

Activism in the Queer Biblical Studies Classroom

Chris Greenough

greenouc@edgehill.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This article serves as an injunction for queer biblical studies to be reclaimed and mobilised as activist practice. First, I discuss the application and activist potential of queer theory – in and beyond the academy. To address concerns around queer elitism, I argue how rupturing the binary between theory and practice recharges the accessibility and the activist potential of queer. In my discussion of queer pedagogy in the biblical studies classroom, I offer practical strategies based on queer commentaries in teaching and learning. I explore the notions of risk, experimentation and failure, as well as of tackling specific issues relating to resistance to queer biblical criticism based on religious faith. Moreover, I consider how flipped learning theory can offer a personalised and holistic approach to queer studies. In emphasising the value of queer biblical studies as activist practice, I stress inclusion, intersectionality and student-educator parity as important elements in this project. In detailing my commitment to activism, I conclude that true commitment to social justice means that researchers aspire for their work to be irrelevant to future audiences: when the work of activist academics becomes irrelevant, it means scholarship has effected change, with social justice becoming realised rather than wish-ideology.

KEYWORDS

activism; queer theory; flipped learning; methodsplaining; risk

Introduction

Somewhere in Bethel, Jacob was flicking through glossy magazines selecting patterns and fabrics for the fabulous coat he was preparing to have designed and made by the highest couturist in Israel to celebrate Joseph's coming out. Yahweh appeared and looked through the window, disrupting the herbal tea Jacob was drinking. He answered the door. Yahweh flounced in, and before Jacob had a chance to invite the mighty deity to sit down, Yahweh took a seat on one of the stones Jacob had spent the morning arranging. Immediately, there was an announcement, "Your name is Jacob, but you will no longer be called Jacob; your name will be Israel." So, Yahweh named Jacob "Israel". Israel fell silent, "Err... Yahweh?" asked Israel. "Well, just, err...Is there any flexibility on this name?" Yahweh did not respond. As the tumbleweed passed over, newly named Israel poured a cup of tea for the unexpected guest. The silence was paralysing. "Izzy for short would be fine," thought the host. Izzy attempted to speak but Yahweh interrupted: "I am God Almighty; be fruitful and increase in number. A nation and a community of nations will come from you, and kings and queens will be among your descendants. The land I gave to Abraham and Isaac I also give to you, and I

will give this land to your descendants after you.” Izzy felt confident that the queer nation was emerging. Yahweh got up from the stone seat and bid farewell. Izzy necked the herbal tea and then immediately set about calling friends and gathering stones, ready for the meeting at the Stonewall Inn that evening (Book of Gender-cis, 35:9-14).¹

The commandment from Yahweh to Jacob is a commandment to queer. It forms part of a queer covenant calling for activism and a commitment to social justice. It calls for change. In this context, my article gives an injunction for queer biblical studies to be mobilised as activist practice. First, I discuss the application and activist potential of queer theory – in and especially beyond the academy. To address concerns around queer elitism, I argue how rupturing the binary between theory and practice recharges the accessibility and the activist potential of queer. In my discussion of queer pedagogy in the biblical studies classroom, I offer examples of practical strategies based on queer commentaries and enacted in teaching and learning. I explore the notions of risk, experimentation and failure, as well as of tackling specific issues relating to resistance to queer biblical criticism based on religious faith. Moreover, I consider how flipped learning theory can offer a simultaneously personalised and holistic approach to queer studies. In emphasising the value of queer biblical studies as activist practice, I stress inclusion, intersectionality and student-educator parity as important elements in this project. In detailing my commitment to activism, I conclude that true commitment to social justice means that researchers aspire for their work to be irrelevant to future audiences: when the work of activist academics becomes irrelevant, it means scholarship has effected change, with social justice becoming realised rather than wish-ideology.

Reclaiming Queer

Queer began as protest and with political engagement, fighting for the recognition and inclusion of LGBTQ+ people. Following on from this, moving into the academy, queer theory was likewise a form of protest. It fought against the restrictions of binary thinking, against linguistic confinement and the productions of normativity. Yet, queer theory risks becoming too head-spinning and theory-turning to be accessible and meaningful at the grassroots. My intention here is to reignite the radical potency of queer, as I call for a return to its roots in activism. To advance this purpose, I resist locating queer research as intellectually convoluted and inaccessible, conducted in ivory towers rather than amidst activist communities and with queer people on the ground. This is not to say that queer research is not a rich intellectual academic pursuit in itself. It is. Nor is the agenda here to take an anti-intellectual position. Rather, I suggest that true queer projects must rupture the binaries between theory and practice, the academy and activism.

¹ Loosely based on Genesis 35:9-14.

As we approach the anniversary of the naming of “queer theory” by Teresa de Lauretis in 1990, we must remember that it was first coined as a joke! De Lauretis had heard the term “queer” reclaimed on the streets by gay activists, and, as David Halperin comments, “she had the courage, and the conviction, to pair that scurrilous term with the academic holy word ‘theory.’”² Of course, ever since the arrival of queer theory almost thirty years ago (happy birthday, by the way!), queer has helped to liberate the researcher from academic captivity. Although queer is often closely related to studies in gender and sexuality, it must be clear that queer works to dismantle other intersecting identity categories also. Its popularity as a theory is by now established in some of the academy,³ but its activist potential needs recharging. Others too note concern about the loss of the activist potency of queer. Both Deryn Guest and David Halperin protest at how far removed from social activism queer theory now is. Guest notes, “the level of political engagement here is worryingly low”⁴ and queer research “will prove to be an elitist discourse, hardly accessible to the lay person or in touch with the lived realities of the grassroots communities.”⁵

In calling for a destabilisation of power structures, queer has inadvertently built power structures of its own and its dense intellectual language has shut out allies. Halperin suggests that the normalisation of queer theory has led to its acceptance and rising success in academia, but simultaneously to a reduction in its radical nature. He warns, “if queer theory is going to have the sort of future worth cherishing, we will have to find ways of renewing its radical potential.”⁶ I suggest that one way to renew queer’s radical potential is in the classroom and through a return to its original agenda of activism. To bring this about, I turn to queering biblical texts. This endeavour is not just for the academy but for reengaging with the queer community,⁷ and beyond, to other marginalised groups. And this can begin and be trialled in the biblical studies classroom.

² David M. Halperin, “The Normalization of Queer Theory,” *Journal of Homosexuality* 45.2-4 (2003), 339.

³ See, Susannah Cornwall, “Home and hiddenness: queer theology, domestication and institutions,” *Theology & Sexuality* 23.1-2, (2017): 31-47, 32; Deryn Guest, *When Deborah Met Jael: Lesbian Biblical Hermeneutics* (London: SCM Press, 2005), 236. Chris Greenough, “Queer Eye in Theology and Biblical Studies: ‘Do You Have To Be Queer To Do This?’” *Journal of Interdisciplinary Biblical Studies* (2019): 26-41.

⁴ Guest, *When Deborah Met Jael*, 48

⁵ Guest, *When Deborah Met Jael*, 51.

⁶ Halperin, “The Normalization of Queer Theory,” 339.

⁷ Many LGBTQ+ Christians have hostile and fearful relationships with the Bible, given how often it is utilised by conservative Christian groups as a weapon against same-sex marriage, LGBTQ+ inclusivity, transgender recognition, and adoption and parenting by LGBTQ+ people. Time to be queerly activist and direct here: by saying “conservative” uses of the Bible against LGBTQ+ lives, what I actually mean is prejudiced and discriminatory uses.

Queer Activism in Scholarship and Teaching

Queer theologies and queer biblical studies offer much appeal to students: queer is simultaneously intellectually challenging, playful, creative and inclusive. Students can engage with complex theory, which is then applied to both texts and real-life settings. The theory whets intellectual appetites while its application quenches creative thirsts. There are plenty of possibilities for applying queer theory in the biblical studies classroom in a number of practical ways. I argue this is why *both* theory and practice are integral to queer studies, rather than just the former. For now, attention turns to some practical examples of this rupture between theory/methods in the biblical studies classroom.

At the outset, students should be prepared to expect the unexpected, as queer announces itself boldly and unapologetically. Queer is not one approach among others, it is the anti-approach.⁸ Students should not expect the same experience in the queer studies classroom as they would in any other learning environment. Guest notes how the queer approaches to biblical studies disrupt “the traditional and cherished norms of historical-critical exegesis with all the force of several gate-crashers at a party from which they had long been excluded.”⁹ Beyond surprise or shock, the queer classroom allows for experimentation and for failure.¹⁰ These are an integral part of the queer enterprise and intentional learning outcomes, as well as distinctive from other traditional learning processes. Such queer freedom may be initially destabilising for students, but it also holds the potential to be liberating and creative.

Explicit attention to failure, following Jack Halberstam, brings rewards:

Failure allows us to escape the punishing norms that discipline behavior and manage human development [...] And when failure certainly comes accompanied by a host of negative affects, such as disappointment, disillusionment and despair, it also provides the opportunity to use these negative affects to poke holes in the toxic positivity of contemporary life.¹¹

If queer theory is marked by “definitional indeterminacy”¹² then the queer biblical studies classroom too should allow for unexpected encounters and for experimental and creative

⁸ See Greenough, “Queer Eye,” 34-35.

⁹ Deryn Guest, “From Gender Reversal to Genderfuck: Reading Jael through a Lesbian Lens,” in *Bible Trouble: Queer Reading at the Boundaries of Biblical Scholarship*, eds., Teresa J. Hornsby and Ken Stone (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 10.

¹⁰ Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner, “What Does Queer Theory Teach Us About X?” *Publications of the Modern Languages Associations of America* 3 (1995), 349.

¹¹ Jack Halberstam, *The Queer Art of Failure*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), 3. Especially given the mental health crisis in tertiary institutions (as elsewhere) and the lack of resources anywhere near adequately to address it, the potential for this approach to take some steps towards mental health wellbeing is considerable and deserves full exploration elsewhere.

¹² Annamarie Jagose, *Queer Theory* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1996), 1.

approaches. It allows students to be guided by personal or political activist sensibilities, or by their instinct, their knowledge, their whims.

The elements of disruption and table-turning are part of the multiple opportunities the queer project affords, and they constitute strategies which can be mobilised in order to engage students and activate learning. To get to work in the classroom on a practical level, collection of essays in the *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible* (2001)¹³ offers varied and scintillating examples that can serve as inroads for students. In a queer example *par excellence*, Roland Boer moves from a queer reading of Exodus 19 to queer writing, and with his story-telling approach, destabilises assumptions about the writing of biblical commentaries. Not only does he depict the relationship between Yahweh and Moses as homoerotic, but Boer moves from the conventional format of a critical essay, to offer something strikingly new in terms of both content and form. Let me cite from Boer's encounter between Yahweh and Moses:

"Sit down, sit down, Moses, take a load off your feet", says the first.

"Thanks", puffs Moses. "Shalom".

"Shalom, indeed, my dear, although it's usually mine to give"

"Big fucking mountain you've got here, Yahweh. What's wrong with the plain, or occasional anthill?"

"Must impress other gods, dear, can't let appearances slip..."¹⁴

Boer's example screams queer. It is disruptive and flirts loosely with the content of the original text, moving away from traditional commentaries that work through rigorous verse by verse analysis. But it also draws attention to the dynamics and hierarchies between Moses and Yahweh and to the need of the biblical text to assert constantly (desperately?) the superiority of Israel's deity. We see here how queer research, playfully and incisively, liberates biblical texts from normative academic captivity. In this way, queer biblical interpretation resists straight-jacketing by traditional hermeneutics and exegesis and opens up new ways of disclosing and understanding subtexts. In turn queer biblical studies can rewrite marginalised characters into the Bible, or trace the contextual significance of the times in which the ancient texts may have been produced, and this can destabilise the politics at play in the biblical texts. These activities are all activist to the core.

Continuing with Boer's text, his queer rewriting raises important questions for students. For example: what makes queer writing queer? How can other biblical texts be queered? What is the effect of queer language and the use of parody? Students can reflect on these questions and then apply such strategies to a different biblical text of choice. In the course of

¹³ Ken Stone (ed), *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

¹⁴ Roland Boer, "Yahweh at Top: A Lost Targum," in *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible*, ed., Ken Stone (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 76.

this, both close reading (an established strategy in biblical studies) and critical thinking (the target and centrepiece of many academic course “aims and objectives” sections) are fine-tuned, while also giving students scope for queer creative exploration.

Rather than exerting didactic leadership from the front of the classroom, the educator in the queer classroom works more effectively among and with the students, as all share in the active experience of experimentation and failure in the queer commentary process. Indeed, it is Boer’s approach was the inspiration to me to pen the opening of this article, which is a contribution to queer commentary from a collaborative class exercise. More significantly, engaging together in the task offers parity between students and educator. This strategy, moreover, can facilitate effective co-learning relationships and mitigate potential resistance and anxiety, a point to which I will return.

Taking Risks

Queer writing, like Boer’s and my example, destabilises biblical studies, and with its humour, parody and playfulness subverts expectations of traditional biblical scholarship. Associations with non-normative gender and sexuality remain, because, as Ken Stone reminds us, “assumptions about the proper boundaries between, and roles of, academic and literary writing are no less susceptible to queer destabilizing than one’s assumptions about proper boundaries and roles in sexual activity.”¹⁵ If we are able to embrace the glorious messiness of our own embodied lives and imaginations, imagine the contributions we can make to queer research in biblical studies!

Returning to queer activism, Charlotte Cooper makes clear that activism “is a bottom-up, not top-down conceptualisation of knowledge production.”¹⁶ Hence, in sharing stories and reader responses to the Bible, we rewrite and reinterpret biblical texts, offering new, fresh lenses to biblical studies. In this process, we are also accessing ourselves and rupturing the binary between theory and practice, ancient text and present context. Rather than working solely with top-down intellect, we are also working with bottom-up practice. Self as resource is something available and unique to us all: a resource that is embodied, contextual, fluid, active. When Timothy Koch identifies the queer resistance to traditional hermeneutics or church authority for deciding the meanings of biblical texts, he assesses this strategy as particularly fruitful for LGBTQ+ identifying individuals. But the queer reading process is fertile and rich also for others, irrespective of gender or sexual identification, because:

we [...] come with our own questions, our own need for resources, our own limited energies; when we regard biblical texts as *resources* for us [...] We can find our own concerns, emotions, goals and fears reflected throughout these

¹⁵ Ken Stone, “Queer Commentary and Biblical Interpretation,” in *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible*, ed., Ken Stone (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 30.

¹⁶ Charlotte Cooper, *Fat Activism: A Radical Social Movement* (Bristol: HammerOn Press, 2016), 38.

pages; we can find role models, cautionary tales, ribald stories and points to ponder that can illuminate our own journeys.¹⁷

The postmodern and subjective turn in biblical studies marks how the reception of the text is not solely influenced by the text itself, but by the position of the reader. Multiplicities of positions and reader identities, thereby, make queer teaching and learning a messy postmodern task full of infinite possibilities. But, as Marla Morris notes, this is a conscious political move,¹⁸ resisting normalisation or standardisation. As such, queer activism in biblical studies is part of a wider agenda including realising political and social justice.

Another expression that encapsulates how queer enables a profusion of radical possibilities comes, again, from Koch who refers to the queer practice of “cruising the scriptures.” This captures succinctly the freedom for students, who may resist one or other approach, or reading or criticism, to feel liberated and encouraged to see what else is on offer. Koch’s hermeneutic of cruising promotes “using our own ways of knowing, our own desire for connection, our own savvy and instinct, our own response to what attracts us and compels us.”¹⁹ This differs from previous queer approaches to biblical studies, as Christopher-Rasheem McMillan notes:

Koch is here talking about the way in which he approaches scripture. He stresses that he is not in a pissing contest with other biblical scholars over the meaning of word(s) relating to homosexuality in the Bible; he is also not trying to find characters like himself in the Bible; but he is treating scripture as he would treat the finding of a sexual partner. He is looking for what attracts him, looking at the ‘object’ that draws him, just as he is drawn to it.²⁰

In this cruising methodology, there is a relationship between the text and the gaze of the reader. The reader is drawn in and the text sparks something that resonates with the reader. It is a reflective practice, too, guided by intuition and temporality. In the classroom, this approach means students can cruise the texts in a similar way, drawing on a text or passage that elucidates particular personal responses. Of course, this prioritises the location of the reader and what we learn from them in their chosen text and their response. To avoid possible embarrassment, this is an approach that students could carry out securely outside of the biblical studies classroom, as I will go on to discuss with reference to flipped learning.

¹⁷ Timothy R. Koch, “Isaiah,” in *The Queer Bible Commentary*, eds. Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bohache, (London: SCM Press, 2006), 373.

¹⁸ Marla Morris, “Unresting the Curriculum: Queer Projects, Queer Imaginings,” in *Queer Theory in Education*, ed., William F. Pinar (Oxford: Routledge, 2009), 279.

¹⁹ Timothy R. Koch, “Cruising as Methodology: Homoeroticism and the Scriptures,” *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible*, ed., Ken Stone (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 175.

²⁰ Christopher-Rasheem McMillan, “Biblical Performance Criticism: The Almost, But Not Quite, Transubstantiation of Performance Studies into Religious Studies,” *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 13:3, (2017), 18.

Koch recognises the limitations and the possible sites of vulnerability to negative critique in this method of biblical interpretation, but balances it out by its gains. Koch states, “attackers may lurk, recognizing that not all of our efforts will result in anything even remotely resembling success – yet all the while participating actively to create the possibilities of life-enhancing, thrilling contact with these texts.”²¹ Koch acknowledges risk: cruising scripture can be unsuccessful – risks can fail, just as sexual advances can be rebuffed. He is also aware that a queer aesthetic and sensibility risks, even invites, rejection from those who prefer mainstream approaches.

One group of people resistant to queer projects are aptly called methodsplainers. The word “mansplaining” has gained popularity and describes a reportedly common gendered experience: usually one where an overconfident and condescending man attempts to explain something to a woman, particularly some concept or idea of which the woman has considerably more expertise or experience. Sociologist Jane Ward relexicalises this term and talks of “methodsplaining” in similar terms: here traditional, mainstream methodologists operate as gatekeepers, deciding what is and what is not a legitimate form of research. Ward reflects on “repeated encounters with the discipline’s fetish for traditional methodologies – an obsession with reifying methodological conventions in such a way that leaves little room for innovation”²² – and I note how familiar this sounds from the context of traditional biblical interpretation with regard to its reluctance to admit queer criticism. Ward describes her experience of how methodsplaining constructs impermeable disciplinary boundaries, which in turn led to anxiety and paralysis in her own work. In queer research, something similar can be felt on multiple levels; not least, because biblical studies exists also beyond the academy, with religious organisations laying claim to particular, allegedly normative, interpretations and to biblical correctness. But the queer agenda questions and overthrows dominant, hegemonic strictures, thereby exposing how power, privilege, whiteness, maleness, cisnormativity, heteronormativity and ableism are at play in traditional and normative biblical interpretation.

Ironically perhaps, queering also brings about a better and more self-conscious understanding of dominance and of tradition. Hence, Butler exposes the illusory nature of gender, by highlighting its need for repetition. Butler calls gender performativity “a stylized repetition of acts,”²³ and points out that drag queens disclose gender trouble through the enactment of parody and subversion, thereby revealing all gender as unstable. Power structures, including heteronormative gender expectations can be first understood and then challenged through mimicry, parody, repetition and dismantlement. I argue that queer projects must be equally parodic and subversive, and in doing so, first recognise and

²¹ Koch, “Cruising as Methodology,” 175.

²² Jane Ward, “The Methods Gatekeepers and the Exiled Queers,” in *Other, Please Specify. Queer Methods in Sociology*, eds., D’Lane Compton, Tey Meadow and Kristen Schilt (California: University of California Press, 2018), 59.

²³ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble* (London, Routledge, 1990), 140.

understand academic normativity and then resist. Queer research should disrupt and subvert. As Michael Warner states, “‘queer’ gets a critical edge by defining itself against the normal [...] and normal includes normal business in the academy.”²⁴ In this way, queering is an intellectual and a practical endeavour, but in the queer biblical studies classroom learning and teaching “undo” traditional methods, offering imaginative alternatives that are unorthodox, hybrid, and creative. Students need not create or follow the usual rules,²⁵ nor must they search for stable models. In avoiding rigid attempts to define or confine queer, there is a tendency among queer theorists to say, “queer is as queer does” but really it should be “queer is as queer undoes.”²⁶

From within biblical studies, Stephen Moore, like Ward, has also exposed the obstructive compulsion with method, noting, amusingly, how “theory has fuelled the biblical scholarly susceptibility to methodaltry and methodone addiction.” He concludes, “Method is our madness”²⁷ asking, “Isn’t it time we exited the methodone clinic once and for all?”²⁸ and notes the deleterious effect of a fetish for methods:

Our obsession with method has made for a mountainous excess of dull and dreary books, essays and articles: here, first, in numbing dry detail is my method; now watch and be amazed while I apply it woodenly to this unsuspecting biblical text.²⁹

In the academy, we follow rules, expound methods, set out hypotheses based on previous studies, analyse according to established principles. In critical thinking, words like “robust,” “order,” “rigour,” “appropriateness” and “justification” are *de rigueur*, and models of analysis are formalised – and formulaic! Moore devalues the emphasis placed on iteration and repeatability of methods used in traditional biblical studies. He, too, calls for a more eclectic approach that allows for critical sensibility combined with originality, and proposes the use of autobiographical criticism as part of this. Moore notes that this swerves away from traditional methodological approaches, because “the critic’s personal history form[s] the explicit reading frame into which the text is placed and in relation to which it assumes fresh meaning.”³⁰ This in itself is not distinctively queer, but is an approach that can be found in some feminist, masculinity, postcolonial and cultural studies, among others. Yet, this approach allows for more inclusive instruction and fits well with queering³¹ – not least,

²⁴ Michael Warner, *Fear of a Queer Planet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), xxvi.

²⁵ On rules, see below.

²⁶ For further discussion on undoing methods, see Chris Greenough, *Undoing Theology: Life Stories from Non-normative Christians* (London: SCM Press, 2018): 51-65.

²⁷ Stephen Moore, *The Bible in Theory. Critical and Postcritical Essays* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 389.

²⁸ Moore, *The Bible in Theory*, 372.

²⁹ Moore, *The Bible in Theory*, 370.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ There are a wide range of texts available for this and I do not wish to provide a comprehensive list here, apart from noting a sample of the texts I use in relation to autobiographical accounts and the impact of

because life story research shifts the focus from the abstract and distant to the immediate and actual.

For the educator and the student, the queer biblical studies classroom is a space of risk and safety, experimentation and deeper understanding of convention, fulfilment and failure. The strategies noted above may elicit a range of positive and negative responses, as queer typically, can simultaneously disgust and delight. I am constantly aware of the snares and pitfalls of queering the classroom, so let me next turn to some questions: what happens when students disengage? How can I manage negativity or resistance? How can such a new and untried space best be negotiated?

Tackling Resistance in the Queer Biblical Studies Classroom

Kristen Schilt cites resistance, reduction and ridicule as strategies used by some academic gatekeepers in resisting queer projects. Schilt explains resistance as “the attempt to erect boundaries against an emerging area of inquiry,” reduction as “the attempt to dismiss scholarship ... as too ‘fringe,’” and ridicule as “an attempt to devalue scholarship...by positioning it as absurd.”³² These three strategies are also widely used by students who disengage with or who attempt to denigrate or ridicule queer readings, such as that by Boer cited above.

One of my opening strategies in the classroom is to share with students early on in a course how queer readings have been and are resisted, thereby placing the oppressors’ tools on the table. Resistance is also thereby shown not to be the preserve of queer, and this is useful for demonstrating how resistance, reduction and ridicule can serve as tactics for enforcing, defensively, what is argued to be normative. Exposing and examining this is important and can reveal the tenuousness of normativity, while also freeing up access to creative resistance. Students often go on from here to see that finding a particular reading of the Bible strange or disturbing is not unique to queer reading, but can apply to any reading of the Bible. Stone states, “it has to be admitted that one can leave particular ‘queer readings’ of the Bible, as one can leave examples of other types of reading of the Bible.”³³ This highlights that queer is not presented as an alternative normativity and frees students up to select or reject, as in Koch’s reading strategy of cruising.

the Bible on queer lives: Robert Goss and Mona West, eds., *Take Back the Word: A Queer Reading of the Bible* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2000); Nancy Wilson, *Our Tribe: Queer Folks, God, Jesus and the Bible* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1995); Adrian Thatcher, *The Savage Text: The Use and Abuse of the Bible* (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008).

³² Kristen Schilt, “The “Not Sociology” Problem,” in *Other, Please Specify. Queer Methods in Sociology*, eds., D’Lane Compton, Tey Meadow, and Kristen Schilt (California: University of California Press, 2018), 39.

³³ Stone, “Queer Commentary,” 18.

Queer theory and pedagogies are trickling into discussions of teaching and learning in higher education.³⁴ To attempt to counter the three Rs noted by Schilt, which often form an obstructive response to queer studies, I urge that queer activism in the biblical studies classroom focuses on three alternative Rs: rules, risk and relationships. In terms of rules, I am following Teresa Hornsby's lead who states:

We need some rules; we need some fixedness, even knowing that these things are imagined. The rules, the established structures, actually create the very conditions necessary for creativity and individual expression and for desire. Individuals, through creativity, can alter the rules but again only against the backdrop of other rules. Without the rules (i.e., some perception of an immovable object), there can be no creativity, no beauty, and no desire.³⁵

Hornsby is right, even when the notion of rules and regulations rubs angrily against the idea of queer as riotous, outlaw, unlimited, with no-holds-barred. Queer may escape the restriction and limitations of rules in terms of the theory and the undoing of methods used to produce research, but the climate of the biblical studies classroom must allow disruption and creativity to happen under the agenda of experimentation and failure. Social rules create a space of safety. Bringing in the second and third 'R' alongside rules: there is no approach in queer activism without risk, yet risk is mitigated through relationships. In terms of teaching and learning, the creative and messy dynamic that is queer simply cannot be neatly prepared. Social rules within the seminar room are often tacit, but they are necessary to remove the fear of vulnerability, embarrassment or oppression. The rules create a space in which relationships are positively maintained and individuals are confident and supported to take risks.

As a queer identifying scholar and educator, I realise my self-presentation and my passionately activist approach to the inclusion of LGBTQ+ individuals across the faculty in which I work leaves scope for accusations of unconscious and biased factors at play in my teaching of queer biblical studies. I am aware that students may not wish to articulate or otherwise express any prejudices they may hold, for fear of causing offence to me. Yet, I still maintain that my visibility in itself is important – and activist. To echo the famous slogan from second-wave feminist activism, “the political is personal” and this applies also to colleagues and other persons who are not queer-identifying, or, if they are, out to their students. My identity and the engagement of this identity in my teaching is one way to demonstrate the relevance of self both in biblical criticism and in political activism. Incorporating and producing autobiographical writings (queer and non-queer) is one effective way of examining and demonstrating the impact of the Bible on queer and other identities. Queer biblical

³⁴ See, for example, sj. Miller and Nelson M. Rodriguez, eds. *Educators Queering Academia: Critical Memoirs* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2016); William F. Pinar, ed., *Queer Theory in Education* (Oxford: Routledge, 1998).

³⁵ Teresa J. Hornsby, “The Dance of Gender: David, Jesus and Paul,” in *Transgender, Intersex, and Biblical Interpretation*, eds., Teresa J. Hornsby and Deryn Guest (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 87-88.

studies may seem uncomfortable to some, but the overarching aim is to affirm inclusion and challenge injustices.

One further challenge to consider is that some students have faith positions that are condemning and judgmental of certain marginalised groups. Indeed, there would be an uncomfortable irony if, in seeking to work at the margins, we actually marginalise students of faith. Philip Davies notes how the Bible may belong to the faithful who worship in a Church or synagogue, but it belongs to the world too. He suggests that academic readings are a different task to readings by the faithful, observing how academic research can and should distance itself from religious readings of the Bible.³⁶ If, however, we are to work at the intersections as an act of activism in queer biblical studies, one of the intersections we must consider carefully is faith. Elizabeth Spelman makes clear that gender, sexuality and race are not pop-beads fastened together on a necklace of identity, where one can be popped off, separated and analysed without consideration of the whole.³⁷ The same pop-bead principle applies to students in our classes who may read the texts from their faith positions, and might therefore find a queer reading of biblical texts challenging. The principle also acknowledges, however, that faith readings do not exist in isolation from other identity markers.

Robert Davidson describes any attempt to differentiate between spiritual and academic readings of the Bible for students of faith as “an impossible act of intellectual and spiritual schizophrenia.”³⁸ Moreover, if our work is truly intersectional, why on earth would we ask students to elide their faith positions? A commitment to intersectionality ensures recognition of all categories of identification as part of contextual theologies and biblical studies, and that includes spiritual or religious identifications. But faith commitment is not privileged over or disconnected from other identities. The focus on rules and relationships means that there is no condemnation for any identity in the queer biblical studies classroom, given that queer exposes how all identities are constructs in any case. It may be the case that time and space are needed to work through these challenges and biases privately between classroom contact, and one way to offer such resources is through the idea of flipping the classroom.

³⁶ Philip R. Davies, *Whose Bible is it Anyway?* (Second Edition. London: Bloomsbury, 2004).

³⁷ Elizabeth V. Spelman, *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988).

³⁸ Robert Davidson, “The Bible in Church and Academy,” in *Sense and Sensitivity: Essays on Reading the Bible in Memory of Robert Carroll*, eds., Alastair G. Hunter and Philip R. Davies (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 166.

Flipping the Biblical Studies Classroom

In addition to the strategies offered that can operate *in* the biblical studies classroom noted above, one further pedagogical approach is flipped learning theory.³⁹ This model is conducive to the queer enterprise, as it reflects a subversion or disruption to the traditional idea of classroom-based learning and offers an overturn of the traditional biblical studies classroom. The learning is inverted and rather than doing their learning *in* the classroom, students explore, prepare or produce the learning material before the class, and this is then deepened through discussion and dissemination. Flipping the classroom gives rise to effective learning by allowing scope for independence, personalisation, intellectualism and potential for activism. In this way educational experience can become transformative.

In queering biblical studies, the benefit of a flipped learning approach means that students work through their reflections and any personal challenges privately before the session. In directly considering students of faith, flipping the classroom affords them time, space and individual support to work out their personal convictions and beliefs, and to interrogate them alongside academic explorations. This allows students to interrogate their own beliefs on a personal level: to speak with their family, friends and personal contacts and to engage with academic literature. The flipped classroom allows students to consider both academic and confessional approaches. During this period, students who are experiencing disconnect between their own internalised attitudes and queer scholarship may need to access tutorial support for further signposts to bespoke texts or resources. Most importantly, the development of empathy should be prioritised. Guest shows optimism in noting that a combination of both academic and confessional approaches may allow balance for students of faith to “come to a more profound and enlarged version of their deity.”⁴⁰ The flipped classroom may allow for personal yet private transformation in students of faith and a reconciliation of two false binary positions, where one position can inform the other. Of course, flipped learning does not create a biblical studies utopia and some students may be unable to work through the challenges of queer readings in relation to queer identities, in which case the rules and safe space of the seminar room must be in place as discussed above. Most importantly, queer functions in two ways: a concern with LGBTQ+ identities, and its disruption of all hegemonic structures of power. For students who face internalised conflict, such as students with religious beliefs that conflict with LGBTQ+ identities, or anti-feminist women, or trans-exclusionary radical feminists, or students of faith from a former colony who cannot accept how the Bible was implicit in colonisation, they can pick ‘n’ mix and may choose not to work on areas they find personally problematic. Instead, they may dismantle other forms of oppression, such as power structures inherent in other biblical themes or texts – because queer is committed to a variety of intersectional approaches and concerns.

³⁹ Jonathan Bergmann and Aaron Sams, *Flip Your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day*, (Washington: International Society for Technology in Education, 2012).

⁴⁰ Deryn Guest, *YHWH and Israel in the Book of Judges. An Object-Relations Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 174.

Following examples used in the classroom such as those offered in this article so far, students may select a lens to explore, relating for example, to identity or power related issues, social injustice, inequalities, popular cultural or social themes, as well as selecting their own particular biblical texts that speak to that theme outside of the classroom. Students may select multiple texts and offset biblical texts against one another. The texts can then be interrogated, played with, disrupted, reconstructed in light of the issue using a variety of methods and media. In flipping the queer biblical studies classroom, explorations are entirely distinctive from models of critical thinking or collaborative learning, as queer learning is underpinned by notions of experimentation and failure. The queer project thereby disrupts normative models of learning and inquiry, just as queer activism in biblical studies disrupts disciplinary expectations and traditional academic approaches. Queer approaches to flipped learning therefore subvert the assumed academic activities of assignments and essay expectations. Students will be able to apply their critical insights and methods to a variety of creatively devised assessment tasks. Allowing students to exercise authority and decision making in selecting an appropriate assignment task with their tutor demonstrates a holistic and personalised approach. The application of the selected theme and biblical texts can result in the production of knowledge using a variety of contemporary media that may include art, poetry, music, film, performance, photography, playscripts, visual arts and digital methods. Students can experiment and enjoy explorations off the beaten tracks. In returning to the classroom, such a variety of media in disseminating their learning has activist potential in terms of impact to their fellow students, plus it has potential to reach wider audiences and to engage beyond the academy.

The queer biblical classroom is a space of difference, and learning in this space is activism. Queer research moves beyond gender and sexuality to interrogate identity-based thinking. Working at the intersections, including race, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, religion and class, we are able to highlight the marginalisation and unjust structures at play in the Bible, in religion, but also in wider culture and society. Cooper states how “queer is a sensibility that can influence action,”⁴¹ and this sensibility allows people to exercise agency. Activist scholars ensure that critical reading of texts poses important questions: “Who is omitted?” “Who is excluded?” “How does this relate to them/us?” “How can we include them/ourselves?” Queer research therefore allows for intersectional interrogation. There is a fruitful partnership when we pair intersectional and queer studies: we are able to identify the marginalised and call out the oppressor in solidarity. Approaching the texts using our queer aesthetic or sensibility is radical.

One final benefit of flipped learning is that it serves to regulate the behaviour of the educator. How do we invite students to articulate their own understanding of the intersections without imposing our own constructed definitions? By resisting normative teaching and learning in the queer classroom, we need to be aware of our power as educators and our own tendency to impose and impress our knowledge. True inclusion comes from a

⁴¹ Cooper, *Fat Activism*, 192.

journey of self-reflection, critical examination and empathy. Authority can be relinquished by approaching biblical studies reflectively and experientially, and the relationship between the educator and the student changes: they become a co-learner and source of support.

Conclusion

In moving from queer theory to its application, we reignite a form of activism which was part of the protest out of which queer originally emerged. Lisa Isherwood and Marcella Althaus-Reid tell us how “Queer theology is, then, a sexual theology with a difference, a passion for the marginalized. That passion is compassion but also a commitment to social justice.”⁴² But this passionate commitment to social justice is rendered impotent unless the theory/practice binary of queer is also ruptured.⁴³ The examples above offer ways in which students and educators can apply queer theory and queer biblical criticism in transformative ways.

In renewing the activism in queer learning, we need not compromise academic rigour. As a theory insistent on disrupting established and traditional expectations, the anti-normative agenda of queer must extend to the academy. In this way, the use of imaginary and creative methods offers original knowledge. Queer activism in the biblical studies classroom interrogates power structures of the Bible and thereby serves the community that queer was originally purported to represent, as well as demonstrating its commitment to intersectionality. It is a process of deconstruction, disruption, dialogue and creative imaginations. Queer activism also troubles assumed and hegemonic practices within the academy whereby normative expectations of learning, teaching and assessment are undone.

The idea of rupturing the binary in queer studies between theory and practice is an important shift for scholars teaching and working in queer biblical studies and theologies. Importantly, resisting methodolatry and flipping learning are connected and resonate with one another, as they are both queer practices. Working critically to undo methods serves to liberate queer scholars from the trappings and regulations of academic hegemony, while the flipped classroom subverts traditional approaches to teaching. In my book *Undoing Theology*, I state how undoing methods are characterised by “by contingency, temporality, fluidity as key indicators.”⁴⁴ I say this in acknowledgment that real learning, like activism, is in the moment and appeals to the present. Theories and perspectives fall in and out of vogue. To

⁴² Lisa Isherwood and Marcella Althaus-Reid, “Queering Theology,” in *The Sexual Theologian*, eds., Marcella Althaus-Reid and Lisa Isherwood (London: Continuum, 2004), 6.

⁴³ The few examples of queer academic and activist scholarship in theology and religious studies with which I am familiar includes the work in African contexts from Adriaan van Klinken and Lilly Phiri, “‘In the Image of God’: Reconstructing and Developing Grassroots African Queer Theology from Urban Zambia,” *Theology & Sexuality* 21:1, (2015): 36-52; Adriaan van Klinken, “Autobiographical Storytelling and African Narrative Queer Theology,” *Exchange* 47, (2018): 211-229. Also, Robin Henderson-Espinoza, *Activist Theology*. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2019).

⁴⁴ Greenough, *Undoing Theology*, 173.

return to Ward and her idea of methodsplaining, I underscore her manifesto to queer biblical studies:

Bring on your interdisciplinary/promiscuous methods, multiple/polyamorous methods, ambiguous/gender-queer methods, unpredictable/moving methods, and your nonreproducible methods. The discipline needs you."⁴⁵

Digression from mainstream methods used in biblical studies, queer approaches colour outside the lines. The Bible is queer and queered. The curriculum is radically subverted, with learning and teaching flipped, to allow reflective and experiential approaches. The teacher moves from a position of knowledge to a co-creator and companion to the student, and this is especially significant as students will develop the next generation of critical interventions in the field. Queer communities fuel creativity and activism, but are also aware of the need to prepare themselves to be resilient, to have courage, to be committed to social justice. These skills are essential as the queer project necessitates personal and professional risk. The queer covenant that opened this article calls for a true commitment to activism in the biblical studies classroom. This covenant calls for self-belief, courage, risk, and points to the idea that a commitment to social justice should be irrelevant to future audiences. Schilt says, "if we are truly committed to effecting social change with our research, we should strive for future irrelevance!"⁴⁶

Just as "queer" is indefinable, queer pedagogy as activism too has to be careful not to promote new authorised or accepted strategies. I concur with Cooper, who warns "activists should beware of creating a fundamentalist movement, a return to an imagined purer past, new orthodoxies, or a replacement monoculture."⁴⁷ Queer and activism do not shy away from awkward encounters, but, with the awareness of strategies discussed in this article, and with our own tools in hand, we break down boundaries and see the constructive benefits of doing so.

Isherwood and Althaus-Reid remind us how "queering theology requires courage."⁴⁸ This is, of course, nothing new. Living on a day-to-day basis has always required courage from queer people; presenting visibly as non-normative requires courage too. Queer theologies and biblical studies require courage because they challenge long held beliefs and assumptions. The elements of vulnerability, messiness and courage are part of activist campaigns. Indeed, Compton, Meadow and Schilt highlight the "messiness and anxiety that often lies behind our attempts to produce politically informed empirical work."⁴⁹ Queer

⁴⁵ Ward, "The Methods Gatekeepers," 65.

⁴⁶ Schilt, "The "Not Sociology" Problem," 49.

⁴⁷ Cooper, *Fat Activism*, 200.

⁴⁸ Isherwood and Althaus-Reid, "Queering Theology," 3.

⁴⁹ D'Lane Compton, Tey Meadow and Kristen Schilt, "Introduction: Queer Work in a Straight Discipline," in *Other, Please Specify. Queer Methods in Sociology*, eds., D'Lane Compton, Tey Meadow and Kristen Schilt (California: University of California Press, 2018), 27

researchers make sense of their vulnerability and are empowered by their communities. Althaus-Reid points to the self-examination and vulnerability of queer theologians. She says:

Queering confronts the theologian's own voice and responsibility too... the theologian stands up in community, in solidarity and in uniqueness. Queer we may stand with a sense of pride and resistance which comes from the sharing of our own stories and sufferings, and the silence of a theology which has assumed too many things about sexuality and God.⁵⁰

Althaus-Reid is right to emphasise the stand we take as queer scholars, without romanticising the fears we may experience in taking such an activist position. Our anxieties may be fuel for activism. We resist and are resisted, but the queer project is activist. It is from a place of radical vulnerability, love and commitment that transformation takes place. The queer Bible says so:

A Letter from RuPaul to the Queer Nations⁵¹

My dear brothers and sisters. And those among you who surpass binary notions of gender, knowing that it is a social construct and family relations are not just blood, but the family you choose...

Stand firm and stay strong in your queer activism. You are free. To love another and to love yourself. If you can't love yourself, how the hell are you gonna love someone else? Can I get an "amen" up in here? Now, let the music play.⁵²

Bibliography

- Althaus-Reid, Marcella. "Queer I Stand: Lifting the Skirts of God." Pages 99-109 in *The Sexual Theologian*. Edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Lisa Isherwood. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Bergmann, Jonathan and Aaron Sams. *Flip Your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day*. Washington: International Society for Technology in Education, 2012.
- Berlant, Lauren and Michael Warner. "What Does Queer Theory Teach Us About X?," *Publications of the Modern Languages Associations of America* 3 (1995): 343-349.

⁵⁰ Marcella Althaus-Reid, "Queer I Stand: Lifting the Skirts of God," in *The Sexual Theologian*, eds., Marcella Althaus-Reid and Lisa Isherwood (London: Continuum, 2004), 104.

⁵¹ Based on Gal 5:1 'For freedom Christ has set us free. Stand firm, therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery'; Gal 5:13-14 'For you were called to freedom, brothers and sisters; only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for self-indulgence, but through love become slaves to one another. For the whole law is summed up in a single commandment, "You shall love your neighbour as yourself"; and Gal 6: 9 'So let us not grow weary in doing what is right, for we will reap at harvest time, if we do not give up' [NRSV].

⁵² RuPaul ends each episode with these last two lines. *RuPaul's Drag Race* (2009-), Logo TV.

- Boer, Roland. "Yahweh at Top: A Lost Targum." Pages 75-105 in *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Ken Stone. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. London, Routledge, 1990.
- Compton, D'Lane, Tey Meadow and Kristen Schilt. "Introduction: Queer Work in a Straight Discipline." Pages 1-36 in *Other, Please Specify. Queer Methods in Sociology*. Edited by D'Lane Compton, Tey Meadow and Kristen Schilt. California: University of California Press, 2018.
- Cooper, Charlotte. *Fat Activism: A Radical Social Movement*. Bristol: HammerOn Press, 2016.
- Cornwall, Susannah, "Home and hiddenness: queer theology, domestication and institutions," *Theology & Sexuality* 23.1-2, (2017): 31-47.
- Davidson, Robert. "The Bible in Church and Academy." Pages 161-175 in *Sense and Sensitivity: Essays on Reading the Bible in Memory of Robert Carroll*. Edited by Alastair G. Hunter and Philip R. Davies. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Davies, Philip R. *Whose Bible is it Anyway?* Second Edition. London: Bloomsbury, 2004.
- Greenough, Chris. "'Queer Eye in Theology and Biblical Studies: 'Do You Have To Be Queer To Do This?'" *Journal of Interdisciplinary Biblical Studies* (2019): 26-41.
- Greenough, Chris. *Undoing Theology: Life Stories from Non-normative Christians*. London: SCM Press, 2018.
- Goss, Robert and Mona West, eds., *Take Back the Word: A Queer Reading of the Bible*. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2000.
- Guest, Deryn *When Deborah Met Jael: Lesbian Biblical Hermeneutics*. London: SCM Press, 2005.
- Guest, Deryn. "From Gender Reversal to Genderfuck: Reading Jael through a Lesbian Lens." Pages 9-44 in *Bible Trouble: Queer Reading at the Boundaries of Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Teresa J. Hornsby and Ken Stone. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Guest, Deryn. *YHWH and Israel in the Book of Judges. An Object-Relations Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Halberstam, Jack. *The Queer Art of Failure*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2011.
- Halperin, David M. "The Normalization of Queer Theory." *Journal of Homosexuality* 45.2-4 (2003): 339-343.
- Henderson-Espinoza, Robin. *Activist Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2019.
- Hornsby, Teresa J. "The Dance of Gender: David, Jesus and Paul." Pages 81-94 in *Transgender, Intersex, and Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Teresa J. Hornsby and Deryn Guest. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

- Isherwood, Lisa and Marcella Althaus-Reid. "Queering Theology" Pages 1-15 in *The Sexual Theologian*. Edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid and Lisa Isherwood. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Jagose, Annamarie. *Queer Theory*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1996.
- Koch, Timothy R. "Isaiah." Pages 371-385 in *The Queer Bible Commentary*. Edited by Deryn Guest, Robert E. Goss, Mona West, and Thomas Bohache. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- Koch, Timothy R. "Cruising as Methodology: Homoeroticism and the Scriptures." Pages 169-181 in *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Ken Stone. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- McMillan, Christopher-Rasheem. "Biblical Performance Criticism: The Almost, But Not Quite, Transubstantiation of Performance Studies into Religious Studies." *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies* 13:3, (2017): 1-23.
- Miller, sj. and Nelson M. Rodriguez, eds. *Educators Queering Academia: Critical Memoirs*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2016.
- Moore, Stephen. *The Bible in Theory. Critical and Postcritical Essays*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Morris, Marla. "Unresting the Curriculum: Queer Projects, Queer Imaginings." Pages 227-236 in *Queer Theory in Education*. Edited by William F. Pinar. Oxford: Routledge, 2009.
- Pinar, William F., ed. *Queer Theory in Education*. Oxford: Routledge, 1998.
- Schilt, Kristen. "The "Not Sociology" Problem." Pages 37-50 in *Other, Please Specify. Queer Methods in Sociology*. Edited by D'Lane Compton, Tey Meadow, and Kristen Schilt. California: University of California Press, 2018.
- Spelman, Elizabeth V. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988.
- Stone, Ken, ed. *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Stone, Ken. "Queer Commentary and Biblical Interpretation." Pages 11-25 in *Queer Commentary and the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Ken Stone. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Thatcher, Adrian. *The Savage Text: The Use and Abuse of the Bible*. London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
- van Klinken, Adriaan and Lilly Phiri. "'In the Image of God': Reconstructing and Developing Grassroots African Queer Theology from Urban Zambia," *Theology & Sexuality* 21:1, (2015): 36-52.
- van Klinken, Adriaan. "Autobiographical Storytelling and African Narrative Queer Theology," *Exchange* 47, (2018): 211-229.

Ward, Jane. "The Methods Gatekeepers and the Exiled Queers." Pages 51-66 in *Other, Please Specify. Queer Methods in Sociology*. Edited by D'Lane Compton, Tey Meadow and Kristen Schilt. California: University of California Press, 2018.

Warner, Michael. *Fear of a Queer Planet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Wilson, Nancy. *Our Tribe: Queer Folks, God, Jesus and the Bible*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1995.