

Report to the Louisiana Board of Regents  
Review of Proposals Submitted for Funding Consideration  
In the Board of Regents Support Fund R & D Program  
Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Subprogram

FY 2017-18

**Subject-Area Review: HUMANITIES**

February 26, 2018

Prepared by:

Dr. Nicholas Bromell  
Professor  
Department of English  
University of Massachusetts – Amherst

Dr. Bruce Chilton  
Bernard Iddings Bell Professor of Philosophy and Religion  
Department of Religion  
Bard College

Dr. Kathryn Grossman  
Professor Emerita  
Department of French and Francophone Studies  
Penn State University

Dr. James Sheehan  
Dickason Professor in the Humanities  
Department of History  
Stanford University

## **BoRSF Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Subprogram, FY 2017-18**

### **Subject-Area Panel Report – Humanities**

#### **Phase I – In-Depth Evaluation of Proposals by Subject-Area Panel**

Thirty-one (31) proposals were reviewed by this panel for the following: academic and/or artistic merit, appropriateness of the project in the context of the Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars subprogram, and the potential of the project to have significant impact within its field of specialty and among broader audiences. Each proposal was assigned a primary discussant from the panel, who took the lead in writing the in-depth review. However, each panel member reviewed each proposal for the benefit of the proposal's author. A consensus was reached through discussion and rankings established during a telephone conference. After the panel reached a consensus, proposals were placed in three categories: Fund Priority I; Revise and Resubmit; and Do Not Fund as Submitted. Evaluation forms were completed for all projects, to enable the applicants to benefit from the insights and suggestions of the panel members. The overall quality of this year's proposals ranged from good to superb. Brief analyses of all proposals follow in Appendix I; Appendix II provides a list of all proposals submitted. Included in each evaluation, if necessary, are recommendations for reductions and/or emendations to budgetary requests.

#### **Priority I – Fund as Submitted (9)**

The nine (9) proposals- included in Fund, Priority I are those that the Subject-Area panel determined to be the strongest proposals in the Humanities disciplines and most likely to achieve the goals of the ATLAS Program.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Recommended</b>
1	043ATL-18	Emily Clark	\$50,000	\$50,000
2	039ATL-18	Katherine Adams	\$50,000	\$50,000
3	060ATL-18	Jana Giles	\$49,301	\$38,057
4	016ATL-18	Wilfred Major	\$22,932	\$22,932
5	065ATL-18	Chris Surprenant	\$47,523	\$47,523
6	037ATL-18	Joel Fredell	\$49,643	\$49,643
7	044ATL-18	Christopher Dunn	\$50,000	\$50,000
8	027ATL-18	William Saas	\$44,823	\$44,823
9	032ATL-18	Sunny Yang	\$47,176	\$44,929
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$411,398</b>	<b>\$397,907</b>

The panel recommends funding, at a minimum, the top four (4) proposals, for a total of \$160,989. Additional proposals should be funded in rank order if monies become available.

#### **Priority II - Revise and Resubmit (15)**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
10	047ATL-18	Allison Emmerson	\$40,802
11	052ATL-18	Oliver Sensen	\$48,622
12	045ATL-18	Maura Kathryn Edwards	\$40,800
13	005ATL-18	Jacob Berman	\$50,000

14	014ATL-18	Alecia Long	\$28,290
15	015ATL-18	Ashley Noel Mack	\$45,935
16	034ATL-18	Gang Zhou	\$50,000
17	024ATL-18	Pallavi Rastogi	\$50,000
18	048ATL-18	Thomas Johnson	\$50,000
19	054ATL-18	Chad Van Schoelandt	\$45,922
20	042ATL-18	John Charles	\$47,374
21	064ATL-18	Frank Schalow	\$41,729
22	021ATL-18	Andrea Morris	\$45,557
22	026ATL-18	Malcolm Richardson	\$49,975
24	040ATL-18	Daniel Burnston	\$47,647

The panel recommends that the applicants submitting the fifteen (15) proposals in this category, which hold significant promise, should consider revising and resubmitting in a future ATLAS competition, if appropriate, once reviewer questions and concerns have been addressed.

#### **Do Not Fund As Submitted (7)**

<b>Proposal #</b>	<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
006ATL-18	Michael Bibler	\$50,000
013ATL-18	Isiah Lavender III	\$26,433
025ATL-18	Maria Rethelyi	\$50,000
033ATL-18	Michelle Zerba	\$39,443
055ATL-18	Michele White	\$50,000
059ATL-18	Lena Suk	\$20,912
061ATL-18	Richard Goodman	\$35,485

The seven (7) proposals listed in this category should not be considered for funding in this round of competition. While these proposals contain worthwhile and interesting ideas, they lack some aspects of program development, scholarly rigor, academic and/or artistic scope, and/or other characteristics necessary to be competitive in the ATLAS Program.

#### **Ineligible for Program**

No proposals were deemed ineligible by the Subject-Area review panel.

## **APPENDIX I**

### **SUBJECT-AREA REVIEW COMMENTS**

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	005ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Citizen, Soldier, Jihadi: The War on Terror's Fictions
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Jacob Berman
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Berman's project examines American fiction's engagement with Islam in a transnational context, using his knowledge of Arabic to examine both sides of the American-Arab interaction. Given the way Islam and the Middle East currently dominate international thinking, this book could have a broad audience.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The potential of Dr. Berman's project is significant: few scholars of American literature can deal with Arabic sources. Americans remain woefully ill informed about the Arab world and about Islam in particular, a religion every bit as complex, diverse, and wide-spread as Christianity, yet often seen only in the light of its most extreme manifestations.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

In this resubmitted version, the applicant has strengthened his sense of the historical context and provided greater depth to his analysis. This is a difficult, challenging project, with great potential. While the panel was sympathetic to the project and mindful of the improvements in this revised submission, the connection between the two halves of his dialogue remains somewhat elusive. Moreover, the panel was not persuaded by his notion of "the literary production of national identity," which needs additional development. The project is also in need of a convincing conclusion, that can demonstrate the real scope and impact of the work.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Berman's first book, *American Arabesque*, was a more straightforward analysis of how Arab culture has been depicted in American writing. The current project builds on, but extends this, trying for a more complex, dynamic sense of transcultural interaction.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The review panel was somewhat unclear about Dr. Berman's progress and the project's status, due in part to a projected completion date of March 2018, which is assumed to be a misprint, and the absence of a detailed timeline. It was not well described how much progress was made since the last submission; the account of the project's state – two chapters finished – is the same as in the previous proposal.

**Recommendation for Funding:** While the panel does not recommend funding at this time, Dr. Berman should consider reapplying in the next round, with a clearer timeline of completion.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	006ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Silly Pleasures: Queer, Camp, Nonce, and the Art of Being Literal
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Michael Bibler
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Bibler argues that silliness (defined as a refusal to be serious) should be taken seriously — as an aesthetic category. Silliness reframes identities in ways that are open, vibrant, and flexible: it enables a “new normal.”

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project to its field of study or art practice and its interest for broader academic and/or lay audiences

Given the number of university presses that feature sexuality studies (Cornell, Duke, Columbia, Oxford, NYU, Ohio State), the competition for exemplary monographs will be vigorous. Such works are inherently interdisciplinary and can address multiple forms of human expression in the arts (literature, music, dance, film, dress). The range and scope of exemplars for discussion and analysis are staggering, and so a particular challenge for scholars is to select works that support general arguments extensible beyond the close reading of individual instances.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s argument for the conceptualization, definition, and organization of the project

Dr. Bibler’s argument challenges the orthodoxy of queer theory, which assumes a binary, oppositional paradigm. He builds on the work of other current critics but takes the argument in a new direction: silliness as an aesthetic practice. Dr. Bibler has clearly framed his argument and has selected a handful of works to test his theoretical framework (a song by the B-52’s, videos by RuPaul and others, and the soundsuits of Nick Cave). The result at times seems a bit of a hodge-podge, however, with different objects of study united under a loose aegis. The risk is ending up with a series of essays rather than a sustained analysis. That said, the sample offers a very interesting, original argument that bodes well for the rest.

The challenge for the monograph will be to make the Big Argument and not be a captive of the interesting examples selected for analysis. With roots in both cultural studies and gender studies and aspirations to become a major work of critical theory, Dr. Bibler will need to articulate forcefully what is most original, distinctive, or compelling about his conclusions and methodology. While his framework may suit these four works, how would it apply to a dozen more works? The problem of selection bias arises because so few works are discussed. How strong is the case that he is making? He takes silliness seriously, and he will want his readers to think differently about it as a broad concept as well, and not just the individual works he examines. Because the conclusion could be read as a fifth chapter — a new conclusion might be able to address these issues. It would also be desirable to see somewhere in the study an account of the differences, not just the connections, between “silliness” and “camp.”

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Bibler has been consistently productive. With a well-received monograph (2009, University of Virginia Press), nine book chapters, and nine articles in print or forthcoming, he has established a solid reputation in the fields of Southern literature and gender studies. His new monograph both builds on and extends his previous work, and it is likely that it will be excellent.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

The work schedule is realistic since a large percentage of the monograph has already been drafted. The question of need is important, since the book appears to be almost finished, so that a full year of ATLAS support will not likely make a difference. Some rethinking may be needed, however, to shape the work into a coherent book-length study, rather than a series of essays.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel does not recommend funding.



## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	013ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Afrofuturism Classics
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Isiah Lavender III
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$26,433

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This promises to be an important contribution to the fields of Science Fiction Studies and African American Literature, one that offers a fresh and compelling argument about the nature and reach of Afrofuturism. Dr. Lavender argues that many classic (canonical) works of African American literature can profitably be read as works that engage the central themes of Afrofuturism.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

There can be no doubt about the significance of this project, which aims to reconfigure the way scholars in two fields conceive of the boundaries and the content of those fields. Moreover, because Dr. Lavender writes so clearly and engages with material of broad interest to a wider public (i.e., science fiction), this work is likely to have both direct and indirect impacts on lay audiences.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

As noted in our review of the proposal the applicant submitted last year, though the project is substantial and likely to be influential, there seems to be a fundamental weakness in the its conception – namely, that Dr. Lavender does not think it necessary to engage substantively with a range of criticism of the authors whom he discusses. Nor does he directly address this issue – either to correct the panel's assessment or to incorporate it – in this year's proposal.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

The applicant has a very impressive record of research and publication, which includes three published books (one of them a monograph), and two works forthcoming (one of them a monograph); as well, Dr. Lavender has published eight refereed articles, several book chapters, and numerous reviews.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Dr. Lavender has already completed this project and sent it to his publisher in December 2017. For this reason, despite its strength, it does not appear to need ATLAS support.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel does not recommend funding.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	014ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Crimes Against Nature: Sex, Violence, and the Search for Conspirators in the Assassination of JFK
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Alecia Long
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$28,290

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

There is, of course, a library of books on the Kennedy assassination. Dr. Long examines the aftermath from a local angle, the arrest and trial of Clay Shaw, which she links to popular attitudes towards gay men in the 1960s. Although her book is rooted in original research, it seeks to reach beyond a narrow scholarly audience. Indeed, one of the primary purposes of her grant would be to turn the scholarly work into a more accessible trade book.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

There is a great deal of important new work being done on LGBT history. Dr. Long draws on and will contribute to this new field, giving her work an admirable local connection as well as a broader national focus.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The panel found this to be an original, interesting, well-defined, and potentially very successful idea for a book. While Dr. Long does base her work on original research, its strength seems less from bringing to light new sources than from looking at what we know in a new way.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

The project extends but also builds on her 2004 book on sex and race in New Orleans. She has also managed a large research project on women in Louisiana and has produced a textbook on Louisiana history.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Although Dr. Long has requested funds for research travel, the work on this book appears to be nearly finished. One of the panel's serious reservations about the project was that the applicant's need for support was less compelling than several other proposals, and that the ATLAS grant would largely provide "buzz" for the work as a publisher is secured and the final manuscript polish is completed.

**Recommendation for Funding:** While the work is of high quality and the potential impact is strong, the panel was not convinced that ATLAS funding is needed to complete the project. If the scope or amount of scholarly work remaining changes, the project could be revised and resubmitted.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	015ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	American Moms: Twenty-First Century Hegemonic Motherhood in the United States
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Ashley Noel Mack
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$45,935

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Mack is completing an analytic account of the nature and messaging of a dominant discourse on mothering in the U.S. in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The project focuses on the way this discourse is “mediated,” or channeled through specific media, which in turn shape it.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

This project promises to be of considerable significance to the field of Women’s and Gender Studies and, because of its topic, could attract the interest of a broader audience.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Dr. Mack’s proposal is very well designed. It has all the strengths of the previous submission; in sum (1) it is informed by broad historical knowledge of the topic; (2) its arguments are clear and persuasive; and (3) its methodology – a focus on media and rhetoric – is very effective. Last year the panel urged her to resubmit a proposal that did more justice to the nuance and detail of her argument, and to take pains to avoid giving the impression that her argument saw a single, unitary force (neoliberalism) behind every word and shift in this complex discourse of motherhood. Dr. Mack has very plainly taken these suggestions to heart, and while a critique of the socio-economic material and cultural force of neoliberalism still animates her project, the project itself now seems much less over-determined by an *a priori* theory.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Dr. Mack is at an early stage of her career, and this is her first monograph. She has published nine articles (a number of them co-authored). The proposal itself is strongly conceived and executed, and the applicant is able to give a concise and compelling account of her project.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

It seems likely that the PI could complete the project in timely fashion with ATLAS support. Indeed, the project appears to be so close to completion that a full year of ATLAS funding seems unnecessary.

**Recommendation for Funding:** No funding is recommended because the project is so close to completion. The proposal could be revised and resubmitted if its focus or scope changes as the applicant works through the final stages.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	016ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Love in the Age of War: The Soldier in Menander
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Wilfred Major
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$22,932

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

The project focuses attention on Menander as a political playwright, by using the view attributed to soldiers as an index of ideology. By means of that approach, a principal poet of the Classical world is located within his social and political environment. As presently conceived, the work's audience would consist of Classicists, but its potential is to reach a wider readership.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Dr. Major wishes to update his ideas about how Menander's comedies fit into their socio-political context. Specifically, the argument is that his plays are most consistent with supporting Macedonian imperial control over Greece. That involves a fresh look at the ways Menander's scripts would have worked in performance in the distinctive theatrical conditions of his lifetime. The importance to anyone interested in Menander is the insight that the playwright addresses the cultural anxiety about mercenaries in his time in ways that make his plays relevant and valuable for the dialogue today about the challenges that combat soldiers face when working to adjust to civilian life.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The applicant has developed a crisp outline of the work, to include both updated versions of his previous research and fresh scholarship. Chapters will orient the reader in the importance of socio-historical context in understanding Menander, and then explain the importance of the characters and roles of soldiers in the plays. The latter focus demands attention to characters used as foils, with which Dr. Major proposes a contrast. The soldier, the work argues, exemplifies a dramatic paradigm in its own right that demands attention. Finally, reception history helps explain why the central role of soldiers in Menander has been overlooked in the past.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Major has an excellent record of scholarship while maintaining an impressive level of collegial and pedagogical engagement within his institution.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The project is admirably planned and the work well in hand. Prompt completion of the work seems assured, if ATLAS support is secured.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel recommends full funding for this excellent project.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	021ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Im/mobility and Belonging in Contemporary Dominican and Cuban Cultures
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Andrea Morris
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$45,557

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This is an extraordinarily challenging project, which ranges across the Hispanic Caribbean, using methods and evidence from literary, cinematic, and ethnographical sources. It seeks to understand the meaning and significance of transnational mobility in the Dominican Republic and Cuba in the last thirty years.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

This project could be of interest to scholars from a number of disciplines, especially anthropology.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Dr. Morris does justice of the range and richness of her subject, but her proposal could do a better job showing how it will hang together. That it is worth doing, is clear. She must work a little harder to demonstrate the level of quality at which she can do it. First, the methodology should be clarified, especially the interplay of literary and ethnographic materials; second, the presentation of the research in the writing sample should be stronger. A great deal of the success of projects like this depends on the rhetorical quality of the presentation, which must combine the immediacy of the literary material with the ethnographer's disciplinary distance.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Morris's first book on Afro-Cuban identity seems good preparation for her current work, which is significantly larger and more complex. While the proposal is improved from a previous submission, it would still be helpful to understand why she has elected to focus on Cuba and the Dominican Republic and to see a stronger delineation of the problem to be addressed.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The project began as a dual project (she first applied in 2014 with a co-author), but it is now Dr. Morris's alone. Her current work plan is realistic; indeed, it appears there is only one chapter remaining to write, and a book prospectus has been sent to Routledge.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The project is near to completion, so a resubmission may not be possible. If the work is still in progress or has expanded, a revised proposal is welcome.



## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	024ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Postcolonial Disaster: Narrating the Catastrophe in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Pallavi Rastogi
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This project analyzes the discourse surrounding catastrophes in the so-called “third world.” It focuses on literary texts in particular and critically examines some ways they negotiate tensions among what the applicant calls their pedagogic, aesthetic, and ethical concerns.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The topic has not been treated before by specialists in post-colonial literature, so it will be of interest to the field. However, Dr. Rastogi does not make clear just how this project intervenes in current debates and problems considered central to the field. On the other hand, insofar as climate change is likely to precipitate more catastrophes in the coming decades, the project deals with issues of concern to a broader public.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The strongest aspect of this project conceptually is its focus on the tension – at times even conflict – between authors’ (or texts’) obligations to tell a useful story about catastrophe (pedagogy), to convey the sufferings of others with power (aesthetics), and yet to refrain from making a spectacle of such suffering (ethics). However, as the panel pointed out last year, it is not clear that or how the project develops this core idea. As described in the project summary, the chapters simply deal with different catastrophes in different places, and touch only incidentally on the ways those differences inflect the aforementioned problematic. Nor does Dr. Rastogi provide a justification for her choice of catastrophes among the many that could have been chosen. Consequently, the project in its current form still lacks the conceptual coherence of its core idea or interest.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

The applicant has written a very well received monograph on Afro-Indian literature and published numerous articles and book chapters. This previous work prepares her well for the current project.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Dr. Rastogi does not clearly indicate whether and how the project has progressed since the previous ATLAS submission. In this year’s application, as in last year’s, she has described the work as nearly

completed, and needing only a final round of revisions. The project may be too near completion to merit a year of funding.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The project is near to completion, so a resubmission may not be possible. If the work is still in progress or has expanded, a revised proposal is welcome.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	025ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	A Documentary History of Jewish Life in Modern Hungary
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Maria Rethelyi
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Rethelyi proposes to complete a collection of primary sources on the history of Hungarian Jews, which can be used as a text in courses about Eastern European Jewish history.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

There are a number of published documents on European Jews, but most of them ignore or do not represent adequately the experience of Hungary's large and extraordinarily important Jewish community. Dr. Rethelyi's project would fill this gap and would be of use to teachers, scholars, and students.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The panel recognizes the value of this project: it would produce a useful source for teachers and students, filling a gap in the scholarly literature, but the proposal does not make clear its analytical contribution or its interpretive structure. Perhaps providing a draft of the introduction rather than a translation would be helpful in understanding the interpretive scope of the work. There is every reason to think that the documents selected would be useful, but whether the book would provide the basis for a new analysis of Hungarian Jewish life is an open question.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Rethelyi knows Hungarian and thus can cross the language barrier that separates most Eastern European historians from the subject. She has a finished manuscript on another (but related) topic, several articles, and some other work in progress. She is clearly well prepared for this work.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

These projects are time consuming and full of unpredictable sources of delay. But there seems reason to think Dr. Rethelyi will finish in the time available. She has a good record of scholarly productivity, often in challenging circumstances.

**Recommendation for Funding:** In its current form and without a sense of the analytical apparatus of the project, the panel does not recommend funding.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	026ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Vernacular Writing and Rhetoric in the London Legal Profession in London, 1292-c. 1550
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Malcolm Richardson
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$49,975

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

The origin and development of modern English must take into account the lives of those who spoke it and wrote it. We knew from previous studies of dialect groups that pronunciation and even linguistic forms varied widely across England, but what has not been studied is the role of written English in reflecting these cultural changes. A clearly defined but curiously neglected discourse community is practitioners of the law. These were native speakers of English associated with the many inns of courts. They needed to be fluent in both Latin and “legal French,” but they also did much of their work in their native language, and their documents have survived as a corpus that Dr. Richardson wishes to exploit.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project to its field of study or art practice and its interest for broader academic and/or lay audiences

The monograph is aimed at a scholarly audience, but its implications could be extended to other fields of reference (e.g., the debates about “standard English” or laments about the rhetorical styles of the Twitter universe). Dr. Richardson is well equipped to examine and reflect on the deeper philosophical, cultural, and linguistic dimensions of social change and centralized control of language.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s argument for the conceptualization, definition, and organization of the project

The project, which has been rethought and revised since last year, has a well defined plan for dealing with the linguistic data. As for the rhetorical angle, early in the Renaissance in England a popular kind of book provided examples of letters and forms as models. Do the manuscripts that Dr. Richardson is examining precede these books or run parallel to them? Other questions that would be useful to address are: How did the “rhetorical conventions” of legal discourse emerge? What new genres emerged, and how were old genres changed? How did they become standardized? How much variation existed, and how was it tolerated or contested within a particular legal community? How did practitioners learn to write such documents — were there classes?

A unique aspect of this project is the use of GIS mapping data to trace and analyze the sites of legal writing and rhetorical training between 1291 and 1470. Thanks to the emergence of other databases, it is possible to map the location of London’s legal inns (several of them moved one or more times) as well as the social origins of their students and managers. Far from being an antiquarian detail, these social maps will depict in a nuanced way the kinds of “English” that were flourishing at the time.

The panel was disappointed, however, at the lack of detailed chapter descriptions or of a timetable for the grant tenure next fall. It also notes that research for the project has not yet been completed, as was urged last year, since the transcription of the materials in London remains to be done.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Richardson is a well-established scholar who has benefited from the proliferation of online tools and databases that enable him to analyze quickly many data elements. He is well prepared for this project.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

Absent a work plan for most of fall, during the ATLAS tenure, as well as for spring (when Dr. Richardson will presumably be working full time) — or, indeed, information on the number and titles of planned chapters that seems to have been omitted this year — it is difficult to judge whether the projected “draft manuscript” will be completed by the end of either spring or summer 2019.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time. The panel urges the applicant to continue working and to revise and resubmit his proposal next year.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	027ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	The Politics of Privation: Barack Obama and the U.S. Fiscal Situation, 2004-2017
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/William Saas
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$44,823

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This project explores the nature of presidential discourse about economics, in particular the speeches of Barack Obama. As such, it touches a broad number of academic disciplines: rhetoric, sociology, and political science. Its audience is academic, not popular, and the study assumes that the audience is conversant with economic theory as well as fiscal policy analysis. This background is essential to an understanding of how Obama framed his presentations to both citizens and Congress, especially at a time of economic crisis.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project to its field of study or art practice and its interest for broader academic and/or lay audiences

In light of President Trump's unceasing lament about the economic mess that he inherited from his predecessor (along with messes in international affairs, defense, security, and trade policies), a fresh look at how the Obama presidency understood, communicated, and acted upon economic (not just fiscal) issues should be attractive to academic as well as general readers.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's argument for the conceptualization, definition, and organization of the project

Dr. Saas has largely rethought, refocused, and rewritten his previous proposal and the result is a more concrete project that is theoretically informed and very timely. It can also lead to a second book on a related topic. His work sample, from chapter 1, is both engaging and well documented. He has also obtained a book contract from Lexington Press, a well-respected academic press.

The project is fully described, but the panel wonders whether the title, "The Politics of Privation," accurately describes its scope and content. The focus is rhetoric, i.e., presidential economic discourse, not economic or fiscal theory and policy. And was "privation" really as central to Obama's framework (both before he was president and during his eight years in office) as Dr. Saas stipulates? The language of accountability seems like a more accurate touchstone, given his extensive policy directives (with Congressional support) after the financial meltdown of 2007–2008.

The panel is also concerned about the project length, since four chapters do not really provide enough space to introduce the topic, establish a methodology, clearly define the historical context, and provide a summary of thirteen years of American history, including walking non-specialist readers through the thickets of Modern Monetary Theory. Words like "privation" will not have meaning without being operationally and situationally defined. In other words, the manuscript will need some further scaffolding before the argument can ensue.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Saas has established a promising start to his career by publishing articles in well-regarded journals. That one chapter section has been accepted for publication in a top outlet since last year and another won a best conference paper prize speaks to the quality of the current project.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

Even with additional scaffolding to improve the quality of the book, Dr. Saas would begin the grant tenure with a large chunk (40–50%) of the manuscript already drafted. The schedule he offers suggests that he would complete the rest by the end of November, though additional drafting time may be required.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The proposal is recommended for funding should additional resources become available. If funding is not available this year, the panel urges the applicant to continue working and to revise and resubmit his proposal next year.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	032ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Fictions of Territoriality: Legal and Literary Narratives of Race, Geography, and US Empire
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Sunny Yang
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$47,176

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Yang plans to study the ways literary texts propose new (anti-hegemonic) conceptions of citizenship in four “‘contestation zones’, or spaces where hegemonic U.S. understandings of race, geography, and governance were forced to confront at least one other competing system of sovereignty (e.g. British, Spanish, Californio, Native American, etc.).”

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The study of U.S. empire is now a well-established subfield in U.S. literary and cultural studies. This project promises to make a major contribution to that subfield by focusing on the ways in which inventive conceptions of U.S. citizenship emerged from the collision between the U.S. empire, with its own notion of citizenship, and competing notions in a range of locations.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

As the panel noted about the previous submission, this is an elegantly conceived and rigorously and creatively developed project. Especially impressive is the way in which Dr. Yang has conceived of each chapter having a two-part structure, which will pay off both by allowing readers easily to compare one chapter with another and by sustaining the ‘conversation’ between archives.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

The applicant has a demonstrated ability to win grant support for this project, which certainly attests to its quality. As well, her description of the project and her ATLAS application as a whole are meticulously thorough, clear, and compelling.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The panel notes that the project was nearing completion a year ago. On the one hand, this augurs well for it being completed within the year of funding that the applicant has requested; on the other hand, the panel wonders whether a full year of funding is actually necessary at this point.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The proposal is recommended for partial funding should additional resources become available; the request for attendance at a book manuscript workshop is not appropriate



for a scholarly grant and should be eliminated. If funding is not available this year and the work is still substantially in progress during the next cycle, the panel urges the applicant to continue working and to revise and resubmit the proposal with a full discussion of the work that remains and a timeline for completion.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	033ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Modern Odysseys: Reading Homer With C.P. Cavafy, Virginia Woolf, and Aimé Césaire
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Michelle Zerba
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$39,443

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

This project explores the variations on a theme by Homer, in particular the uses of the *Odyssey* as a framework or touchstone for more modern authors. An odyssey can be geographical or spiritual — or both — and Dr. Zerba shows how kinds of odysseys echo and transfigure each other. The work will appeal to an academic audience well versed in contemporary literary and cultural theory as well as comparative literature.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project to its field of study or art practice and its interest for broader academic and/or lay audiences

Very few works have exerted a deeper cultural and literary resonance than the *Odyssey*. When we think of the quest motif in ancient or modern literature, we eventually come back to Homer. Modern authors (Dr. Zerba’s choices of Cavafy, Césaire, and Woolf, to name just a few) echo Homer and thus bring an ancient canonical work into dialogue with modern Mediterranean, Caribbean, and European literary voices and themes (e.g., race, homo-eroticism).

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s argument for the conceptualization, definition, and organization of the project

The proposal has been largely rewritten since its last submission in 2016, and the manuscript has now been solicited by Oxford University Press, though whether it is actually under contract is not apparent. The book has a clear structural principle: Homer and X, where X represents a modern author (Cavafy, Woolf, Césaire). However, despite the panel’s prior requests, Dr. Zerba has not yet justified her choice of 20<sup>th</sup>-century texts, though many other authors could have been selected (Pound and Walcott are also mentioned). As a result, the conclusions are likely to be limited to a fresh interpretation of the authors selected, rather than a broader, overarching argument about reception theory or comparative literature, that is, about how classic, canonical works resonate, reverberate, and interact with modern sensibilities. Dr. Zerba acknowledges this by proposing a “poetics of ... weak links and oblique relations.” Perhaps she will be in a better position once she has completed her research on both Cavafy (in Athens) and Woolf (at Washington State University).

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Dr. Zerba is a distinguished scholar, with two important books (Princeton University Press, 1988, reprinted 2015, and Cambridge UP, 2012); a co-edited critical edition of Aristotle’s *Poetics* (Norton, January 2018); and numerous articles, papers, and invited lectures on her book topic since 2009.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

As described, the project likely entails too much to complete — research, drafting, and revisions — in only one semester, especially since Dr. Zerba will also be involved in organizing an international conference on Modern Odysseys in late 2018 or 2019.

**Recommendation for Funding:** Do not fund as submitted.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	034ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Translating Souths: A Search for Translators
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	LSU A&M/Gang Zhou
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

A contribution to the fields of comparative literature and transnational studies of literature, this project examines the writings of several non-U.S. citizens about the American South.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Dr. Zhou does an excellent job of situating this work-in-progress at the crossroads of comparative literary studies, Chinese literary studies, and (“the new”) Southern studies. It is harder to discern, however, what particular impacts the project will have on these fields. The applicant writes eloquently but in rather general terms that: “In my work, modern Chinese literature is no longer sufficient unto itself ... It [her work] identifies the idea of the South as an important thread that leads us out of modern Chinese literature and into other geographies, other languages and literatures, and back to the case study of China with new insights and observations.” The panel was left wondering what precisely these insights and observations are, and whether they constitute an argument or thesis of any kind. Without knowing the answer to these questions, the panel could not assess the project’s significance.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The project has considerable strengths stemming from Dr. Zhou’s ability to read a number of languages and thereby to study cultures not often (if ever) connected: modern China and the American South. The archive of Chinese writers is rich and impressive. Glissant makes an interesting subject for the fourth chapter, but one wonders why he is included, other than because he travelled in Mississippi. More explanation and justification of such choices is needed.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

The applicant’s published work (some of it supported by an earlier ATLAS grant) is of excellent quality. The writing sample offers a highly readable and engaging account of the Chinese writer Gang Yang, but it is less successful in addressing the concerns and interests of the scholarly community.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Dr. Zhou has completed more than two of the four chapters. The work plan is very clear. There is every reason to conclude that she could complete the project in timely fashion.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel encourages Dr. Zhou to revise and resubmit the proposal for a future ATLAS competition, once the thesis and impacts are more clearly delineated.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	037ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Documentary Editions and Multiple Witnesses in the Age of Smartphones: John Gower's <i>Confessio Amantis</i>
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	SELU/Joel Fredell
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$49,643

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

A contribution to the field of digital humanities, but also to early modern literary studies, the project would provide the “first documentary editions for a major late-medieval poem, John Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*...” -- more specifically, “documentary editions for early witnesses to the three main forms of the *Confessio* in the poet’s lifetime.” These digital editions would be scaled to the small screens most in use today and would be available to the public without charge through Creative Commons licensing.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

As Dr. Fredell points out, there has been no major edition of this important work since 1901, much less a digital edition with all the features – searchability, accessibility, readability – thereof. The project could also inspire similar efforts to increase access, particularly on digital platforms, to medieval manuscript materials, which could be a boon to scholars in a number of disciplines.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Dr. Fredell makes a very strong, clear case for this project, explaining it in terms a layperson can understand. As an editorial project, it is an unusual ATLAS submission, but the sample is critically very well informed and argued.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

The applicant is a distinguished scholar in his fields, with numerous publications in prestigious venues. Clearly a leader in digital humanities, Dr. Fredell received a coveted Leverhulme Fellowship in 2010-2011. Judging by his past work and by this proposal, the panel has no doubt that the completed project will be of very high quality.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Given Dr. Fredell’s past record of achievement, there is strong reason to believe that he could complete this project while supported by an ATLAS grant.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel recommends full funding if sufficient monies are available.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	039ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reconstructing Value: Cotton Culture and Blackness after Emancipation
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Katherine Adams
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

There have been a number of important works on the history of commodities, including Sven Beckert's magisterial work on cotton. Dr. Adams uses the post-emancipation cotton economy as a window through which to view the social, cultural, and political history of race relations in this tragic but fundamentally important era.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The panel was convinced by Dr. Adams's proposal, which is interdisciplinary in the best sense, drawing on methods, evidence, and insights from several scholarly traditions. This should give the resulting book broad appeal.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The panel was impressed by the applicant's command of her subject and by her ability to weave together so many disciplinary strands, as well to combine global as well a local historical developments. The account of her project is lively and cogent, and the argument set forth in the work sample was compelling.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Adams has shown herself to be a productive and efficient scholar. She has published an important and well-received monograph as well as several articles and conference presentations. In addition, she has recently completed a visiting fellowship at the British Library. It is clear that her scholarship is of extremely high quality.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The ATLAS grant would come at just the right moment in Dr. Adams's career, enabling her to finish her second book project in time for her tenure review. The project will be well positioned for the ATLAS year, with four of six chapters drafted by the end of spring 2018. There seems every reason to believe she will complete her work as planned.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel strongly recommends full funding. Dr. Adams's project is just the sort ATLAS was created to bring to fruition.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	040ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Intentions, Biology, and Intentional Action
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Daniel Burnston
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$47,647

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Burnston has established a record in the intersection of philosophy with neural psychology. His particular interest is the nature of human agency, and the conscious awareness of that agency. Intentions form a crucial node of investigation within that analysis. Although the present conception is for the guild of those engaged directly with the question, the potential interest is very broad.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The applicant proposes to challenge the common view that intentions are propositional, in the sense that they implement reasoning by causing the body to act towards the desired end. His alternative is a model in which there is a competition among potential plans of action that are represented in perceptual and motor imagery. For this reason, he calls this a “perceptuomotor competition” theory. Replacing a standard view of how intention emerges would be of powerful significance for both the humanities and the sciences.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The four research papers described will clearly advance Dr. Burnston’s argument. In particular, they promise to show how neural function proceeds by the competition among brain systems that represent distinct possible outcomes. The objective of producing a sequence of research papers that harness both philosophical and neuroscientific perspectives to examine the nature of human agency and the experience of acting with agency suggests an original, critically sophisticated project that crosses two fields in unique ways. That said, however, the proposal seems premature, since it does not explain its relationship to the applicant’s doctoral dissertation (2015), the journals targeted, its humanistic interest, the progress to date, or the production schedule.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

The candidate has an excellent record of research in the field, and his work with the Oxford-Tulane Developmental Justice Network is germane to the proposal.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The production of four original research papers seems on track. Given the importance the applicant assigns to the project in philosophical terms, however, the panel wonders whether a monograph would be



a more appropriate end product. Dr. Burnston should note that conference travel is strongly discouraged in ATLAS and such a request suggests that he is not planning to spend the full ATLAS period drafting and revising the work for publication.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel encourages the applicant to revise and resubmit the proposal with more attention paid to the place of the work within Dr. Burnston's career and related scholarship more generally. It is worth considering whether the four articles are the right form for presenting the work as a whole.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	042ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Andean Christianity after the General Resettlement: Viceroy Francisco de Toledo's Church Reform in Colonial Peru [1569-1581]
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/John Charles
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$47,374

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

The applicant requests support to write two essays for edited volumes by an international group devoted to studying the Great Resettlement of indigenous peoples in Andean regions, while he also pursues work on a separate book-length project.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Dr. Charles's project as described in the proposal focuses on Spanish policy during the sixteenth century in concentrating populations in towns modeled around the church, or *reducciones*. Their relation to the local indigenous leadership, the *cabildos de indios*, has not received the attention it deserves in the applicant's analysis. In particular, the resettlement of more than a million people by the viceroy in Peru, Francisco de Toledo, offers a welcome perspective on the entire topic. Although the immediate audience of the work would be the guild of historians, its wider impact is a potential factor.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The applicant proposes to open up an understanding of the *cabildos de indios* as instruments of religious and social formation. The archives of church inspections by bishops from Lima suggest that Toledo's program largely succeeded. What he has proposed for ATLAS funding is a group of projects based in his defined area of research: two articles and a book-length study. Because he does not build his argument around a single, clearly defined project, it is difficult to judge the organization and plans for execution.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

The applicant has had excellent record of scholarship and is presently engaged with a project organized through the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka entitled "Colonial Modernity in the Andes: A Comprehensive Study of Viceroy Toledo's General Resettlement." Plans to produce articles for the volumes involved appear well in hand, though it seems unlikely that the book-length aspect of the project – the most appropriate for the scope of the ATLAS program – will be finished within the grant period.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The contribution of articles to the collaboration with Osaka seems eminently feasible, but two scholarly articles do not fit well within the scope of the ATLAS program. Since another monograph is already in

process and not yet complete, the panel sees no compelling reason to offer funding for the monographic treatment proposed.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel encourages Dr. Charles to revise and resubmit a proposal for a monograph-length study in this consequential area when the monograph is near to completion.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	043ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Noel Carriere's Liberty: From Slave to Soldier in Colonial New Orleans
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Emily Clark
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Clark's project follows the life of a soldier, born a slave, whose experience provides fresh insights into this great national story, exposing its deeply ambiguous meaning for some of those who fought for freedom.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

This project has a powerful local connection, but it also touches on some of the most fundamental issues of American history: race, the ambiguities of freedom, the power and limits of individuals to shape their own destiny. It is an essential story to be told, with concerns well beyond the boundaries of the individuals and locales involved.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Dr. Clark has presented a model application, which captures the excitement of the project as well as its larger significance. In concise, articulate paragraphs, she demonstrates her command of the field and sets her work in its scholarly and political contexts.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Clark has had a most impressive career with international reach. In the two decades since receiving her doctoral degree, she has written two important books, edited others, organized conferences, won prizes—in short, done everything a successful, productive scholar can and should do. In some ways, this biography is a new departure for her, while it continues to build on a firm scholarly foundation.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The panel has no doubt that her timetable is reasonable and, given her track record, that she will finish within the ATLAS timeframe.

**Recommendation for Funding:** Dr. Clark's outstanding project is highly recommended for full funding.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	044ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Stray Dog in the Milky Way: Tom Zé and Brazilian Popular Music
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Christopher Dunn
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Dunn proposes an analysis of the music of Tom Zé, a Brazilian popular artist associated by many with the *tropicalista* movement but whose career has spanned more than five decades and whose music has evolved significantly over time. The applicant argues that music of Zé offers a unique prism through which to study the relations among Brazilian art, politics, and popular culture in that long period.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Since the re-release of some of his best early work by the label Luaka Bop, Zé has become an internationally famous musician and performer with a strong “cult” following in the United States. Because his music has always engaged explicitly with modernization, politics, structural inequality, and other social justice themes, it does offer – as Dr. Dunn claims – a valuable window into Brazilian history since the 1950s. This will be the first monograph in any language devoted to Zé’s work, so it is certain to have a significant impact on Latin American studies and popular music studies.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The proposal lays out an unusually detailed book outline; the chapters’ subjects and their sequencing are manifestly important and logical.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Dr. Dunn’s previous work, the writing sample, and the aforementioned description of the project all indicate that the completed project will be of very high quality. He has already published two monographs and co-edited two volumes concerned with Brazilian popular music, not to mention several articles, including one in a leading journal in the field, *Popular Music*.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The applicant has completed the archival work the project requires and has published or given papers on several parts of the book-in-progress. Along with his publication record, the detailed chapter descriptions indicate that he is realistic in thinking he could complete the book in one year with ATLAS support.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The project is recommended for full funding if sufficient monies are available.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	045ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Reforming the Republican Empire: French Indochina and the Popular Front
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Maura Kathryn Edwards
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$40,800

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Until 1918, France was the only republic among the great powers, its government devoted, in theory at least, to the revolutionary ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. At the same time, France was an active colonial power, whose republican rulers viewed her global presence as both premise and product of national greatness. Dr. Edwards examines the interplay of republican politics and imperial ambitions at a critical moment in the history of each: the Popular Front era, when Europe was slipping towards war and the empire stumbling towards disaster.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The role of the empire in French politics and culture is now a prominent part of the nation's historiography, with Vietnam attracting a number of influential scholars, including Eric Jennings, Dr. Edwards's mentor at Toronto. Her book will be read with interest by those in this area.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Dr. Edwards has an excellent command of the sources and the historical context. Her central theme is the problem of colonial reform, difficult under the best of circumstances and especially so when the domestic and international climate inhibited active policy. This is, in a way, a prelude to the larger crisis that would sweep away the empire two decades later. The proposal should provide a clearer statement of the project's scope and significance, possibly by providing introductory or concluding arguments that will frame the particular historical context.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Edwards has written an important book on Vietnam in France, concentrating on the memory of the war. She knows the terrain very well indeed, and is certainly qualified to undertake this study.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposal lacks a detailed timeline, and details quite a bit of work remaining to do: drafting of three chapters, an introduction, and a conclusion. The application for ATLAS support, then, seems premature. A firmer commitment to a publishing deadline would improve the proposal.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel do not recommend funding at this time, but invite revision and resubmission with a clearer statement of the project's larger significance, as well as a timeline for completion.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	047ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Death, Pollution, and the Making of Roman Cities
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Allison Emmerson
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$40,802

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Emmerson is an archaeologist with a special interest in urban planning and the uses of urban space. In this book, she will argue that attitudes towards the dead played a fundamental and hitherto underestimated role in the organization of ancient cities.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Dr. Emmerson is a young scholar, but clearly active in her discipline and well connected with a number of ongoing research projects. Her current work could have a major impact on how we understand urban life in the Roman world.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

This is technically demanding field, hard to learn and not easy to explain to outsiders. Dr. Emmerson's proposal is convincing that what she was doing was important, but should do more to show how and why this is so.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Unlike most humanists, who work alone on a single project, archaeologists work in teams and often publish with other authors. This can make it difficult for outsiders to see the individual scholar's place and to measure the progress of any one research endeavor. In addition, Dr. Emmerson has a number of two co-authored books to submit as well as several works that will require substantial editorial attention during the coming year. Dr. Emmerson should attempt to clarify its place in her research agenda and how it will relate to her other publishing responsibilities.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The proposal lacked a detailed timeline for the grant period, which raised concerns about whether the plan of work and publication schedule were realistic. The combination of the writing and editorial work to be done on other projects, mentioned above, and the need for significant drafting on the ATLAS project suggest that this proposal is premature.

**Recommendation for Funding:** Though not ready for funding at this time, Dr. Emmerson's proposal is strong and should be revised and resubmitted when it is nearer to completion.



## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	048ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Rhetoric, Race, and Revolution: Contexts for Mark Essex
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Thomas Johnson
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Johnson proposes a scholarly study of Mark Essex, the New Orleans sniper of 1973 — both the rhetorical traditions that shaped him and the immediate and long-term responses that followed. The study will help to elucidate both the history and the discourse surrounding the shootings of police and the outcry against police brutality in recent years.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project to its field of study or art practice and its interest for broader academic and/or lay audiences

In light of the political tension generated by the #BlackLivesMatter movement, Dr. Johnson's exploration of the Mark Essex case is timely, even 45 years after the mass murder. One might ask, "why another book about a mass murder?" but it is clear from that his project is not a sociological or psychological study; its focus is rhetoric, the power of language to shape and define people and issues.

It is not clear whether this will be an academic or a popular book, since it is apparently aimed at either a university press, such as LSU or UNC, or a trade press. Dr. Johnson believes that the volume might be useful not only in graduate courses in rhetorical studies, courses in criminology, or freshman seminars that trace the historical background of current events in the U.S. — but the latter does not suggest a very high scholarly bar.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's argument for the conceptualization, definition, and organization of the project

The proposal clearly discusses the project and situates it very well in both its historical and critical contexts, with a well-conceived organization of diverse cultural and historical material. The monograph is divided into two parts with three chapters in each section. The heart of the project is chapter 3, which creates the rhetorical context for the mass shooting. The second part presents the range of reactions to the tragedy and includes a wide variety of voices. In a sense, part 1 focuses on black culture, and part 2 on white culture. What draws them into conversation is the Essex tragedy. It would be helpful, the panel thinks, for Dr. Johnson to indicate how his book will differ from, respond to, or critique other recent books about mass killings (especially Thompson's and Burrough's). In other words, what is most original or distinctive?

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Johnson has a solid record of publishing both scholarly and more pedagogically focused work. He currently has a contract with Cambridge University Press for an edited volume, to be published in spring 2019. He is well qualified for this project.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

The work plan lacks significant detail, perhaps because the book is not yet very far along, with only one of six chapters completed at present. Given the time constraints that will also be imposed by the Cambridge University Press volume in the coming year, the project is not likely to be finished during the ATLAS grant tenure, making this application premature.

**Recommendation for Funding:** Though not ready for funding at this time, Dr. Johnson's proposal is compelling and should be revised and resubmitted when it is nearer to completion.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	052ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Kant's Categorical Imperative: A Philosophical Justification for the Requirement to Respect Others
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Oliver Sensen
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$48,622

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Sensen's project focuses on respect of others, and anchors that respect in Kant's categorical imperative: "So act that you use humanity, whether in your own person, or the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means." Although the applicant approaches the issue as a Kantian, he plans to approach the topic accessibly, so that those interested in moral philosophy as such might engage with the monograph.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The applicant describes his argument to justify respect as "a novel, neglected" alternative to a conventional view. In his analysis, the requirement to respect others is an *a priori* principle that arises before contact with any other being. As such, it does not presuppose a metaphysical value of that other. Interestingly, however, the applicant maintains that Kant's ideas are supported by empirical research, which is a significant new direction.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The concept of "constitutivism" serves as the pivot of discussion. A sample of the work that develops the concept skillfully, by parsing its definition in respect of moral realism. Dr. Sensen argues that Kant, seeing moral law as the gift of reason itself, presents respect as part of what is "constitutive of pure reason." Though the work sample is expertly and tightly argued, the proposal does not mention either an introduction or conclusion and chapter descriptions are minimal.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Sensen is an established contributor to the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, with considerable publications to his credit, both accessible and more expert. He is exceptionally qualified to pursue this study (and defense) of Kant's categorical imperative.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Though the monograph could be completed on the timetable specified, it is at an earlier stage than many projects – with twenty weeks of research remaining – and only one of several projects in the applicant's queue, which includes another monograph forthcoming in 2018 and two co-edited volumes.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel recommends that Dr. Sensen consider resubmission of this proposal when the project has reached a later stage.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	054ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Moral Norms: A Philosophic Account
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Chad Van Schoelandt
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$45,922

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

The manner in which agreed norms of morality emerge is a central question of philosophy. In this project, Dr. Van Schoelandt proposes to argue for a greater overlap between social norms and moral norms than is often maintained. The way in which moral judgments are formed might be broadly reconceived by means of the work.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Mutual expectations are a central concern of the work, and are taken to help define a system of moral accountability. The process sees social norms “moralized” so as to produce a sense of obligation and a moral perspective. The way in which moral judgments are formed might be broadly reconceived by means of the work. In the proposal, it appears that the audience is primarily scholars in the subfield and philosophers more generally; the project would be unlikely to attract a lay audience.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Dr. Van Schoelandt’s work is to develop the conception of moral norms, discussing the views of Kurt Baier and P. F. Strawson. This is the basis of asserting that a social system of moral norms constitute a moral perspective. The second Part of the work is devoted to accountability as a social function of norms in that they produce shared expectations. Finally, the third Part is to explain how moral norms form part of a “polycentric order, or an order in which there are multiple sources of rules with overlapping jurisdictions.” The project is ambitious, and its conceptualization is reasonable for the complexity of the subject matter. A stronger articulation of the importance of the work would be helpful.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

The applicant seems to have made a promising start of a research career by means of published articles and public presentations, but the proposal provides no list of previous or related publications.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Dr. Van Schoelandt will no doubt offer public presentations of his work, and it is useful that George Mason University has offered to sponsor a workshop on the initial draft. At the moment a publisher of the whole has not been identified, and progress to date strikes the panel as provisional. The applicant also has several activities happening concurrently – completing the research for the proposed work, publishing a

co-edited volume for Routledge, and conference travel to consult on the work in progress – that suggest it is unlikely that the work will be completed during the ATLAS period. Research and consultation with other scholars should be significantly farther progressed before ATLAS funding, which is reserved for completing major works.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel recommends that the project be revised and resubmitted to a future ATLAS competition, when the work is nearer to completion.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	055ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Touch/Screen/Theory Monograph Proposal
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	Tulane/Michele White
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$50,000

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

The interface between digital media and their users is an already central and still-growing area of study within the humanities. “Digital humanities” is now represented on virtually every campus in the United States. The twin demands of the discipline are for theoretical lenses that can make sense of the interface, and for engaged explanation of the technologies involved. Dr. White’s project envisages taking touch-screen technology, perhaps the most influential of recent innovations, into account.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

Instructions and advice on the use of touch-screens, as hermeneutical guidance, are to be critiqued in the analysis. The aim is to equip users to be aware of the ways in which their engagement is shaped, intellectually and emotionally. An historical section on the development of the technology is especially promising from this point of view. The factor that users bring to the interface is to be investigated in a treatment of hands, and of “how dirt and traces of the body accrete on these devices.” Finally, the emotional and virtually tactile results of engagement are assessed. Users of this technology, a substantial proportion of researchers in the humanities today at all levels, could benefit from such investigation.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

Both the theoretical and pragmatic sides of the discipline are admirably addressed in the proposal. The core of the proposal is to “provide students and scholars with key terms and textual analysis methods for researching touch screens”, though the proposal would benefit from a much more detailed and clear indications of what the methods are and how they are new.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Dr. White is a highly regarded and active contributor to the field of digital humanities. Well-respected publishers have brought out previous monographs, and the support and recognition of the work attests its importance. The thematic through line of the work and some sense of the importance of the analysis and significance of the topic, however, has yet to be fully articulated.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Work on the project is underway, and a potential publisher has been identified. Dr. White has many other scholarly activities to complete in 2018 – a book manuscript ready to send to Routledge and a co-edited

special journal issue – which suggests the potential for completing this work within the ATLAS period is in question.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel does not recommend funding.



## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	059ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Girls' Night Out: Gender, Cinema, and Movie-Going in Brazil
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	UL Lafayette/Lena Suk
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$20,912

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

At first glance, this research might seem to be a narrow study of movie-going practices in Brazil, but this project is much richer and complex than that. Dr. Suk has selected a country and a decade of dramatic cultural change to complete a study that will appeal to scholars of history, film studies, race, and gender studies.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project to its field of study or art practice and its interest for broader academic and/or lay audiences

The films that we see hold up a mirror to the audience, and by studying these works of art, we understand Brazilian culture, especially its women, in a much more nuanced way. Dr. Suk builds on similar studies of Mexico (2014) and Chile (2012), but no scholar has yet studied Brazil in this way. The work would appeal largely to a scholarly audience across several disciplines.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's argument for the conceptualization, definition, and organization of the project

The project has clear boundaries (cinema in the 1920s) but it would benefit from greater clarity and justification for the scope. Why the 1920s and not the 1930s or 1940s? How many Brazilian films were produced in the 1920s, and what percentage are they of the corpus shown? How will the data on cinema consumption be gathered, and how will the data be broken down by gender? What about rural and urban differences? The panel raises these questions because the proposal does not touch on them. If the approach is literary rather than historical, then other questions arise: Dr. Suk is interested in images, for example, but artifacts from a century ago may be quite scarce. Granted, some archives exist, but the proposal does not say much about what materials are available.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Suk has published one article and has another in submission since the previous ATLAS submission. The monograph is a revision of her 2014 dissertation but will include significant new material from her archival research, funded by Mellon and Fulbright.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

The manuscript has been submitted to an unspecified academic press, and if it is accepted, Dr. Suk would use the ATLAS support to incorporate readers' suggestions and to obtain print-quality images and permissions for the copyrighted material she wishes to incorporate in the monograph. It would be difficult

to make the grant contingent on an acceptance that may or may not come, and based on the uncertainty of what, if any, revisions will be required. In any event, she does not need ATLAS funding to finish drafting the volume.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The panel does not recommend funding.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	060ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	The Post/Colonial Sublime: Aesthetics, Politics, and Ethics in the Twentieth-Century Novel
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	UL Monroe/Jana Giles
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$49,301

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Giles's project explores the nexus of aesthetics, politics, and ethics in the 20<sup>th</sup>-century British novel, considering especially the aesthetics of the sublime in a post-colonial context.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project to its field of study or art practice and its interest for broader academic and/or lay audiences

While the subject might seem dauntingly esoteric, it is not in Dr. Giles's hands. She explores the "aesthetic turn" in post-colonial and colonial studies, addressing authors (Conrad, Forster, and Rhys in her dissertation and now adding Lindsay, Coetzee, and Ghosh) whose works exploit these tensions. The study marks a significant revision of a Cambridge dissertation (2009). It was not accepted for publication at CUP in 2014, but Dr. Giles has the resource of the readers' reports to clarify and enrich her analysis and conclusions. Her central thesis is to demonstrate "common ideological practices across different cultural and environmental settings while emphasizing themes and variations arising out of gender, race, culture, historical, or ecological moment." Her choice of texts, of course, is critical to the generalizability of her thesis, but she is clear about her criterion for selection: an overt concern with the sublime.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's argument for the conceptualization, definition, and organization of the project

Dr. Giles has revised her proposal since it was originally submitted, based on the panel's feedback two years ago. In so doing, she has reduced and reworked what was previously an unwieldy three-chapter theoretical introduction, thereby shifting her focus to the post-colonial argument regarding the works to be discussed. The panel urges her to adhere to the outline offered in the prospectus (which, we note in passing, skips from chapter 2 to chapter 4), without expanding its scope to other writers, in order to bring the project to fruition. If she does so, the project is likely to be manageable in the time envisioned. She will have two chapters to update (along with the bibliography, we assume), an introduction and conclusion to write, and final revisions to make in order to complete the book. Some research at LSU and the University of Texas at Austin remains to be conducted as well.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Giles has published ten essays, has one accepted, and another two are in submission. A volume with a good university press would be a real step forward.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project

The work plan is feasible so long as Dr. Giles resists adding new material. As the panel cautioned previously, funding will be best used after the research has been completed, presumably during summer 2018.

**Recommendation for Funding:** Partial funding of \$38,057 is recommended for this excellent project. Given very limited ATLAS resources, the travel for research and citation checks is not a wise investment of very limited ATLAS resources, and should be cut.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	061ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	An Anthology of Environmental Writing about the Gulf South
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	UNO/Richard Goodman
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$35,485

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Goodman proposes to produce a co-edited anthology of environmental writing about the Gulf Coast.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

This project is less a contribution to a scholarly field than an intervention in public understanding of and concern for the Gulf Coast as a fragile (and threatened) environment. Given what science tells us about the probable future of the Gulf, there is potential here for a significant project in public humanities. However, it is in the very nature of anthologies that quality and significance are extremely difficult to assess in advance.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The project is very strong conceptually, characterized by (a) an aspiration to be comprehensive, including as many voices from as many backgrounds as possible and (b) a creative but persuasive structure that organizes contributions to the volume under the headings of Sea, Wind, Fire, and Earth. The applicant reports that he and his co-editor have compiled a bibliography of more than 100 books and articles from which to select the collection's contents. The proposed Table of Contents shows how richly varied this selection will be and how effective the aforementioned categories are.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

Dr. Goodman has an impressive publication record as a writer of creative non-fiction. It includes four books (three of them published since 2008) and approximately 45 articles, essays, and book chapters. The quality of the proposal is itself very high, and the writing sample gives strong evidence that the editors will be able to reach the broad audience for which they are aiming.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

With the bibliography compiled, many of the selections made, and the Introduction drafted, most of the work required has been completed. The biggest hurdle remaining is to secure permissions. This is a matter of some concern since it means that publication of the work is by no means assured. Without certainty that the work will reach the public, the risk is too great to award ATLAS funds.

**Recommendation for Funding:** No funding is recommended.

## Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	064ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	A Philosophical Approach to the Study of Addiction
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	UNO/Frank Schalow
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$41,729

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Dr. Schalow aims to write with a philosophical focus on a pressing social concern: the misuse of opioids. The target audience, however, is primarily health professionals and policy makers. In addition, development of new teaching venues is suggested in association with the project.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The project would raise public awareness of the issue, with the hope of influencing policies and practices, and at the same time problematizing the medical description of the addiction to opioids as an “epidemic.” Instead, the applicant develops the approaches of Marx and Heidegger in order to suggest that the social impulse to instant gratification, not only by pharmaceutical means, lies at the base of addiction. In particular, he highlights a failure in the conception of temporality, such that the present is not conceived in its relationship to future and past.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal’s conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The project, which seems genuinely original, has been conceived to the point of an outline, though with considerable research already undertaken. It is difficult to judge the strength of the project, which is at an early stage; the proposal includes no descriptions of individual chapters.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant’s previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant’s preparations for the current project

Dr. Schalow’s stature in research and teaching is well established, and he has recently written on the subject, in *Toward a Phenomenology of Addiction: Embodiment, Technology, Transcendence* (Dordrecht: Springer Publishers, 2017). This previous work suggests that he is uniquely qualified to undertake the current topic, but because the proposal is in a preliminary stage, the relationship with the previous work is not entirely evident.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

The timeline in the proposal commences in June 2017, so it is difficult to judge how much is completed, what remains to do, and publisher interest.

**Recommendation for Funding:** The proposal has significant potential, and the panel encourages the applicant to revise and resubmit when it is farther advanced.

### Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

<b>Proposal Number</b>	065ATL-18 (Humanities)
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Criminal Justice Reform in the US: Three First Steps
<b>Submitting Institution/PI</b>	UNO/Chris Surprenant
<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$47,523

**Project Summary:** Principal concerns of the project and its intended audience(s)

Reform of the criminal justice system in the United States has become a critical focus of discussion. The applicant proposes to deploy a philosophical perspective in respect to the issue. He also wishes to bring insights of empirical psychology, sociology, criminology, and economics to bear, in order to diagnose the problem and suggest practical solutions to a trenchant social condition. Three issues need to be addressed, in his view: the over-criminalization of behavior, the profit incentive associated with incarceration, and its overuse as a form of punishment. The work is conceived to address readers in the field of philosophy, but to be accessible to lay audiences.

**Criterion 1:** The significance of the project as described to its current field of study or art practice and to broader academic and/or lay audiences

The project, rethought since a previous ATLAS submission, is bolder and perhaps less overtly philosophical than before. Recourse to philosophy promises to focus the detailed examples that Dr. Surprenant has analyzed. These are taken from the secondary literature as a whole, as well as from contributions to a collection he recently edited. Clarification of ethical issues involved in crime and punishment will be the intended result. There is less reflection on how philosophy itself might be affected by considering the issue.

**Criterion 2:** The strength of the proposal's conceptualization, organization, and plans for project execution

The proposed focus on the issue of financial incentives for incarceration would be innovative, especially as analyzed philosophically. The chapter list provided does not align clearly with the description of the project in the proposal, but the writing sample is excellent.

**Criterion 3:** The quality of the applicant's previous work and/or promise of quality based on the applicant's preparations for the current project

The applicant has been impressively active as a teacher and scholar, showing leadership in the interface between his discipline and contemporary discussion of key issues. He appears to be well prepared for the current project, and has made significant progress since the last proposal submission.

**Criterion 4:** The feasibility of the proposed plan of work and likelihood that the applicant will complete the project within a limited timeframe

Approximately half the manuscript has been brought to submission form, while the remainder is in draft or detailed outline. Completion by the contract date with Routledge is entirely feasible. The applicant

intends to use the ATLAS grant to reinforce a non-residential fellowship grant from King's College in New York, to develop courses on criminal justice reform.

**Recommendation for Funding:** Full funding is recommended, if sufficient monies are available.



**Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Program  
FY 2017-18 Competition  
Humanities Proposals Submitted**

<b>Proposal # &amp; Discipline</b>	<b>PI Name(s)</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
005ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Jacob Berman	LSU A&M	Citizen, Soldier, Jihadi: The War on Terror's Fictions	\$50,000
006ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Michael Bibler	LSU A&M	Silly Pleasures: Queer, Camp, Nonce, and the Art of Being Literal	\$50,000
013ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Isiah Lavender III	LSU A&M	Afrofuturism Classics	\$26,433
014ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Alecia Long	LSU A&M	Crimes Against Nature: Sex, Violence, and the Search for Conspirators in the Assassination of JFK	\$28,290
015ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Ashley Noel Mack	LSU A&M	American Moms: Twenty-First Century Hegemonic Motherhood in the United States	\$45,935
016ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Wilfred Major	LSU A&M	Love in the Age of War: The Soldier in Menander	\$22,932
021ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Andrea Morris	LSU A&M	Im/mobility and Belonging in Contemporary Dominican and Cuban Cultures	\$45,557
024ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Pallavi Rastogi	LSU A&M	Postcolonial Disaster: Narrating the Catastrophe in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	\$50,000
025ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Maria Rethelyi	LSU A&M	A Documentary History of Jewish Life in Modern Hungary	\$50,000

ATLAS Humanities Proposals  
FY 2017-18  
Page 2 of 4

<b>Proposal # &amp; Discipline</b>	<b>PI Name(s)</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
026ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Malcolm Richardson	LSU A&M	Vernacular Writing and Rhetoric in the London Legal Profession in London, 1292-c. 1550	\$49,975
027ATL-18 HUMANITIES	William Saas	LSU A&M	The Politics of Privation: Barack Obama and the U.S. Fiscal Situation, 2004-2017	\$44,823
032ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Sunny Yang	LSU A&M	Fictions of Territoriality: Legal and Literary Narratives of Race, Geography, and US Empire	\$47,176
033ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Michelle Zerba	LSU A&M	Modern Odysseys: Reading Homer with C.P. Cavafy, Virginia Woolf, and Aimé Césaire	\$39,443
034ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Gang Zhou	LSU A&M	Translating Souths: A Search for Translators	\$50,000
037ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Joel Fredell	Southeastern LA University	Documentary Editions and Multiple Witnesses in the Age of Smartphones: John Gower's Confessio Amantis	\$49,643
039ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Katherine Adams	Tulane	Reconstructing Value: Cotton Culture and Blackness after Emancipation	\$50,000
040ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Daniel Burnston	Tulane	Intentions, Biology, and Intentional Action	\$47,647
042ATL-18 HUMANITIES	John Charles	Tulane	Andean Christianity after the General Resettlement: Viceroy Francisco de Toledo's Church Reform in Colonial Peru [1569-1581]	\$47,374

<b>Proposal # &amp; Discipline</b>	<b>PI Name(s)</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
043ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Emily Clark	Tulane	Noel Carriere's Liberty: From Slave to Soldier in Colonial New Orleans	\$50,000
044ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Christopher Dunn	Tulane	Stray Dog in the Milky Way: Tom Zé and Brazilian Popular Music	\$50,000
045ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Maura Kathryn Edwards	Tulane	Reforming the Republican Empire: French Indochina and the Popular Front	\$40,800
047ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Allison Emmerson	Tulane	Death, Pollution, and the Making of Roman Cities	\$40,802
048ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Thomas Johnson	Tulane	Rhetoric, Race, and Revolution: Contexts for Mark Essex	\$50,000
052ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Oliver Sensen	Tulane	Kant's Categorical Imperative: A Philosophical Justification for the Requirement to Respect Others	\$48,622
054ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Chad Van Schoelandt	Tulane	Moral Norms: A Philosophic Account	\$45,922
055ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Michele White	Tulane	Touch/Screen/Theory Monograph Proposal	\$50,000
059ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Lena Suk	UL Lafayette	Girls' Night Out: Gender, Cinema, and Movie-Going in Brazil	\$20,912

<b>Proposal # &amp; Discipline</b>	<b>PI Name(s)</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Proposal Title</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>
060ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Jana Giles	UL Monroe	The Post/Colonial Sublime: Aesthetics, Politics, and Ethics in the Twentieth-Century Novel	\$49,301
061ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Richard Goodman	UNO	An Anthology of Environmental Writing about the Gulf South	\$35,485
064ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Frank Schalow	UNO	A Philosophical Approach to the Study of Addiction	\$41,729
065ATL-18 HUMANITIES	Chris Surprenant	UNO	Criminal Justice Reform in the US: Three First Steps	\$47,523

**2017-18 COMPETITION: SUMMARY OF HUMANITIES PROPOSALS**

**NUMBER OF PROPOSALS: 31**  
**TOTAL REQUESTED: \$1,366,324**  
**TOTAL AVAILABLE FOR AWARD: \$155,000**