

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 2018-19

Subject-Area Review: HUMANITIES

February 21, 2019

Prepared by:

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

Dr. Karen-edis Barzman
Professor
Department of Art History
Binghamton University

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

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

BoRSF Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Subprogram, FY 2018-19

Subject-Area Panel Report – Humanities

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

Thirty-eight (38) 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 (10)

The ten (10) 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.

Rank	Proposal #	Principal Investigator	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended
1	027ATL-19	Leslie Tuttle	\$50,000	\$50,000
2	052ATL-19	Emilia Oddo	\$49,050	\$44,050
3	033ATL-19	Valerie Goertzen	\$28,884	\$28,884
4	031ATL-19	Andrew McKevitt	\$40,360	\$40,360
5	009ATL-19	Hayley Johnson	\$41,684	\$34,084
6	035ATL-19	Janet Allured	\$30,685	\$28,185
7	063ATL-19	Emilia Orr	\$44,102	\$44,102
8	043ATL-19	Ryan Boehm	\$50,000	\$50,000
9	004ATL-19	Lauren Coats	\$37,361	\$37,361
10	054ATL-19	Stephanie Porras	\$50,000	\$50,000
Total			\$422,126	\$407,026

The panel recommends funding, at a minimum, the top five (5) proposals, for a total of \$197,378. Additional proposals should be funded in rank order if monies become available.

Priority II - Revise and Resubmit (21)

Rank	Proposal #	Principal Investigator	Amount Requested
11	041ATL-19	Melissa Bailes	\$49,280
12	056ATL-19	Gary Remer	\$50,000
13	060ATL-19	Elise Franklin	\$20,102

14	003ATL-19	Paolo Chirumbolo	\$48,207
15	008ATL-19	Dorota Heneghan	\$46,437
16	011ATL-19	Isiah Lavender III	\$50,000
17	057ATL-19	Ana Sanchez-Rojo	\$49,494
18	016ATL-19	Andrea Morris	\$23,459
19	019ATL-19	Pallavi Rastogi	\$50,000
20	021ATL-19	William Saas	\$48,068
21	018ATL-19	John Protevi	\$50,000
22	040ATL-19	Adrian Anagnost	\$50,000
23	015ATL-19	Bryan McCann	\$50,000
24	022ATL-19	Charles Shindo	\$50,000
25	014ATL-19	Ashley Noel Mack	\$47,496
26	048ATL-19	Eric Herhuth	\$49,939
27	029ATL-19	Samuel Cannon	\$14,726
28	032ATL-19	Gregory Schelonka	\$37,028
29	037ATL-19	Todd Furman	\$49,982
30	006ATL-19	Serap Erincin	\$49,390
31	010ATL-19	Benjamin Kahan	\$50,000

The panel recommends that the applicants submitting the twenty-one (21) 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)

Proposal #	Principal Investigator	Amount Requested
001ATL-19	Stephen Andes	\$50,000
012ATL-19	Alexandre Leupin	\$50,000
020ATL-19	Maria Rethelyi	\$49,980
030ATL-19	Alexander Mikaberidze	\$6,000
050ATL-19	Laura-Zoe Humphreys	\$50,000
061ATL-19	Allison Leigh	\$20,645
062ATL-19	Ramona Mielusel	\$23,885

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

Proposal Number	001ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Zorro's Ghost: How a Mexican Legend Became America's First Superhero
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Stephen Andes
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

This study of the origins of the legend of Zorro investigates both the two most plausible historical models for this mythical hero and also the process by which such myths and legends come into being and are perpetuated.

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. Andes does not make a strong case for the significance of this project to historical studies; rather, the proposed work appears to be a popular history intended for a broader audience. Although the prose is lively and engaging, the historical record itself may be too thin to support a project of this kind, and one wonders whether many readers would be as interested in the way Zorro became a mythic figure as they are in Zorro himself.

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

The concept of the project seems to be designed to make the best of the fact that in the last analysis, as Dr. Andes himself makes clear, the origins of Zorro remain shrouded in mystery. The PI proposes "a historical meditation on the meaning - changing as it does - of the presence of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans in the U.S." But a "meditation" is unlikely to have the kind of depth and significance that ATLAS-funded projects usually have. Moreover, the panel was concerned by the applicant's omission of the whole field of "border studies," which is surely relevant to this topic.

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. Andes is a distinguished scholar and a prior recipient of an ATLAS award that enabled him to carry that project to successful completion. However, the current proposal is for a very different kind of project, so it is hard to assess the PI's preparation for it based on his previous work.

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

The work plan itself seems feasible for the book as currently conceptualized. The proposed project is a short book (about 200 pages). It will be written in a casual, accessible style, and much of the research has been completed. Moreover, the applicant has a track record of accomplishing work he proposes to do.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	003ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Green Screens: Industrial Landscapes and the Environment in Twenty-First Century Italian Ecodocumentary
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Paolo Chirumbolo
Amount Requested	\$48,207

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

Dr. Chirumbolo proposes a study, within the fields of film studies and eco-criticism, of recent Italian documentaries about the degradation of the environment.

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 have significant impact on Italian film studies, with some impact as well in eco-criticism. However, for reasons detailed below, the panel worried that as currently conceived it might not fulfill its potential.

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

The main strengths of the proposal in these respects are two: the sheer quantity and diversity of Italian documentaries Dr. Chirumbolo has seen and plans to write about, and the organization of the volume into sections based on the material sources and forms of environmental degradation: oil, steel, waste, and chemical. This plan allows both for a sensible division of the films to be studied and an analysis of the specific challenges each kind of problem poses (at least as represented in the documentaries). The panel was concerned, however, that the applicant makes little effort to utilize the distinctive methods of film studies (modes of seeing and interpreting this particular medium) or to place these documentaries in a broader history of Italian filmmaking. As well, although the project clearly speaks to issues central to eco-criticism, Dr. Chirumbolo does not engage sufficiently with works, debates, and conversations in this emergent field of study.

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 quality of the applicant's previous work is very high and includes several books on a range of facets of Italian culture and art. One of these, on work and literature, sets him up nicely for this project, as does a series he is currently editing on Italian documentary film.

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

Because Dr. Chirumbolo has completed all necessary research and has a compelling four-part structure for the book in mind, the work plan seems feasible.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time. The applicant is encouraged to consider the panel's comments and revise and resubmit the project for a future ATLAS competition.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	004ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Terra In/Cognita: Mapping the New United States
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Lauren Coats
Amount Requested	\$37,361

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

The project will produce a monograph that studies the social construction of space in the United States in the nineteenth century, with a particular focus on “mapping” understood not just as cartography (map making) but including as well an archive of supplementary written and pictorial materials cartographic expeditions generated.

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 speaks directly to current issues of interest to 19th-century Americanists and the “spatial turn” in American studies. Dr. Coats is active in the field and has a sharp sense of how to craft a project that promises to make a significant intervention in it.

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

The applicant’s conceptualization of the project is not entirely successful. The problem is that the proposed book appears to lack a see-through line of argument. Each chapter is a case study, and an interesting one, but its argument is not always clear. Nor do we see a larger argument accruing as we move from chapter to chapter. Nor is it clear why the chapters are in the order proposed. In short, the parts do not yet appear to have been assembled into a whole. This suggests that perhaps the project is not yet ready for funding. But the problem could also be a lack of precision in the description of the project. For example, the summary of Chapter 4 (Prospectus, p. 7) uses the verb “considers” three times (“the chapter considers” appears twice, and “I consider” appears once) in crucial places; we need instead a sharper presentation of the chapter’s argument, driving question, or hypothesis. The panel is confident that with another year of work on the project, Dr. Coats would be able to present a much stronger proposal for ATLAS funding.

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. Coats’ principal expertise to date has been in the digital humanities, and this will be her first monograph, but she seems well prepared to undertake it. A digital humanities project for which she sought ATLAS funding previously was brought to successful completion and is now online, despite not having received ATLAS support. Clearly, the applicant completes the projects she undertakes. As well, she has an article published in *J-19*, the journal of record in the field of nineteenth-century U.S. literary and cultural studies. As well, she is the founding editor of the important *Archive Journal*.

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

The PI has written two chapters (of four) and would use ATLAS funds to complete the remaining two and to revise the manuscript as a whole. This is a feasible work plan. However, as noted above, the panel concluded that the project is still at an early stage of its development.

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 consider panel comments, continue working, and revise and resubmit her proposal next year.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	006ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Towards a Rich Theatre: Technology, Reperformability, and The Wooster Group
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Serap Erincin
Amount Requested	\$49,390

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

Playing on the project of a “poor theatre” devised by Jerzy Grotowski, Dr. Erincin focuses on a technologically astute (and in this sense) “rich theatre.” The work evolves around a consideration of the Wooster Group in New York City, which has exerted a considerable impact on both live performance and cinema since 1975. The applicant aims for an advance in a psychophysical theory of performance, defined as “reperformability,” which turns on the intersection of the actor with electronic media. If successful, the work will directly interest those involved in the theater in its broadest sense, and might also engage a more general audience, as have earlier theorists of acting.

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

By focusing on the particular contribution of Elizabeth LeCompte, Dr. Erincin has been able in previous publications to explore the theoretical underpinnings of the Wooster Group. She has also enjoyed access to archival material that enhances the contribution. The Group has had a seminal influence on American theater and cinema, and the project is of significance in historical terms alone. With its theoretical dimension, it promises also to have a practical impact.

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

Central to the applicant’s conception of the work is her development of “reperformability,” which she takes to be a psychophysical key to performance as such. Rather than privileging “live communion,” as in Grotowski’s perspective, the applicant stresses the contribution of Richard Schechner, a founding figure of the Wooster Group. By developing that approach, Dr. Erincin aims to offer an integrated understanding of performance. By using an analysis of the “technologized body” as pioneered by the Wooster Group, the project is to delineate the interaction of the actor with the environment of what is performed as well as the environment of the audience, in order to resolve the paradoxical relationship between repetition and spontaneity.

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 received support and recognition for her work in articles in the past; the current project is designed to integrate and deepen her contribution. The applicant’s background in acting, directing, and playwrighting makes the contribution all the more pertinent.

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

The plan of work, especially given the record of previous accomplishment in this field, appears entirely reasonable. At the moment, however, the key concept of “reperformability” appears more descriptive than analytic, and must be further developed to ground the project and ensure its impact.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. The panel encourages Dr. Erincin to revise and resubmit the proposal for a future ATLAS competition, once key concept is more clearly defined and delineated.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	008ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Gender Relations and Nation in Sofia Casanova's Writings from Poland [1913-1933]
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Dorota Heneghan
Amount Requested	\$46,437

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

Sofia Casanova was a Spanish writer who was married to a Polish diplomat. Her publications, written in Poland between 1913 and 1933, provide an original perspective on the two countries. The P.I. emphasizes the importance of gender and gender relations in Casanova's texts, as well as her contribution to the development of Spanish political thought.

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

Transnational themes have become increasingly important throughout the humanities, and especially in European studies. This project makes an unusual transnational connection and should attract scholars interested in both Spain and Eastern Europe.

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

The panel does not believe that Dr. Heneghan has made a sufficiently strong case for the significance of her subject. Casanova is clearly an interesting figure, with an unusual career. Whether her ideas and writing are worth a book is not entirely clear. Moreover, in the materials provided the role of gender relationship was not clearly defined and sufficiently integrated into the analytical frame.

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. Heneghan received an ATLAS grant in 2011-12 for a book about fashion and gender in Spanish literature that was published in 2014. She has the unusual combination of linguistic skills which this project requires, and is well qualified to finish it at a high level of 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 timeframe seems feasible, at least as the project is now defined. Changes to the argument or focus might, however, extend the time to completion.

Recommendation for Funding: Though no funding is recommended at this time, the panel encourages Dr. Heneghan to consider panel comments and revise and resubmit the proposal for a future ATLAS competition.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	009ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Beneath Heavy Pines: Louisiana, Camp Livingston, and Japanese Enemy Alien Internment
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Hayley Johnson
Amount Requested	\$41,684

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

This project has two investigators: Hayley Johnson and her colleague, Sarah Simms, both librarians at LSU A&M. Together they plan to write a history of Camp Livingston, an internment camp for Japanese in Louisiana. Japanese internment has received a good deal of scholarly attention and continues to have political and ideological resonance. There has not been much work on Camp Livingston, and its location in Louisiana makes it particularly appropriate for an ATLAS grant. The book that will result will have a wide audience, including scholars interested in Asian-American history (a new and active field), and in the Second World War (always a lively subject with special connection to Louisiana).

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 applicants have located a rich collection of documents, which they describe clearly and effectively. As librarians, they are experienced researchers, whose presentation displays a firm grasp of their subject's shape and significance.

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

This is a well-written, convincing proposal. Equally important, it displays the applicants' commitment, both to the subject and to the scholarly enterprise. They provide a well-considered account of the camp, its organization and development, and the wider significance of internment for American history.

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

It is important to keep in mind that Johnson and Simms do not have the advantages of faculty members. They do not have access to research support or released time. The work they have done to date has been accomplished while working full-time jobs. In this way, their accomplishments are most impressive, in terms of both quality and quantity.

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

The applicants have written two chapters out of a proposed twelve. If they received some released time from their jobs, there is a good chance they will finish a draft as planned, as well as complete final archival work.

Recommendation for Funding: Partial funding of \$34,084, supporting release time and travel, is recommended for this excellent project. The panel strongly encourages the campus to provide laptop computers, a fairly typical expense, as part of its support of this important work.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	010ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Sex Under Necropolitics
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Benjamin Kahan
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

The project 1) addresses “the impact of segregation on black bodily practices and corporeal intimacies” from the late 19th through mid-20th centuries, with focus on Harlem Renaissance, and 2) compares and contrasts “white queer theory” (with its emphasis on the reorganization of desire and pleasure into a new “sexuality” and production of new forms of subjectivity) and “queer of color critique” (with its focus on “intimacy”).

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. Kahan argues that this project will contribute to work on the Harlem Renaissance by breaking from the focus on “object-choice-based models” of homoeroticism and the elision of queer experience in the black and white communities. This will be accomplished by foregrounding the development of black culture’s post-Jim Crow systems of “black carnality” and eroticized gendering, and also by comparing it with contemporary white male sexualities, which would be parsed on a scale from “white” to “not so white” (Irish, Italian, Jewish). The project will be of interest to academic audiences in both race and gender/sexuality studies; it is not likely to attract lay audiences.

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

Dr. Kahan is a distinguished cultural historian and important interlocutor in debates around race and sexuality. The panel felt the proposal, as written, would have benefited from clarification of certain key theoretical concepts, e.g., specifically how is the concept of “necropolitics” heuristically useful here? What are the key points the reader should take away in terms of the distinction between “sexuality” and “intimacy?” What is the efficacy of mobilizing Hortense Spillner’s concept of “ungendering” when such categories as the “sweet mama,” “sheba,” and “sheik” seem radically gendered?

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 previous work is sophisticated and well-received in various academic circles. The current work has great promise and there is no doubt he will complete it at a high level of quality. The conceptual issues alluded to above could be considered in a revision of the proposal for resubmission.

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

Given the applicant's publication record and the advanced state of the project, there seems little doubt that it will be completed in a timely manner.

Recommendation for Funding: Though no funding is recommended at this time, the panel encourages Dr. Kahan to consider panel comments and revise and resubmit the proposal for a future ATLAS competition.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	011ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Critical Race Theory and Science Fiction
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Isiah Lavender III
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Dr. Lavender proposes a monograph that would undertake a Critical Race Theory (CRT) analysis of the unacknowledged and disavowed whiteness of much mainstream science fiction.

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 is of great potential significance to a number of academic fields: science fiction studies, race studies, literary studies, and American studies. Dr. Lavender's writing is jargon-free and would be accessible to a broader audience as well. A broader audience is possible, too, because of a deep popular interest in the subject matter.

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

The project's conceptualization and organization appear to be at an early stage of development. The chapter descriptions are thin, with genres names and titles listed, but without sufficient accounts of what each chapter will accomplish. (The panel questions if organizing the chapters by sub-genres might be a mistake, since it allows for so little thematic development — not just reiteration — of the book's overall argument from chapter to chapter.) The writing sample is clearly organized, but the judgments it renders lack complexity and nuance, likely due to the early stage of development.

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. Lavender is a leader in the field of the study of race and science fiction, with a distinguished publication record and an international reputation. He is very well qualified to undertake 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

The work plan is feasible, but the project is still at too early a stage to fund. Judging from the work plan submitted, the panel sees that if the applicant continued work, developed the project and the proposal, and resubmitted next year, there would still be a possibility of securing an ATLAS year to write.

Recommendation for Funding: Though no funding is recommended at this time, the panel encourages Dr. Lavender to consider panel comments and revise and resubmit the proposal next year, when the work is nearer to completion.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	012ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Beginning and Decadence of the Modern Individual
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Alexandre Leupin
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Dr. Leupin wishes to investigate the problem of the “Self “as it has changed from what is described as its Christian definition to the “modern ego.” It is proposed that contemporary signs of “the fading of the ego” can be addressed by means of Eduard Glissant’s thinking. As the applicant conceives of the work, it will address a very wide constituency of readers, especially as he intends to write from a nontechnical perspective.

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

Borrowing the terminology of Erich Boeglin, Dr. Leupin describes the modern impasse as part of the transition from “theophany” to “egophany.” The project would describe the problem and its proposed solution by means of analyses of Augustine, Guillaume de Machaut, Michel de Montaigne, Pascal, Descartes, Rousseau, Hegel, Mallarmé, Freud, Lacan, Proust, Céline, Sherry Turkel (in regard to social media), and Glissant. It is clear the work would appeal to an academic audience.

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

Although, as the applicant acknowledges, the spectrum of the work is vast, considerable progress has already been made, and the plan of work is practicable, as assessed in view of the high level of productivity in the past. Given the very wide range of works to be assessed, however, a degree of conceptual compression results in less differentiation than would be the case in a monograph. Some of the generalizations made in the prospectus, for example that statement that Saint Paul “literally invents sin (as opposed to social shame)”, might replace one kind of imbalance in the secondary literature with another.

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 standing is considerable and he is certainly qualified to undertake the project. The panel is concerned, however, that the reach of the present project might prove excessive. In its current state, the work appears ambitious, but overly general.

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

The work plan as presented is very feasible, and the work is intriguing, although the Panel would have wished to see more engagement with current scholarship and more evidence that the work is well in hand.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	014ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Motherhood in Modernity: Twenty-First Century Hegemonic Motherhood in the United States
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Ashley Noel Mack
Amount Requested	\$47,496

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

The goal of Dr. Mack's project is twofold: 1) to produce a critique of Motherhood Studies insofar as the stakes around "mothering" have been framed within a "white Western feminist tradition," which has privileged the heteronormative experience of white Western women; and 2) to bring in "black feminist, Marxist, Chicana, queer, transnational feminist, postcolonial, and decolonial critics" as interlocutors in an investigation of motherhood.

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. Mack sees the book's target audience in the fields of feminist studies, decolonial studies, and motherhood studies. Surely there will be avid readers in these communities as well as lay readers of different stripes, drawn simply by the title.

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

The panel felt the project would benefit from a more nuanced *historical* understanding of the development of discourses on motherhood ("white, Western feminist" and otherwise). Marxian analysis and Marxist feminism ought to get their due up front, as the other discourses mobilized here (black feminist, Chicana, queer, transnational feminist, postcolonial, decolonial) depend on the earlier interventions of materialists linking the emergence of the nuclear family with the rise of capital.

Also in need of clarification are assertions like "hegemonic cultural ideals of motherhood in the U.S. (...) proliferated in modernity through the violent and forced colonization of the Americas." What does such colonization, typically associated with central and South America, have to do with "the logics of hegemonic motherhood in contemporary [U.S.] society?" The answer is not obvious except insofar as the applicant wants to privilege Latina feminist theory and practice. Such assertions could productively be unpacked.

Also, a summary of the "four contemporary case studies [to be examined, in which] the meaning of motherhood is circulated and struggled over" would be helpful in assessing the proposal's conceptualization and organization. The reader has no idea what these case studies entail, even by trying to extrapolate from the chapter titles and from the lengthy book prospectus - unless we are to understand that the "case studies" are named in the titles for chapters 3-6.

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 well published in her field and she has an advance book contract with University of Alabama Press (Rhetoric, Culture, and Social Critique series), although this is not a guarantee for publication. The current work needs additional unpacking and polishing to make a firm judgment about its promise.

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 proposes doing more data collection (see section 2c.) and analysis as well as writing and revision of what has already been drafted. This seems ambitious for one year, particularly given the ATLAS program's focus on near-term completion.

Recommendation for Funding: Though no funding is currently recommended, the panel encourages Dr. Mack to consider the comments above, continue working, and revise and resubmit in a future competition.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	015ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	“The Idea of the Negro”: Debating Black Protest Fiction after the Harlem Renaissance
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Bryan McCann
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Dr. McCann proposes a study of the relations between the Communist Party and black artists from the Great Depression through the 1960s, with a particular focus on the ways the Party could not come to grips with blackness, or black positionally, but instead subsumed these in its model of worldwide proletarian struggle against capitalism.

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 does not make a strong enough case for the significance of this project to his current field – Rhetorical and Cultural Studies. The problems here are that Dr. McCann does not make clear (a) what “deploys a rhetorical criticism” would mean in practice for this project; (b) what would distinguish this approach from those taken by a host of other scholars in the fields of history, literary studies, and Black studies; and (c) what the project’s contribution to the field of Rhetorical Studies would be. Indeed, the project now appears to be a straightforward literary history, and as such one that aims to enter a space already crowded with work on this topic.

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

The proposal’s conceptualization is not clear. Dr. McCann never explains how his work would contribute to/differ from a considerable body of scholarship on the relation between the Communist Party and Black writers and artists. Whose work will be “built on?” Whose work will he “extend” or “supplement?” With whose work does he “disagree?” To assess this proposal, the panel needed answers to these questions. The panel is also concerned about the intention to build chapters from readings of relatively small data samples (e.g., several book reviews). It is difficult to see how these could support strong arguments.

Toward the end of the proposal, and as a seeming afterthought, the applicant frames the project in a way that has considerable promise. Invoking Rita Felski and Bruno Latour, Dr. McCann embraces “a critical orientation ... that does not presuppose a political project.... I advocate a critical protocol that attends to the fugitive nature of discourse...” Here we see in outline what might distinguish this project from earlier work on the subject. The proposal might be considerably stronger if the applicant developed this distinction and brought it forward to the beginning of the proposal, thereby answering the kinds of questions the current proposal generates.

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. McCann has published several articles in the fields of Rhetorical and Communications Studies, but these do not in themselves indicate that he is well prepared to undertake literary historical analysis.

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

Feasibility is hard to assess for this project, given the proposal's lack of clarity as detailed above. It seems likely that the project will take longer to define and germinate than is anticipated in the work plan.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time, but Dr. McCann is encouraged to reconsider aspects of the proposal in light of the comments above and consider revision for a future competition.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	016ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Dominican and Cuban Im/mobilities in Contemporary Literature and Film: A New Ethics of Encounter
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Andrea Morris
Amount Requested	\$23,459

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

The principal concerns of Dr. Morris's project are 1) to establish the relations between migration and tourism in regard to Cuba and the Dominican Republic as national entities, as well as spaces of diaspora; 2) to explore the role of race, gender, and class in enabling/inhibiting migrant and tourist mobility; 3) to examine the impact of migration and tourism on subject-formation and community; 4) to identify and compare strategies used by Cuban and Dominican writers/filmmakers in representing the experiences of migrants and tourists; and 5) to examine the models on offer in their work for "ethical encounters in a world marked by increasing global inequities."

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

Cutting across disciplines in the arts, humanities, and social sciences, this work proposes to fill a gap in Caribbean Studies and Latin American Studies. When mapping the field (e.g., in footnote 1), the applicant, however, could clarify how her work would go beyond that of others. Still, it is easy to imagine a wide readership for a book such as this in the area studies cited above. There might even be appeal among lay readers interested in out-migration and tourism to Caribbean countries, Caribbean identity politics, film or literature, and/or current geopolitical affairs concerning Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

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

The proposal could benefit from answering the several questions: Is the main focus the experiences of migrants and tourists, hence the anthropological work of interviewing, etc.? Or is it the way these experiences are mediated in literature and film, hence the analysis of works of art? The lack of clarity here impacts organization, which would benefit from greater focus on the project's aim(s). Moreover, the implications of race, gender, and class could be brought out in the proposal. That said, there is greater clarity in the introduction provided with the prospectus, though questions remain.

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

A fair number of publications and conference papers indicate that the applicant has presented her work in serious venues and has numerous interlocutors in her sub-specialism. She seems qualified for the current work, though it needs additional specificity and focus.

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

The plan seems feasible within the proposed timeframe. In terms of writing, only chapter 2 is left to produce and then the work will be edited from beginning to end. This can certainly be completed within an ATLAS year.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time, but Dr. Morris is encouraged to reconsider aspects of the project in light of the comments above and resubmit for a future competition if sufficient work remains to be done.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	018ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Support for book project: 'Human Nature: Between Philosophy and Anthropology'
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/John Protevi
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Dr. Protevi plans through this project to explore human nature philosophically, with particular attention to anthropology. The argument seeks to establish a prosocial (that is, altruistic) dimension to human nature, and to assess philosophical accounts on the basis of that primary finding. The intended audience includes philosophers and anthropologists, as well as those interested in the intersection between the disciplines concerned.

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 deliberately disputes arguments involving biological determinism of sort that have been favored in the past. Group selection, already posited by Darwin, is revived in order to address the rise of altruism. In order to do so, controversy over the place of warfare in the development of altruism will also be discussed. This work is significant and of interest to a largely academic audience, though dispersed among several disciplines.

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

The applicant's previous scholarship dealing with philosophy and social sciences places this project at a strategic juncture. It continues that interaction, while extending the interdisciplinary range into biology. At the same time, the investigation of warfare and altruism is to owe a great deal to a forthcoming publication, *Edges of the State* (University of Minnesota Press). The reference to "expansion and refinement" of that work provoked concern during the panel's discussion.

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 quality of the applicant's work is attested by an admirable bibliography, which indicates a carefully articulated, interlocking agenda of inquiry. He is well qualified to undertake this project.

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

The plan of work is succinctly and ambitiously set out, and corresponds to the applicant's excellent record of accomplishment in the past.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time. Dr. Protevi is encouraged to more clearly define the relationship of the work in progress to the forthcoming publication, and resubmit for a future competition if sufficient work remains to be done.

Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	019ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Postcolonial Disaster: Narrating Catastrophe in the Twenty-First Century
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Pallavi Rastogi
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Dr. Rastogi's project will result an academic monograph studying works that comprise a "literature of catastrophe" in the broader fields of postcolonial literature and postcolonial studies.

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 ambitious project promises to make multiple interventions, not just to the fields named above, but also to narratology. Disaster studies is an emerging topic of great importance (for obvious reasons), and the applicant would be one of the first to approach it from the perspective of an expert in postcolonial literary studies. That said, however, Dr. Rastogi does not make quite clear exactly how disaster studies would *shift* this field instead of just offering a new topic to be studied within it.

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

Though the applicant has changed the proposal somewhat from previous iterations, it is not clear that the project has been improved, nor that the concerns the panel raised about previous versions of the proposal have been successfully addressed. The key terms of the earlier proposal (pedagogy, aesthetics, ethics) have now become "story" and "event," terms drawn from the field of narratology. While these make the project's intervention in that field clearer, they lack the dynamism of the earlier terms, which spoke to multiple fields. As well, Dr. Rastogi now posits a "disaster unconscious" similar to Jameson's famous "political unconscious," but she does not make a strong enough case for the validity or usefulness of the term. (One wonders if it is really necessary to her main line of argument.)

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. Rastogi is an excellent scholar with a distinguished publication record, including a monograph, a co-edited collection of essays, and several peer-reviewed articles. She is well established in her field, and the the promise of this project is supported by the quality of her previous work.

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

The work plan is, if anything, too feasible. The book appears to be so nearly finished that it does not require ATLAS funding at this point.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended. If the applicant reformulates the work, leading to additional work to be done, a resubmission is encouraged.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	020ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	A Documentary History of Jewish Life in Modern Hungary
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Maria Rethelyi
Amount Requested	\$49,980

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

Dr. Rethelyi is seeking support to prepare an annotated collection of sources on Jewish life in modern Hungary. While there is a good deal of work on the rich and ultimately tragic history of Eastern European Jews, Hungary has not been well studied. The audience for this work would be scholars interested in Jewish history (an active and growing field) and especially undergraduates who do not have access to primary materials.

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 is a very useful project, which deserves to be supported. It is not, however, the kind of original scholarship for which the ATLAS program was intended, so it has difficulty competing.

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

The applicant's proposal is clear and well presented. Her writing sample reflects an impressive command of the sources and the scholarly work on Jewish history and on Hungary.

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 PI has the scholarly background and the language skills necessary for this project.

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 was troubled by a certain lack of clarity in this proposal. Dr. Rethelyi does not make evident how much work she has to do on the revision of her book manuscript and whether that will occupy her fully during the period of an ATLAS grant. The panel is, however, highly sympathetic to her needs and to the circumstances that have delayed her scholarly work. If she decides to apply for a future ATLAS grant, we urge her to focus on a scholarly project rather than a source collection and to make clear how the grant would help her complete this work.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	021ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	The Pay-For: A Multimedia Rhetorical History of Modern Monetary The
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/William Saas
Amount Requested	\$48,068

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

The principal concerns of Dr. Saas's project are to 1) historicize and critique the development of Modern Monetary Theory, or MMT; 2) look at the rhetorical strategies that constitute it as a heterodox yet nonetheless coherent school of political economy by answering the public policy question: How will we pay for housing, employment, and healthcare programs for U.S. citizens?" with "public money;" and 3) draw on experience as a participant-observer, reflecting on contemporary trends MMT and strategies for the future (thus, performing as a "scholar-advocate").

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. Saas argues that the project will move the discipline of Communications forward by introducing the rhetoric of MMT as an object of analysis in the field's sub-specialism that focuses on the role of rhetoric in shaping U.S. economic policy. It is also said to represent a methodological shift in that sub-field, insofar as it seeks validation for the author as "participant-observer" and "scholar-advocate." Finally, it will present the results of the study in scholarly book form *and* documentary film pitched more at a lay audience, which would be novel in the field.

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

Among the proposal's strengths are the creative, cross-disciplinary context in which the project was conceived and the dual format for presentation of results. Among possible pitfalls are the potential for blurring the role of objective observer with "advocate" and getting overwhelmed by the dual format and incommensurate audiences for presentation of the final 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

The published piece provided with the proposal is succinct and well written. Worth noting is that much of the other work is co-authored, which may be standard in the discipline but makes it difficult to assess the prospects for this single-authored project.

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

The proposed work is overly ambitious for the timeframe, particularly given that the project is in an early phase of development. It is unlikely the project would be completed within or immediately after the ATLAS year.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time, though revision over the coming year with an eye toward near-term completion as required for ATLAS, is encouraged, taking into account the caveats discussed above.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	022ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	From Protest to Propaganda: The Americanization of The War of the Worlds
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Charles Shindo
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Dr. Shindo proposes a book that will “fill the gap” between academic and fan-oriented studies of popular culture and offer a popular history that tells the tale of “changes in American society over the course of the long twentieth century” through an analysis of four versions of H. G. Wells’s *The War of the Worlds*.

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. Shindo aims to tell the story of changing social life in the U.S. in the last century, but makes no reference to (among other subjects) race, immigration, and gender. How can this be? What history of that century can omit all of these topics? Further weakening the book’s conception is its method: the applicant begins with the text (*The War of the Worlds*) and asks, what does each version of the text tell us about U.S. culture at that time? But the sum of answers to that question will (a) vary enormously from text to text and (b) almost certainly fail to tell the kind of broad story the applicant aspires to provide. At the very least, Dr. Shindo should provide an introduction that lays out his general interpretation of U.S. history in this period, and then show how each chapter develops that interpretation. In other words, the applicant’s claim that “The history of *The War of the Worlds* is a history of twentieth century America” must be supplemented by a fuller unpacking of that little word “a”: which *particular* history is this book telling, and why is that history important?

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

Like the applicant’s two earlier monographs, this one has an elegant conception and structure: it aims to recount a very broad history through a deep analysis of a relatively narrow topic. The book’s structure is equally elegant: four chapters, one on each of the four versions of Wells’s *The War of the Worlds*. However, the chapter outline and the writing sample (Chapter Two) indicate that Dr. Shindo’s history will be too thin and too arbitrary to contribute to its academic field, and even lay audiences may be puzzled by the seemingly random choices of themes within each chapter.

In addition to addressing the problem noted in #1 above, the applicant should do more to contextualize his argument in each chapter within the relevant historiography on that topic. For example, Chapter Two seems to focus in large part on the U.S. shift from a producer to a consumer culture, and on Wells’s critique of the latter. This debatable thesis, along with Dr. Shindo’s account of the U.S. in the 1930s, needs to be placed in conversation with the work of other scholars (James Livingston, Lizbeth Cohen, Jean-Christophe Agnew) who have studied U.S. consumer culture, not to mention contemporaneous

cultural critics such as Dewey and Lippmann. The chapter relies much too heavily on a fairly casual interpretation of the radio play and just a handful of other sources (e.g., Cantril).

Finally, phrasings like “the American mind” and “the American character” make the project appear to be oblivious to the mountains of scholarship that have questioned such unitary conceptions of U.S. culture. Is this intentional?

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 publication record, teaching, and career to date all indicate that he is well equipped to undertake this project.

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 seems a bit optimistic. At this point, Dr. Shindo has written only parts of each of the four chapters. Completing the entire project by Spring 2020 would almost certainly render impossible the deepening of scholarship that the panel judges to be necessary for this project to succeed.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time. The panel suggests that Dr. Shindo revisit his approach to the project in light of these comments with an eye toward resubmission in a future ATLAS competition.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	027ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Dreaming in the Age of Reason: Sleep, Passions and Knowledge in Early Modern France
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU A&M/Leslie Tuttle
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

The origin and nature of dreams pose a particular problem within the context of the Enlightenment. Traditionally, they had been held to offer guidance, sometimes from a supernatural source; a conventional understanding of “the Age of Reason” contradicts that perspective. Dr. Tuttle wishes to challenge convention, and to “offer a useful way to think through how humans learn within a cultural setting to differentiate and evaluate their experiences.”

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 is intended to be accessible to a broad audience of readers, and therefore to offer insight into the transition from the pre-modern to the modern world.

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

The applicant brings together insights from the history of science, of religion, and of culture to consider how, since the Reformation, the mind has been conceived to function. Increasingly, a materialist explanation located dreams in an ancillary position. Of particular interest, the aim is also to factor in medieval developments in the conception of dreaming, which raised the problem of evil in a fresh way. The focus of the work on French culture provides an excellent sense of intellectual horizon, and a departure from the more expected (American, British, and German) literatures of dreaming.

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. Tuttle has traced an excellent trajectory of research, and has prepared the way for the current project. The panel raised some questions of the logical sequencing and contextualization of the narrative to be traced, but these issues did not challenge the excellence of the project.

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

Research for the work having been completed, the project seems on track to be in the hands of one of two publishers by September of 2020. The work plan is entirely reasonable.

Recommendation for Funding: Full funding is recommended for this excellent project.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	029ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Ashes in the Gutter: Politics and Culture in Chile's Post-Dictatorship Comics
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU Shreveport/Samuel Cannon
Amount Requested	\$14,726

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

Dr. Cannon proposes to write the first analytical survey of narrative comic art in post-Pinochet Chile. The book is intended for students and teachers in Latin American cultural studies and political history, as well as the broader fields of Latin American comic studies and comic studies.

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

Narrative comic art has long been recognized as a major genre by scholars in cultural studies and popular culture studies, so this book promises to make a significant contribution. Moreover, because of the specific history of Chile, and the fact that comic art is deeply engaged with that history, this book might contribute as well to memory, Holocaust, and trauma studies.

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

The proposal does not make a sufficiently strong case for the project. One weakness is that it gives no account of the contents of the chapters, nor of the reasons the applicant focuses on the particular topics treated in the chapters, nor of the reason for the order in which the chapters are sequenced, nor of the applicant's method of analysis (clearly and impressively multidisciplinary, to judge by the writing sample). A second, less important weakness is Dr. Cannon's prose (in the writing sample). While serviceable, it is often awkward, and sometimes incorrect. As an example of its awkwardness: Dr. Cannon relies much too heavily on "it is/there is" constructions that generate clauses composed not of concrete subjects and strong verbs, but of the very abstract subjects "it" or "there" and the weak verbs "is," "was," "were," and so on. The last paragraph of the sample is made up of nine sentences and includes nine such constructions. The panel recommends that the applicant try to make his prose more concise, vivid, and interesting.

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 at a very early stage of his career, but seems to be sufficiently prepared to undertake this project. In this respect, his work with Chilean graphic artists and the Chilean government is quite impressive.

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

Dr. Cannon seems to know his material well, so the ambitious timeline (writing virtually the entire book in one year) may be feasible. It would be helpful to understand the relationship between this monograph and his dissertation. What revisions is he making to the former? How extensive are these?

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time, but the applicant is encouraged to review panel comments, continue working, and consider submitting a revised proposal in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	030ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Global History of the Napoleonic Wars
Submitting Institution/PI	LSU Shreveport/Alexander Mikaberidze
Amount Requested	\$6,000

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

The series of wars that began in 1792 and ended in 1815 were centered in Europe, but included conflicts throughout the world. In this sense they were, like the Seven Years' War in the eighteenth century and the two great wars of the twentieth century, global conflicts. A history of the global dimensions of the Napoleonic wars will attract a wide audience, among students of Napoleon (new biographies appear every year) and of military 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

This is a potentially significant project. Military history, always popular but somewhat neglected by academic historians, has recently become an active field. At the same time, there has been a shift away from national and European subjects towards a more global approach. This project will contribute to, and benefit from, both these trends.

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

The proposal is well conceived and clearly (if not elegantly) presented.

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. Mikaberidze has written a great many popular studies of particular battles. He is also one of the editors of the Cambridge History of the Napoleonic Wars, a clear indication of his standing in the field.

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 an endowed chair and is the curator of the important group of materials in the Noel Collection at LSU-Shreveport. Unlike most of ATLAS applicants, he does not need support for release time. The request for travel and research, while relatively modest, is not consistent with the goals and guidelines of the ATLAS program.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	031ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	America's Worst Disease: The Killing of Yoshi Hattori and the Struggle for Gun Control
Submitting Institution/PI	Louisiana Tech/Andrew McKevitt
Amount Requested	\$40,360

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

Dr. McKevitt's project examines the shooting death of a Japanese exchange student in Baton Rouge in 1992. Since Yoshi Hattori's tragic death occurred in Louisiana, the project has a strong local connection, but because he was a Japanese exchange student, it also has global resonance. The applicant has worked on Japan and Japanese popular culture, which gives him the tools he needs to examine both local and international dimensions. It will be a scholarly book that should appeal to 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 debate over gun control remains a central issue of American politics, a fault line that divides the nation politically, culturally, and regionally. Like immigration, another hotly contested issue, gun control brings to the surface deeply rooted views on the character and direction of national life. By setting this issue in a global context, Dr. McKevitt suggests an original perspective on what is often a parochial debate.

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

The proposal is well written and carefully constructed. While the applicant leaves no doubt about his position on the issue (clear enough in the title), this is a scholarly work, with a well-defined documentary basis and a forceful argument.

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. McKevitt has completed an important book, published by the University of North Carolina press in 2017, on Japanese popular culture. He has also published a number of scholarly articles. Particularly considering his heavy teaching obligations, he has an admirable record of publications.

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

The work schedule seems feasible. Dr. McKevitt will finish his research by the time the grant begins and is very likely to have a completed manuscript in hand by the end of the ATLAS year.

Recommendation for Funding: Full funding is recommended for this excellent project.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	032ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Crime, Vengeance, and the City: How Crime Fiction and Film Narrates the Story of Contemporary Life in Latin America
Submitting Institution/PI	Louisiana Tech/Gregory Schelonka
Amount Requested	\$37,028

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

The applicant proposes a study of crime fiction and film in Mexico, Brazil, and Central America. The intended audiences are teachers, scholars, and students of Latin American cultural, literary, and film studies.

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. Schelonka does not make crystal clear what the current state of scholarship on this topic is, nor does he explain the precise contribution this project would make to that body of work. It is very difficult, then, to determine the significance of the work in progress.

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

The proposal successfully conveys a general sense of what the project aims to accomplish, but it does not explain or justify many of its choices. The panel would like to know: *Why* has Dr. Schelonka chosen to write chapters about specific topics (and not others)? *Why* are the chapters sequenced as they are? In other words, what broader argument is being logically developed by these chapters in this order? For example, Chapter Three treats works about bad cops and good cops, but the proposal does not explain why this is an important topic, how it links up with the other chapters, and how it contributes to the book as a whole.

As well, the applicant often seems to treat these novels and films as evidence or expressions of historical phenomena rather than as representations of them. He writes, for example, that "these works show the many ways in which society's wealthiest are involved in crime." The verb "show" here suggests that these works are reliable sources of factual information, which seems most unlikely. A more effective proposal would make clear that the applicant is analyzing a field of representation (of crime in Latin America), not the historical reality of crime in Latin America. He would also make clearer why knowledge about that field of representation is important – what it tells us about Latin American culture.

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. Schelonka has accomplished an impressive amount of scholarship – six peer-reviewed articles and several book reviews and encyclopedia articles – while carrying a very heavy teaching load. This record, along with his description of the research he has already done on this project, suggests that he is well prepared to bring it to successful completion.

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 drafted two of four chapters and done extensive research for writing the others. The timeline for completion seems feasible.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended at this time, but Dr. Schelonka is encouraged to consider panel comments, continue working, and develop a revised proposal for submission in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	033ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	View from the Piano Bench: The Arrangements of Johannes Brahms
Submitting Institution/PI	Loyola/Valerie Goertzen
Amount Requested	\$28,884

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

Dr. Goertzen proposes to complete a volume of the piano arrangements of Johannes Brahms, to include twenty-two arrangements of his own works and twelve of other composers' contributions. The volume will also address the histories of composition, publication, and performance. The compositional process as well as issues of sources are also of concern in this fully critical edition, in which several reputable publishers have expressed interest.

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 historical critical edition and discussion of the arrangements are recognized as key components of current scholarship on Brahms. In addition, the applicant has established a reputation that makes her a bridging figure between German-speaking and English-speaking scholars. In that the project deals with hitherto neglected parts of the repertoire, it is likely to exert a major influence.

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

The project is very strongly conceptualized, involving dealing with Brahms himself, the role of the piano during the nineteenth century, and a systematic analysis of the types of arrangement (categorized by purpose and the intended applications).

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

Because Dr. Goertzen has a career-long interest in the subject, she is poised to make a discipline-shaping contribution with the volume. A key figure in both the *Johannes Brahms Gesamtausgabe* and the American Brahms Society, the applicant's standing in the field is incontrovertible.

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

The conservative request for funding is a reflection of the maturity of the scholarship that is to come to fruition in this volume. The panel wondered whether, in view of the strength of the scholarship, a widening of scope to emphasize historical and social context might be contemplated in the interests of drawing a broader readership.

Recommendation for Funding: Full funding is recommended for this excellent project.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	035ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Southern Methodist Women, 1940-1990: Agents of Progressive Change
Submitting Institution/PI	McNeese/Janet Allured
Amount Requested	\$30,685

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

Dr. Allured has uncovered a body of materials that led her to an unknown chapter in the history of civil rights in Louisiana. This will result in a book with broad appeal, especially within Louisiana, but beyond its borders as well.

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 interconnected issues of race, religion, civil rights, and women's movements are of central importance to American history. Together they touch on problems that have deep historical roots and enduring contemporary significance. This will be an important work and of interest to broad audiences.

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

The panel was impressed by the clarity and force of the proposal. In addition to her refreshing enthusiasm for the subject, Dr. Allured demonstrates a firm command over its scholarly context and broader significance. This was among the best written and most persuasive proposals received.

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 PI was awarded an ATLAS grant in 2012 for a book that she completed as planned and which has now appeared. The subject of this project is quite different from her previous work, but has some useful overlap, both chronologically and methodologically.

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 a clearly defined empirical basis for her book and has completed almost all of the research. Considering her track record, there is every reason to believe that she will have a finished manuscript by the end of the summer of 2020.

Recommendation for Funding: If sufficient monies are available, partial funding of \$28,185, for salary and fringe benefits, is recommended. The panel notes that the travel request is not well justified and includes conference travel, which is strongly discouraged in ATLAS.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	037ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Good Shoot, Bad Shoot?: A Legal and Ethical Analysis of Shootings by Law Enforcement
Submitting Institution/PI	McNeese/Todd Furman
Amount Requested	\$49,982

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

Dr. Furman's project aims to elucidate the ethics of the use of firearms within law enforcement. The practical purpose of the study is supported by collaboration with an expert in criminal justice. Concurrently, the applicant is completing a master's degree in Applied Behavior Analysis.

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 problem of the fatal shooting of suspects, some of them unarmed, is widely recognized, and well discussed by the applicant. Serious engagement with the issue is bound to arouse interest, and this work serves to test the relationship between the discipline of philosophy and current culture.

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

A distinction between moral and legal considerations is helpful, especially since Dr. Furman proposes to include suggestions for changes of the law within the discussion. The decision to exclude racial factors in argument might be seen as a weakness and should be fully explained. The proposal to engage in case review is wise, but under such circumstances the issue of race may be inescapable.

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 established an admirable record of teaching and research, as well as an innovative approach to applied philosophy. He is well qualified to undertake this project.

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

Research and writing are well in hand, but a publisher has yet to be identified. Contextualization in terms of other work remains to be developed, and the rationale for the case studies and their relationship to one another should be articulated further.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. Dr. Furman is encouraged to consider panel comments, continue working on the project, and consider submitting a revised proposal to in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	040ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Organic Architectures: Forms of Belonging
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Adrian Anagnost
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Dr. Anagnost's project concerns a movement in Brazilian architecture that intends to encompass "ecological sensitivity, human scale, and anti-authoritarian politics." The roots of the movement, however, involve the assessment of American and Italian architects. That takes the inquirer into the designs of Frank Lloyd Wright, but also into institutional projects in Italy and Brazil. The surprising place of the Mussolini régime in the development of the movement is bound to raise interest.

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 maintains architectural rigor throughout, but also invites considerations of urban development, which the applicant proposes to explore, and the politics of design. The work is likely to attract a broad academic audience.

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

The applicant shows mastery of much of the material, although the application is for continued visits to sites, which is not fully within the brief of the ATLAS program.

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 reached an exemplary standard at an early stage of a very promising career. Data for the current project was gathered during doctoral research, the fruit of which is in press.

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 most feasible, but will probably require more time than is presently allowed for in the application. The panel also notes that the emphasis on field work remaining to be done challenges the notion that this project is near completion, as required for ATLAS.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. Dr. Anagnost is encouraged to consider panel comments, complete much of the preliminary research and field work, and consider submitting a revised proposal when the project is near completion.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	041ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Nature's Clockwork: The Natural History of Time in British Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Melissa Bailes
Amount Requested	\$49,280

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

Dr. Bailes proposes to complete a study of the “Long Eighteenth Century”, exploring “how the era’s scientific literature formulates or reshapes temporal perceptions of the environment.” The primary audience will be literary historians specializing in the 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

The project seems to be a descriptive account of a range of manifestations of its central concern (see above) rather than a synthetic argument about them. A seeming uncertainty about its core argument appears, for example, when Dr. Bailes writes that her project “pursues shifting ideas about time and the environment, as well as machines and biological life...” Here “pursues” substitutes for “argues that...” The same problem appears later in the proposal, in the chapter descriptions, where the applicant relies on verbs like “explores” and “examines” rather than explaining her argument or hypothesis.

The same might be said of the individual chapters – at least, judging by the writing sample, the central thesis of which is that “shifts in portrayals of the Floral clock exhibit changes, not only in its alignment with materialist thought, but also in the broader influence of Linnaean botany and the increasing professionalizations of literature and sciences, with implications for both poetry and plant physiology.” The panel needed a straightforward claim about why this finding is important – to the project itself, and to readers and scholars of the period’s literature.

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

As noted above, the applicant has not made a strong enough case for the significance of this project because she has not identified and offered a synthesizing argument from her materials. While each chapter discusses a relevant (and fascinating) topic, taken together the chapters do not appear to develop an argument about literature, science, and temporality in this period. For this reason, too, the sequencing of the chapters appears to be rather random. Sentences that link the argument of each chapter to those that come before and after 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

Dr. Bailes is an accomplished scholar with a monograph and numerous peer-reviewed articles published. The description of this project and the writing sample both indicate that she has an impressive command of all the sources needed for such a study. All it lacks is a clear and compelling argument.

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 drafts of three chapters (of six planned), so the timeline seems feasible.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. Dr. Bailes is encouraged to consider panel comments, continue developing her core argument, and consider submitting a revised proposal in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	043ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	'The Land Beyond the River: Palestine in the Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods'
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Ryan Boehm
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

The project deals with the southern Levant (the "Palestine" of the title) during the Persian Empire, a time of profound development.

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

Research on the Persian Empire has improved in recent years, but Dr. Boehm proposes to refine the region targeted, and to take account of the evidence for a diversity of cultures there. The project is likely to attract a broad scholarly audience.

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

The applicant will draw on his experience with the excavation at Ashkelon. The deployment of a thematic treatment of Persian impact on the diverse cultures of the region is an asset. Dr. Boehm notes that the Iron Age has been privileged in the past as a result of an interest in "biblical archaeology," but that the Persian period actually saw the emergence of the canon, as well as the composition of foundationally important biblical books. The issue of the interface between material and literary culture inevitably arises, and should be explored.

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 an excellent record of research and productivity. His previous work demonstrates mastery of the field, and he is poised with the current work to make a major contribution.

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 sound, though it seems to be at a fairly early stage. The timeline for completion seems overly ambitious.

Recommendation for Funding: The panel recommends full funding if sufficient monies are available. If support is not available this year, Dr. Boehm is strongly encouraged to continue working and submit an updated proposal in the next ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	048ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	The Animated Conscience: Interiority and Mental Life in Animated Media
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Erick Herhuth
Amount Requested	\$49,939

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

Dr. Herhuth proposes to use “conscience” (self-reflexivity) in the analysis of popular animation exceeding “particular moving image techniques,” including the robotic and A.I. The main focus is affect and self-judgment in response to the challenges of “contemporary American life.” The intended audiences comprise various media-driven fields – cinema studies, animation studies, science and technology studies – as well as practitioners in computer graphics and the animation industry and members of the lay public interested in animation.

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

By using “conscience” heuristically, the work would open a new line of inquiry in various media-driven fields outlined above. More specificity would be useful here, but it appears that the project addresses things at the level of narrative or content (i.e., the depiction of mental health, presumably of animated characters) rather than form (or as a way into analysis of form? it would be helpful to have that spelled out).

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

A strength is that the work will be presented in the dual format of scholarly book and website, both of which would comprise a kind of history or “genealogy” of the subject matter. The website would also provide a space for cross-disciplinary practitioners (artists and scholars) to present new work, which is a novel idea. A concern is that the proposal is gestural regarding the efficacy of “conscience” as the conceptual tool driving the project, although the writing sample provides some clarity.

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 multiple awards already received by the applicant suggest a positive reception of previous work. For this project, subsequent contributions to the website by undergraduates in Dr. Herhuth’s future classes, after the funding period, raises the possibility that quality could be uneven.

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 goals seem ambitious for one year. Plans for the ATLAS year include additional grant-writing, which could distract from completing the work in progress. The project seems to be at an earlier stage than ATLAS requires.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. The project is innovative, but early in its development. Dr. Herhuth is encouraged to consider panel comments, continue project work, and consider submitting a revised proposal in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	050ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Fidel Between the Lines: Paranoia and Ambivalence in Late Socialist Cuban Cinema
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Laura-Zoe Humphreys
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

This is an ambitious, interdisciplinary project that combines an analysis of Cuban films (most from the 1980s to the present), archival materials, and ethnography. It will attract readers interested in the history and political significance of films, as well as in the recent history of Cuba as it begins its post-Castro 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

Dr. Humphreys' project is potentially very significant, bringing together anthropology and film studies in a powerfully original way. While she sets out to write an academic book, it should have broader relevance. In the next few years, Cuba will become increasingly interesting and important.

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

The proposal is well written and carefully presented. The panel was impressed by the applicant's command over the primary sources, as well as her sensitivity to the comparative dimensions of her project. She will illuminate the complex interaction of political dissent, censorship, and the pressure for ideological conformity, problems that have a special meaning in Cuba but can be found in many other settings.

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

This will be the Dr. Humphreys' first book, based on her dissertation. She has published articles, including a preliminary version of the book's argument in 2017, which augur well for the quality of the monograph.

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

While the panel was impressed by the proposal and convinced that Dr. Humphreys would produce an important book, it was evident that she does not need an ATLAS grant to complete her work. She has a book contract and a completed draft. While additional work might be useful, it is not essential, especially given the high level of competition for limited funds.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	052ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	The House of the Frescoes at Knossos
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Emilia Oddo
Amount Requested	\$49,050

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

Dr. Oddo is at work on a site identified in 1923, but now subject to extensive new investigation. Although her particular expertise is in pottery, and that is centrally involved, Dr. Oddo will be undertaking a broad study of the remains at Knossos from the Neopalatial Period. Ritual function is an especial interest, and becomes an argument for how the site may be interpreted.

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 will offer an argument for the regional consideration of ceramics, yet at the same time show how Knossos was linked more broadly, in ritual and political and economic terms, within the culture of Crete. It is extremely important work and will be broadly influential, read by everyone from high-level scholars to lay readers and undergraduate students interested in archaeology.

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

The applicant has set out the work in exemplary form, and undertaken the bulk of research and writing. The project is beautifully conceptualized.

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

Peer-review of previous work has established its high standing, and the promise of quality of the current student is evident. It is worth noting that Dr. Oddo's stature is so great that she was invited to undertake this study, one of the most important in the field.

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

Submission for the Supplement series of the British School of Athens in 2020 seems practicable, if ambitious. There is little doubt, however, that this major work will be completed as planned.

Recommendation for Funding: Partial funding of \$44,050 is strongly recommended for this excellent project. The request for travel is to conduct a final check of the catalogue, and given ATLAS's limited resources should be covered by another funding source.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	054ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	The First Viral Images: Maerten de Vos, Antwerp print, and the early modern globe
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Stephanie Porras
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

This project examines how an image of St Michael the Archangel created by Maerten de Vos in Antwerp became the source of works by Filipino ivory carvers, Mughal miniaturists, and Spanish and Latin American painters. It is an interesting subject, and likely to be attractive to both scholars and readers interested in art 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

Like a number of model projects, Dr. Porras's work transcends the national divisions that once dominated European scholarship. This project will be a contribution to European art history, but also to the understanding of the transmission and transformation of European culture as it moves into a global context.

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

While the panel viewed this proposal positively two questions were raised: First, did the archival work have the depth required for a substantial scholarly work? Second, was the subject matter broad and rich enough to sustain a major book, as opposed, for example, to a long article? These concerns, as well as questions about the need for ATLAS support, led to a lower ranking among those projects recommended for funding.

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. Porras presented an impressive list of publications and has a varied background in art history and collections. She has an established record of accomplishment, with a number of prizes and awards. The quality of the sample presented speaks to the strength of the work, though did not mitigate concerns about the archival footing 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

The timetable seems feasible for the project as it is currently defined. Additional archival work, if needed, would certainly add to the time needed to complete the work.

Recommendation for Funding: The panel recommends full funding if sufficient monies are available. If support is not available this year, Dr. Porras is strongly encouraged to continue working and submit an updated proposal in the next cycle if sufficient work remains to justify ATLAS funding.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	056ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Friendship Across Religious Lines: Renaissance Jewish and Christian Kabbalists in Dialogue
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Gary Remer
Amount Requested	\$50,000

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

Christian Kabbalism has been a thriving area of inquiry, and Dr. Remer plans a systematic extension of analysis. The personal contacts of Pico, Reuchlin, and van Helmont with Jewish Kabbalists, their development of friendships and conduct of dialogues, represent an acutely conceptualized plan of advance.

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 greatly deepen understanding of the revival of Kabbalism during the Renaissance and its influence on theological discussion. It would largely attract scholarly audiences, though across multiple areas of inquiry.

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

Conceptually, the applicant builds on an extension of the data set to be considered by assessing relationships in terms of friendship and dialogue, both concepts that he has thoroughly researched in earlier work. The work, though at an early stage, promises to be both fascinating and influential.

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. Remer has a history of fine, well-published research, much of which targeted on the humanistic tradition in a way that will serve the current project. His past work and the strong, well-documented conceptualization of the current work prepare him well to complete the project at a high level.

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 itself is well conceived, but research is at a fairly early stage and continuing and the work seems unlikely to be completed within an ATLAS year. The panel would like to see what becomes visible to us, or what we learn, by examining friendship in practice. Factored into a more detailed plan of work, that would make the proposal compelling.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. The project is beautifully conceived, but early in its development. Dr. Remer is encouraged to consider panel comments, continue project work, and consider submitting a revised proposal in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	057ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Troubling Modernity
Submitting Institution/PI	Tulane/Ana Sanchez-Rojo
Amount Requested	\$49,494

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

The principal concerns of Dr. Sanchez-Rojo's project are to contribute to reception history, looking at 1) the marginal position of Spain in the historiography of western music, and 2) debates around music in eighteenth-century Spain as a way of shedding light on the specificity of the Spanish Enlightenment and its "ambivalence toward modernity."

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

Most significant to the project's significance is its interdisciplinary (see below) and its shifting of the prevailing scholarly narratives concerning Western music by writing Spain into its history. The work is likely to attract scholarly audiences across a number of disciplines.

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

Strengths include 1) the focus on reception, particularly in print culture (rather than, for example, a composer's oeuvre), and on music's public in Spain (although "low" genres and "popular" audiences are not included – the emphasis is on "high" art and "cosmopolitanism and civilization as gateways to modernity"); 2) the project's interdisciplinarity (drawing on and contributing to musicology, intellectual history, social history, early modern studies and, more specifically, Spanish cultural studies); 3) new primary sources brought to the table; and 4) little known musical compositions brought to light. Concerns include a lack of clarity around what is meant by "modernity," which is the critical fulcrum upon which the entire project turns.

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. Sanchez-Rojo writes well and the quality of previous work seems high. She seems poised to finish a coherent manuscript for publication, within a limited timeframe.

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

The schedule of work seems feasible and the project is likely to be completed in a limited timeframe.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. Dr. Sanchez-Rojo is encouraged to strengthen the definition of modernism in the project and consider submitting a revised proposal in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	060ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Disintegrating Empire: Algerian Family Migration, Welfare, and Decolonization
Submitting Institution/PI	UL Lafayette/Elise Franklin
Amount Requested	\$20,102

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

Dr. Franklin's project brings together problems of immigration, family and gender relations, and the role of the welfare state. It will be of interest to French historians but also to students of immigration, decolonization, and welfare policy.

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 lingering results of the Algerian war, the continuing efforts to integrate immigrants, and the larger problem of political and cultural identity are of central importance to contemporary French politics and therefore of enduring interest for historians. The book that will result from this proposal will be a significant contribution to an active scholarly and political conversation.

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

The panel was impressed by the rich archival research that provides the foundation for this project. Some questions were raised about the quality of the writing, both in the proposal and the writing sample. In a competition as intense as this one, conceptual clarity and stylistic grace separate the very good projects (which this one surely is) from the small group of finalists.

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

This is a revised dissertation, presented by an applicant at the beginning of her career. The dissertation was funded by the Social Science Research Council and other prestigious funding sources. Dr. Franklin has finished two articles based on the dissertation, which suggests her productivity.

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

The feasibility of her plans depends on the scope of her revisions. Some members of the panel were concerned that her redefinition of the project was overly ambitious and could not be completed within the timeframe she proposed. A first monograph often takes longer than expected to finish, and it seems likely given the extension of the original argument and the work remaining that she will not finish as quickly as anticipated.

Recommendation for Funding: Funding is not recommended at this time. Dr. Franklin is encouraged to consider panel comments, continue project work, and consider submitting a revised proposal in a future ATLAS cycle.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	061ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Masculinity and Modernity in 19 th -Century Russian Painting
Submitting Institution/PI	UL Lafayette/Allison Leigh
Amount Requested	\$20,645

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

The principal concerns of Dr. Leigh's project are to 1) explore "the detrimental effects of modernity on men's daily experiences" through the lens of various forms of cultural production associated with nineteenth-century Russian male artists (their paintings, writings, critical responses to their work, etc); 2) introduce the public outside Russia to key nineteenth-century Russian artists and their works.

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 sees the significance of the project in terms of introducing and underscoring the specificity of masculinity and its "crisis" in nineteenth-century Russia against the measure of Western European masculinities and expanding the canon of modern artists to include those in the "peripheral centers" of Moscow and St. Petersburg.

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

Conceptually, the work harkens back to gender-studies interventions in the late 1990s, addressing the theme of the "crisis in masculinity." Methodologically, it proceeds in the manner of a socially inflected iconographic study ("close readings of paintings interwoven with reference to socio-political events of the time"). In short, the work is very traditional. The book is under contract with Bloomsbury Academic, which suggests initial interest by a press, although does not serve as a guarantee of publication.

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. Leigh received her PhD in 2014, and has two publications (2009; 2014). Multiple pieces of scholarship on the List of Publications are identified as "in progress," "forthcoming," or "in press." The prose in the sample chapter submitted with this application struck some readers as excessively florid. Serious re-writing would be necessary to strike a more mature and scholarly tone.

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

The book will essentially be drafted in full before the beginning of the coming academic year – the ATLAS year. The schedule of work is feasible, but the work already exists in draft, raising questions about the utility of ATLAS funding. The budget includes travel abroad to secure permissions, much of which the panel believed could be done remotely.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	062ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Understanding Islam in France: Representations of Muslims in Contemporary French and Francophone Cinema
Submitting Institution/PI	UL Lafayette/Ramona Mielusel
Amount Requested	\$23,885

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

This project's principal concerns are to 1) demonstrate that French and Francophone cinemas replicate current mainstream media's "othering" of Muslims in France (including what is seen in television documentary), and 2) provide background on colonial and early post-colonial representations of Franco-Magreb Muslims in French and Francophone cinemas, including strategies to normalize Muslims with respect to French culture and/or to underscore their social integration as opposed to vilification, which has increased over the past 5-10 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

In addition to writing the first comprehensive study of cinematic representations of Islam and Muslims in France, Dr. Mielusel seeks to contribute to "neo-colonial" and "neo-imperialist" studies as well as cinema studies and French/Francophone cultural studies, by emphasizing "Orientalized views" of Muslims in contemporary film, which, through repetition, reinforce "islamophobia." The work will be of interest to a scholarly readership across multiple disciplines.

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

Conceptually, one of the strengths of the project is the historical approach, with an overview of filmic practices in the past to situate practices today, calibrated against developing social unrest in France in the wake of terrorism, both abroad and on French soil, and French republican secularism. While it is hardly new to assess western cultural production concerning Islam in the context of "Orientalizing," a focus on French cinema and documentary would provide a new contemporary window onto the practice. Helpful would be inclusion of a more nuanced framing of colonial and post-colonial relations when it comes to France and Magrebi populations in France. Also useful would be greater distinctions between and among the terms "Islam," Magreb populations," and "Arab populations."

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

Confidence in the quality of the applicant's work may be judged, in part, by her appointment to the three-year endowed professorship in Francophone studies, received now for a second time; this seems to come with a stipend, which the applicant has used for her research. She has also been awarded numerous small travel-to-conference grants and internal research support from a summer fund at her home institution. In terms of the quality of the work in progress, the sample chapter submitted suggests that editing will be

necessary to polish the writing. There also seems to be extraneous material presented in the sample chapter (e.g., on the careers of the actors in the productions under analysis).

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

The proposed schedule seems optimistic. Though the applicant states that she “believe[s] the project is already at a quite advanced stage,” only two of seven chapters are drafted. It would be difficult to complete the work within the ATLAS year.

Recommendation for Funding: No funding is recommended.

Merit Review Criteria for ATLAS Projects

Proposal Number	063ATL-19 (Humanities)
Proposal Title	Constructing the Woman Writer in England, 1670-1750
Submitting Institution/PI	UL Lafayette/Leah Orr
Amount Requested	\$44,102

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

The principal aim of Dr. Orr's project is to present quantitative and qualitative analysis, to establish a) the preponderance of non-literary production (religious tracts, instruction manuals, etc) by female authors in England in the late seventeenth through mid-eighteenth centuries, and b) how publishers marketed female authors to constitute an English reading public for them at the time. Other goals include expanding the definition of "authorship" for the period, to include the accepted practices of imitation, translation, revision, and editing, which "fall outside post-Romantic ideas of authorial creation;" and demonstrating the efficacy of "a reception-centered history" in the study of texts from the period, underscoring the constructed nature of authorial identity in paratexts, driven by market concerns (i.e., *constituting* a readership, to create demand).

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 is too modest in identifying the fields to which the work will contribute. In addition to the discipline of English, scholars engaged in Women's Studies, Gender Studies, early modern studies, eighteenth-century studies, and the history of the book will undoubtedly find the book invaluable.

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

The project is conceptually sound, aimed at producing as comprehensive a survey of female-"authored" texts as possible. It is also methodologically innovative, focusing on "paratextual materials" (prefaces, dedications, author biographies, introductions, etc.) and their operations in printed materials, where they work to consolidate the very readership they address as well as construct the identity of "the female author."

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. Orr's first book was highly original, and the work in progress seems to follow in a similar vein. The proposal here is well written and shows great promise for another innovative piece of scholarship.

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 is very feasible, given the current state of the work. A draft of the manuscript is in place, but there is sufficient work to do during the ATLAS year to bring the project to completion.

Recommendation for Funding: The panel recommends full funding if sufficient monies are available. If support is not available this year, Dr. Orr is strongly encouraged to continue working and submit an updated proposal in the next cycle if sufficient work remains to justify ATLAS funding.