our own teaching, give us maximum benefit from visitors to the campus, and support our own individual research efforts. In addition, through a scheme for released time for faculty members participating in the learning experiment, we ought to be able to increase the FTE ratio in religious studies and even garner additional salary revenue. At any rate, the hint of this is present.

I should like to get your reactions soon so that we can give the matter the proper attention, if you think the notion is worth pursuing.

Walter

PANIKKAR:

1. There really are no "reasons." I was asked to come here and I decided to do so. You can call it karma or the falling of a ripe fruit.

2. The department is capable of a unique development: it is within a state university context and can work toward a universal and "scientific" approach that is more difficult for a theological school. Also, the lack of tradition is a plus, which can allow and encourage innovative development, which a tradition of only some centuries makes more difficult. The negative aspect now, is that it is not easy to crystallize these hopes and projects. The department is still far from the goal it has set for itself, and must continue to strive for it.

One missed opportunity: we have not taken enough steps to overcome individualism without harming personality. Excessive individualism is a great problem in modern life and in American culture, and this includes the academic world. The system is geared to rewarding individual achievements. Yet the lasting work of the department requires collegial work. This is needed to create a school of thought. And it is a great temptation for each of us to stay in our own areas centrifugally, as it were to what the department is concerned.

We are on the right way, but it will take time, and we will meet resistance.

3. Positively, but more in terms of program, projects, and hope than concrete realization. The direction is excellent, the intentions good, but we need now to produce fruits. We have the advantage of being a small department, conserving still the human -and humane - scale.

4. 1) Greater internal crystalization. We need a more coherent and harmonious syllabus. I mean here first of all an internal growth in depth and quality and not an increase in numbers. I see our function as catalysts rather than organizers in the teaching of religion.

2) Additional faculty to cover some of the loopholes that we still have, for instance psychology of religion, Chinese traditions, supplementary religion and science offerings.

3) A better selection of students, especially graduate students. We need to be more selective in admissions, and should raise our standards rather than lower them.

5. a) All, because all are required. I think that a good teacher has to tackle all three levels. Overspeciality can be harmful. I feel there should be an intimate relation between the three programs: mutual challenge and criticism. We should beware of losing contact with present-day realities. This has been one of the causes of religious stagnation. The triple program should prevent us from falling into this danger.

b) I don't know.

6. a) The students themselves should probably answer this. Fairly good and personal, though I don't know them all. Here again, I think individualism is a problem. It's not enough for me to have individual relationships with certain students; there needs to be a greater feeling of community and the conviction that we are engaged in and even committed to a common enterprise.

b) Actually, none have achieved anything yet. Track two is hindered by O'Dea's illness. Tracks one and three are both promising, but have still to

produce fruits.

I am interested in all and feel we must not emphasize faculty and students as "belonging" to a certain track. There is one single program, all cross-cultural and interdisciplinary, with three areas of interest. We must not over-emphasize the three tracks at the cost of losing sight of the unity.

7. I have little basis for judgment on the first part. For the second, I don't fully understand the "should"; the relation is what it is. I only feel that we should work in close collaboration and yet distinction. As for a reconception of the institute, I don't think I am entitled to draw a new project. But perhaps one could envisage a committee to study a new charter for both institute and department. I would not be happy with a division of labor: research left to the institute and teaching to the department. I think the relationship should be studied in order to enhance the function of the two.

8. First, I have a general criticism to the quarter system, which makes unnecessarily difficult a deep and continuous relation both to topics and students. Perhaps a middle solution, which would still keep the summer free for summer courses would be to maintain the fall quarter and to blend winter and spring into a unit.

a) Personally, I think our TA's are very good. But many improvements could be made for the format. I consider a graduate student to be more like a colleague than a student merely continuing his undergraduate work at a higher level. A graduate student has already begun his academic career, and a fortiori a TA should be much more involved in the whole teaching procedure. The relationship should be that of a community of persons, albeit at different levels of scholarly development, not just a means of providing some assistance for professors and some money for the students.

b) This can and should be improved. The department needs perhaps a good library of its own as well, and more journals to circulate and comment upon. We also should bring back the weekly luncheons. And there is a great need for architectural reform. It is not good that people have to wait in the corridors, for instance, but even by utilizing the floor we have now, we could make better use of it. We need an inviting common room for study and discussion. Such physical changes would symbolize and make possible another type of relationship and sharing life more consonant to our ideals. It would also be good to launch a journal of some sort, probably in connection with the institute.

c) Again, architecture and individualism hamper interdepartmental relations. There are many colleagues willing to have contact with our department, but pressure of time and lack of facilities makes this difficult.

9. I am working on only one thing, though its facets are almost infinite. It could be called the cosmotheandric vision, bringing together the total experience of mankind. Such an ambitious task must be taken in small pieces, and this is what I am doing. I am mainly concerned with bringing together the four traditions that I know well: Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, and secular society. And I'm trying to do so at many levels: through teaching, research, and involvements in the wide world.

I have just completed an anthology of the Vedas and am almost finished with what I call a Christophany. Also I am writing many articles and teaching classes which may crystallize in books written by others, as it has so often happened with me.

10. I think the very concept of religious studies is cross-cultural and -historical and interdepartmental. The opportunity of the field and of our department is to do what other branches of learning have done in other eras: to integrate, but without imposing a rigid model of our own. I am in religious studies instead of elsewhere now, exactly because of this. Religious studies has no particular context; it is global.

We need to gain more intellectual stamina without losing what we have now. I am neither complacent nor defeatist about the department. We are a fine department, but we must also work to improve.

file under -
Multi-media Projects

WALTER:

Your idea concerning a proposal to study the relationship of the growth of cities and religions sounds good. Following are random comments and references as they occur to me, which might spark further directions that such a proposal might take.

1. Relevance could not be questioned. I suspect that behind much of the concern for "environmental studies" is a resurgence of Eliade's "sacred space," "establishing center," and a nostalgic return to illico tempore, frosted over with a heavy coating of pleas for healthful (health*=heil) lives, all highly suspect of sacral intents under Eliade's categories.

2. Reference can be made to grandiose plans to refurbish cities today (such as the attached "Environment" article from Time, July 2, 1973, concerning "Chicago 21"), in which the aid of federal monies, and, in the attached article, "Chicago's power elite" (q.v.), are enlisted along with the people of the city, to participate in "one of the great acts in the renaissance of the city." (p. 70) Such all encompassing activities calls to mind the cross-section of humanity dragging stones across the countryside of France to build its cathedrals, and across the desert to build the great temples and their adjoining pyramids in Egypt.

3. Reference, too, can be made to the current National Geographic (CXLIV.1, July 1973, pp. 40 ff.), where a battle is being conducted to save an Icelandic village from a volcano. The battle with cosmic forces to preserve the deliniation of human order from that of chaos, that line between the grassy purity of the Vestmannaeyjar tribal precincts and the belching levithan scattering its contaminating black ash over all. Noel Grove describes the reaction of a crowd on the deck of an approaching ship to a blast from the volcano, and responds: "It is a war, I would discover in the days ahead, a battle between the earth-shaping processes of our planet and a town that refuses to die" (pp. 41-2). Immediately after this he entitles the first section of his article, "Islanders Sing Against the Thunder." An ironic identification of the new volcano is its first name, Kirkjufell, or "Church mountain," since "it opened near the site of Heimaey's earliest Christian shrine" (p. 42). Well, perhaps all this is curious rather than relevant!

4. Not only the better known and "living" religions have cities which perform centering and structuring functions (Judaism, Chr., Islam, Buddhism, in India, China and Japan, also Ceylon, Hinduism, etc.), but also Egyptian, Babylonian, Hittite, Greek, even Aztec and Olmeic city-states were inextricably associated with their religions, so much so, that, when they fell as cities, so did their cults.

5. O.F. Bollnow, in "Lived-Space" (Readings in Existential Phenomenology, ed. by Nathaniel Lawrence and Daniel O'Connor. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.), pp. 178-186, deals

with the coordinates of space extending from the one perceiving space about him, and how this relates to one's residence, being "at home," and that even today, Italian roads lead to Rome as the acknowledged center, and each kilometer stone gives without explanation distances to Rome. In speaking about dwellings, he characterizes man's activity of dwelling as being unlike any other activity, for in it man "realizes his true essence." Even in our secular time the dwelling has a sacred character, he notes, as is shown in modern jurisprudence where the crime of burglary and the inviolable right of the guest is considered with disproportionate gravity. Outer space is dealt with only briefly under three concepts characterizing it: breadth, strangeness and distance (or horizon). The road as trade routes extending from city to city, as means of extending cities (as Roman military power and two Napoleons in France, or our own network of freeways), cuts out pieces of ground from the natural world about ~~xxxxx~~ it, and serves not as a place of rest or dwelling, but to facilitate transportation from center to center. "Housekeeping" where one shapes living space, "Lived Distance," where mathematical distance can be smaller than actual "lines of force" of one's concrete life situation (friends and relatives are closer by telephone than neighbors separated by thin membranes of concrete), and "Space as Felt," where fear and courage determines distances in lived-space, are outlined by Bollnow.

6. Roget's Thesaurus, #188, 189, and 180-184, show the English language to be rich with words relating to habitation and space. No doubt our legal system and English Common Law has much to say.

7. The story of the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11.1-9), ~~figures~~ ^{appears} in literature and art (especially Peter Bruegel--Kunsthistorische Museum, Vienna) as a figure of fallen cities and empires, and judgment on cities, as does Babylon in the NT (Revelation especially).

8. The New Jerusalem (Revelation 21-22) begin a series of Utopian cities envisioned to the present time.

9. Paradise has become parks in cities and natural gardens on the edge of Isla Vista.

10. Renaissance city planners, including Leonardo and Michaelangelo, as well as later architects of cities (in the "New World--Washington and Jefferson, even Frank Lloyd Wright), no doubt offer revealing motivations in their writings, for the imposition of exterior order upon functional needs implies aesthetic activities which are most often super-sensual, perhaps mystical.

11. Apocalyptic implications of the fall of Rome find immense literary and scientific attentions paid to it. Thus, some 14 writers contribute to the paperback, The Fall of Rome. Can It Be Explained? (ed. by Mortimer Chambers. European Problem Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963).

Cities--p. 3.

12. Numa-Denys Fustel de Coulanges treats religion and cities in "The Ancient City," excerpted from The Ancient City (tr. by Willard Small. 3d ed. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1877) in the textbook, Reader in Comparative Religion: An Anthropological Approach, (Wm. A. Lessa and Evon Z. Vogt, editors. Second Ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1965, pp. 89-102). The book now is in a paperback ed. in English, and deals with the dynamic role of religion in ancient Greek and Roman life, showing the interrelatedness of laws and institutions with religion.

13. Good bibliographic footnotes are included in Joachim Wach's Sociology of Religion (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 79 ff., especially pp. 82 ff.

14. Richard E. Sullivan, in Heirs of the Roman Empire (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1960. paperback), traces the extension of influence of the city-state of Rome through the founding of three new civilizations between the end of the 6th cent. to the 10th centuries, including Byzantine, Carolingian and Muslem, extending from the Tigris-Euphrates and Nile valleys, to Saxony, Bulgaria, Russia and England.

Institute of Religious Studies
April 18, 1973

TO: Faculty in Religious Studies and Advisors to the Institute
FROM: Walter H. Capps, Director, Institute of Religious Studies
RE: Another Trial Balloon, or, perhaps, a Lively Hope

Dear Colleagues:

For the past several weeks I've been playing with some notions that may hold an intriguing prospect for some of us. Their genesis lies in the following sets of information:

- 1) On May 22-24, Dr. J. Edward Dirks, Vice President of the Danforth Foundation, will be making his second visit to the Institute and to the campus in recent months. Dr. Dirks will be meeting with persons in the Contracts and Grants Office, with Dean Offen in the Graduate Division, with Vice Chancellor Snyder, and with us in the Institute and the Department about projects and proposals in research and learning that might be funded through the Foundation.
- 2) Heretofore, over the past six years no less, no member of the faculty in Religious Studies (with two notable exceptions) has submitted a proposal for extra-mural research support to or via the Institute. None has been forthcoming from the Religious Studies faculty as a faculty. Only one or two have come individual faculty members. What proposals there have been have been conceived and generated by the directors of the Institute. These facts put us in a vulnerable position when the need for such an institute is assessed.

- 3) From the very beginning, the University has agreed only to provide "seed money" to the Institute, and not to be its sole support. The assumption has been that said "seed money" will be used to attract additional research-support monies, and not simply to underwrite the Institute's program of lectures, symposia, and publications.
- 4) There are moves afoot to explore the present possibility of transferring the Institute from a "campus-wide" to a "university-wide" research unit. The strategy involves enhancing both the internal and external funding capabilities of the Institute, and including persons from other campuses of the University in Institute-sponsored or supported projects. Such moves require that certain changes be made, and that the internal and external assessments of the Institute's programs be made more rigorous than ever before.

The new program notions (mentioned above) have also been spawned by an assessment of our experiences over the past three years (experiences which include direct contact with approximately two hundred foundations and/or extra-mural support agencies) regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the Institute's program:

- 1) The several projects which have found their way into print or are destined for the same, have been highly successful. One can cite the proceedings from symposia -- the UC Press publications, the articles we have placed with professional journals, and the series of publications we are beginning to initiate and print on our own as significant

examples. Relationships with a wide variety of publishers are excellent, and contacts of this kind continue to expand. For example, there is a good possibility that an Institute-initiated book series will be accepted by a major international house of publication, and there is a very real prospect that one of the AAR's series of publications will emanate from the Institute. In addition, several publishers have expressed interest in the native American religions materials from January's symposium.

Now, Publication possibilities continue to increase and expand.

2) The individual lectures that have been scheduled from time to time must be judged, mutatis mutandis, to be relatively unsuccessful. It is difficult to find convenient times for such lectures. It is impossible to entice the same persons to attend all of them. The competition for time, space, and attention is keen. And it is embarrassing to have outstanding visitors to the campus deliver their remarks to nearly empty or partially coerced audiences. Furthermore, budget money gets spent quickly this way with little ongoing carry-over capacity. Lectures too often become one-shot affairs with little or no provision for follow-up action and even less serious preparation time. Recommendation : since at least two members of the Religious Studies faculty are highly placed on Arts and Lectures committees, it would be more efficient and feasible to steer more Institute-sponsored, or co-sponsored, events through the regular extra-curricular lectures agencies.

3) The symposia have been good for the Institute; but, in the face of limited or diminishing resources, they become either too expensive or too infrequent. For example, our large hope of having Paul Ricoeur and George Steiner together for a symposium had to be abandoned because of our inability to bring Ricoeur from Chicago and to pay him the sort of honorarium to which he is accustomed; this, despite the fact that Arts and Lectures is footing the entire bill for George Steiner.

Now, with the foregoing information and analysis as background, I want to suggest a new way of organizing Institute enthusiasms. The proposal derives in part from inquiries which have come to the Institute office; it also represents some of the interests of faculty and grad students that have been expressed to me. The proposal itself pertains to the establishing of several working groups of scholars -- selected interest groups -- which might meet on a regular basis over a given span of time for specific individual and corporate research purposes.

I am proposing, in short, that we work more systematically toward approaching some of the current fundamental issues in religious studies in an ongoing, corporate, and interdisciplinary fashion. The issues I have in mind are the strategic and formative problems and interests within the subject-field which cut across several lines of inquiry and involve persons of a variety of disciplines and background. Having accepted the fact that the Institute's primary contribution lies in the direction of lending constitution to an emerging field of study and research within the context of the state university, I'm searching for a more effective way of

identifying and clarifying the frontier issues in this new endeavor. And in talking about corporate, group activity, I have something more in mind than finding an occasion for all persons interested in Islam or in mediaeval Christianity to sit down to discuss that interest together. In other words, I'm not thinking primarily of discussions of subjects for which progress consists of the accumulation of data while methodological assumptions are left relatively undisturbed. Rather, I'm attempting to focus on a few issues which carry strategic or formative capacities with respect to the constitution of the field.

Before suggesting a list of such topics, I would like to mention some of the benefits and advantages that ought to follow from the new program. For example, the constitution would be such that grad students and faculty could work alongside each other; in this setting, means might be found to support the work of some graduate students extra-murally. Lectures by visitors, visits by resource persons, and symposia could be arranged to correlate with the objectives of a particular working group. Visiting lecturers would be invited to contribute to an ongoing sequence of discussion, and their remarks would be evaluated and appropriated in the light of that sequence. Symposia would be scheduled on subjects and topics which are generated by the interests of one or another working group. Working agendas would be established internally by the working groups themselves. And the entire process would be looked to to generate research proposals that might be forwarded via the Institute to the appropriate funding agencies. Such a turnabout could come into being because of alterations in self-conceptions: instead of viewing Institute-sponsored events as extra-curricular intrusions into a

schedule which is already too full, persons participating in the program could come to welcome the same events as means of furthering cherished objectives.

Now for a list of suggestions about topics around which groups might be organized:

- 1) A group working on structuralism, the place of literary categories in textual studies, the interests of Paul Ricoeur, Kuhnian and post-Kuhnian studies on models and paradigms, the interests of Stephen Toulmin (UC Santa Cruz) as evidenced in his new book, Human Understanding, etc. Two persons in particular on this campus have expressed interest in the matter, i.e. Dick Comstock (Religious Studies) and Herbert Schneidau (English). There are doubtless many others. One incentive might be to refurbish the persistent interest in bringing Ricoeur (together with Toulmin, who labors close by) to the campus.
- 2) A group working on the question of the true significance of the distinction between primitive (archaic) and modern in religious apprehension. Until more clarity is given to this distinction, very little can be made of the distinction between "the religious" and "the secular" and even less can be said about the scope and objectives of the history of religions. There are a number of people on this campus who have some interest in the matter. Melford Spiro (of UC San Diego) and Jonathan Z. Smith (of University of Chicago) would be excellent resource persons.

- 3) A group working on the significance of the expanding emergence of new religions. The best of the Institute's work on "pentecostal movements" might fit this rubric. In addition, we can depend upon the resourcefulness of two persons whose writings on this subject are frequently cited: Jacob Needleman (Cal State University, San Francisco) and Robert Ellwood (USC). The Institute also has letters of inquiry on file from persons (one of whom would qualify as a post-doctoral research fellow) who would like to spend some months in residence working on this subject.

At present, the funding capability would seem to be high.

- 4) A continuation of the group now working on native American religious awareness. With the exception of the University of Montana (by virtue of Joseph Brown's presence), no academic institution within this country has claimed any special competence in the religious aspects of this fascinating subject. UCSB can make no grand claims either, although the participants in our recent symposium have expressed an interest in continuing joint work, and have wished to do it here, and there are faculty members in residence who would like to join them. Once again, extra-mural money may be available.

- 5) With the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of the country just a few years away, we receive more and more information about grants for research in early American history. Perhaps steps could be taken to organize an interdisciplinary research group on some subject having

to do with civil religion in America, religion and the public schools, or a topic of related current national interest. One or two graduate students (particularly Bill Van Ness, who is himself an able organizer) have expressed interest, and in Robert Michaelson and others we already possess considerable strengths. Once again, the extra-mural research capabilities are high. The symposium interest is there, and the timeliness of the subject provides additional incentives.

In the midst of this array of possible topics, it would be foolish to expect that all persons involved would become involved at all possible points. Similarly it is unrealistic to suppose that Religious Studies faculty would take prime responsibility for the organization and nurture of all groups. The Institute was designed to promote and bring support to research projects in religious studies that are interdisciplinary in nature, which, presumably, will elicit the interest and involvement of persons in other fields of study. It is because of the expressed interests of such persons, in part, that the suggested list of topics has been compiled. Thus the list capitalizes on the same variegation as a methodological strategem in approaching crucial and formative issues.

These comments are entitled a "Trial Balloon," but they really serve as preparation for Dr. Dirks' visit in late May. In formal terms, the operational model which is being sketched here is designed to serve several functions simultaneously. From the very beginning, it acknowledges that the hope of finding shared (religious studies)

enthusiasms for a single topic is unrealistic, unattainable, and probably excessive and wrong-headed. It recognizes that an "organized research unit" can operate without such consensus. It holds that meaningful corporate research can revolve around subjects that need not be construed as common denominators. It affirms that there are numerous worthy research topics in which a variety of persons from a diversity of fields and disciplines can participate.

Suggestions such as these invite reactions and responses. I will wait for them, hoping too that we can discuss the matter more fully prior to Dr. Dirks' visit to the campus.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

INSTITUTE OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93106

20 May 1974

CONFIDENTIAL

If it comes to fruition, the action taken at last Friday's faculty meeting will strengthen the Institute of Religious Studies and enable its program to expand in several directions. With some strong administrative assistance, I feel freer about moving into areas, and accepting responsibilities, that would have been beyond our reach under the present staffing situation. But I want us to be clear about our present situation so that we can move ahead together. It is for this reason that I am putting these views on paper.

In my view, a large portion of Institute effort so far has been expended on experimentation and testing. We have attempted to test our capacities and to cultivate an identity. The operating principle has been that we can find extra-mural assistance only if we can point to real quality performance. So, we have initiated a number of projects, and have probed to various depths on various levels.

When I look back over the record of the past several years, I recognize I think, that the Institute has been working within at least three environments. Some of what we have done belongs to

20 May 1974

-2-

the context of religious studies as a profession. We have been concerned about the development of a new academic field on the state university campus, and have charted our direction with this interest in mind. Another operational context has been the religious studies program on the UCSB campus. Here, as I frequently say, the relationship between Department and Institute has been symbiotic. For the Institute's part, some achievements can be noted that may not have been accomplished by the Department alone. The third operational context, more difficult to identify, has been the humanities (and perhaps the social sciences too) on the UCSB campus. The interdisciplinary work that has been initiated (the evening faculty colleague groups, for example) as well as that which is being called for can be cited as significant cases in point. At the moment we are operating within all three of these ranges of interest in mutually inclusive ways. And I see no reason why we should eliminate any one of the three, as long as we and our interpreters recognize that we are investing in three contexts and not simply in one. In the following ways:

When we look ahead, however, there are some large issues which have not been resolved. The first pertains to a clarification of our "campus-wide vs. university-wide" designation. When I became director of the Institute I was told that we were a "university-wide" organized research agency, of course, with location in Santa Barbara. I was told that we were free to operate on that basis; consequently,

20 May 1974

-3-

I am also concerned about long -- or longer -- range planning. one of my first acts was to invite faculty from other campuses of the University to serve as members of an advisory committee. But then I learned that we were designated as a "campus-wide" agency. This does not affect our relationship with faculty members from the other campuses of the University, but it does influence budgetary resources. All of that is history now. At the present moment the Institute is being looked to to take some sort of leadership -- if it will -- regarding other religious studies programs, and perhaps even with respect to relationships within religious studies between the University and the junior and community colleges. Beyond this, I have felt all along that UCSB can really take advantage of the exceptionally resourceful faculty persons on other campuses of the University, and that we should work to regularize a "university-wide function" if not a "university-wide formal status." With that in mind, I am making the following suggestion:

that we propose no change in "campus-wide" status or nomenclature, but regularize the "university-wide" inter-relationships in the following ways:

- (a) keep the hub of the operation here at UCSB, maintaining the integral relationship with the Department
- (b) restrict membership on advisory committee to local faculty
- (c) appoint Fellows from other UC campuses as well as from UCSB (perhaps twelve from each group initially)
- (d) request faculty from other UC campuses to serve as program advisors, members of editorial committees, symposium participants, etc.

20 May 1974

-4-

I am also concerned about long -- or longer -- range planning. Without criticizing or praising past behavior, I know that the time has come for us to plan the future more carefully and to develop a more effective mechanism for placing items on the Institute's agenda. We need to project symposia and conference priorities at least two or three years ahead. We need to have suggestions about persons to invite to give guest lectures. We should make conscious decisions about how many guest lectures we should have -- or can tolerate -- per quarter, how many symposia we desire per year, etc. And this process itself should assist ^{us} in thinking together about our corporate conceptions of the way the field is developing, or student interest is crystallizing, or where the focus should lie.

I'm bothered too about the lack of graduate student involvement in Institute projects. For too long, I think, graduate students have been invited to become members of audiences. I wish their involvement could be more participatory, active, and direct. I don't have the model in mind, but I'd covet the chance to work with them toward discovering or designing one.

Further, I think we can wait no longer on publication policy. Whatever the means or mode, I would like to see the day when symposia and conference presentations are coordinated with a definite publication schedule. Within the broadened operational base (indicated above), I do think we have the capacity to inaugurate a professional journal. My suggestion would be that we approach

20 May 1974

-5-

such a journal as a twice-yearly publication venture, each issue of which would be organized around a particular topic, each topic of which would be decided in advance by an editorial committee. I am also convinced that, even with this, we have not begun to explore possibilities open to an organized research center to act as a "publications organon."

Further along, I perceive that we'll need to make a decision as to the extent to which we want the Institute to become involved in faculty development and faculty renewal. If we were willing to do it, we could devote most of our energies to this purpose; certainly there is need for and interest in it. At some early future date, we'll also need to be aware of our disposition regarding appointing senior visiting fellows -- scholars who would be invited to spend some time here, to whom, if we are able, we would offer some incentive.

I have confidence about every piece of the Institute's program except extra-mural funding. Here we have tried hard, but have not done very well. I feel reasonably sure that I know what sorts of projects extra-mural funding agencies might find attractive, but in most instances I am not sure that we could or would want to pursue them. For the record, four formal proposals have been submitted to extra-mural funding agencies during the current academic year, and all four have received negative replies. At the same time, there are four additional proposals in process. In two of those

20 May 1974

-6-

cases, there is definite interest on the part of the extra-mural funding agency. In the other cases, the foundation's sustained interest will depend upon our response to their response to our initial statement. Larger ventures than these are being explored -- as has been the situation all along -- but their configurations have not been determined. To me, the continuing disturbing fact is that all but one of these proposals have been director-generated. This is not to chide others for not conceiving or submitting research proposals. But it makes me suspect that most persons in our field look to extra-mural funding agencies simply for fellowship or grant support, and that it is highly unusual for any of us to make application -- say, to Carnegie, Ford, or the Mellon Foundation -- for research assistance. Unlike faculty in the sciences, we're not in the habit of operating this way. Consequently when we are called upon to do it -- or when our performance is measured according to this criterion -- we have to "think up" projects that might qualify. Of course, this puts the cart before the horse, and makes research support an end to be sought rather than means or facilitation. Too often it looks like a lame excuse to request that persons in the humanities not be judged according to a research model which belongs rather uniquely to experimental sciences. Here we walk a delicate line. If our argument for reconsideration and reinterpretation is too forceful, we come close to talking ourselves out of the need for an organized research agency. On the other hand, to operate according to canons

20 May 1974

-7-

of organized research centers in the sciences can even induce us to divert our best energies. I have learned already that "extra-mural" successes can turn out to be "extra-curricular" activities. This is a major dilemma as we face the future. But we are closer to cracking it now than ever before.

These jottings can go on and on, but I have passed the point already, I fear, at which reporting becomes soliloquy. Suffice it to say that I appreciate the action on the part of the faculty last Friday. I can assure you that it will make a difference.

Walter H. Capps