

52^e Congrès de l'Association Française d'Etudes Américaines
Université de Lille, 26-29 mai 2020

La post-Amérique / Post-America

CALLS FOR PAPERS

WORKSHOP # 1:

Change and continuity in historical writing in the American Republic

Bertrand Van Ruymbeke, IUF, Université Paris 8 (Vincennes Saint-Denis) and Agnès Delahaye, Université Lyon II Lumière, UMR Triangle

The aim of this workshop is to analyze the independence of British colonies in North America from the postcolonial perspective of their historiographies, or the works of early national American historians. Strictly speaking, these former colonists had been freed from their colonial status and dependency through the creation of their own sovereign state, a moment whose historical significance signified both a radical break from their colonial past and a validation of their common sovereignty within the newly-formed Union. Participants are invited to analyze the historical productions of early national American historians through the prism of this tension between continuity and rupture, between tradition and renewal, to question American perceptions of their postcolonial moment. Was there a postcolonial condition in the early Republic, as Kariann Akemi Yokota has argued in *Unbecoming British. How Revolutionary America became a Postcolonial Nation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011)? What definitions and issues can be identified surrounding the terms colonial and postcolonial in the North American context? Papers could compare, for instance, historical narratives of colonization across various regions of the Republic and the British dominions, to uncover the similarities and the differences these intellectuals mobilized in their treatment of their metropolitan origins, and in the historical role they attributed to colonization in the constitution of their new political, economic and social orders, at regional and national level. Others could analyze the methodological and ideological choices and strategies employed in these early national narratives, to isolate and value certain sources, characters, and events, and neglect, modulate and silence others, in particular, indigenous sources and imperial sources critical of expansion. Finally, we invite papers reflecting on the long connections between the colonial history of the vast early America, and the history of expansion of the early Republic, beyond the historiographic tradition that sees these periods as separate, and therefore, distinguishing moments of American history.

Proposals of 300 words accompanied by a short biography must be sent by January 31 2020, to agnes.delahaye@univ-lyon2.fr et bertrand.van-ruymbeke@univ-paris8.fr

WORKSHOP # 2:

Postaposthuman: the becoming of humans and their environment

Sylvie Bauer (Université Rennes 2) and Hélène Machinal (Université de Bretagne Occidentale)

Postapocalyptic and posthuman narratives will be the two major axes of this panel. Figures of the posthuman have been present in fiction for the past decades, be it in films, literature, video games

TV series. They have been the object of critical analysis by scholars from various fields such as philosophy (D. Lecourt, C. Wolfe, D. Haraway and K. Hayles) and gender studies (T. Hoquet and R. Braidotti). Technological progress related to life science and to the digital revolution have triggered a reconfiguration of the way science is fictionalized and our hypermedia culture enables the circulation of the representation of possible worlds and of future humans. Body and/or mind are shown as enhanced, modified, reconfigured, dematerialized, stored, uploaded and the new protagonists of the posthuman scene are clones, androids, robots, AI, cyborgs and other hybrid entities. Those becomings reconfigure human identity and prompt a philosophical, ethical and mostly political reflexion on a possible transgression of binary oppositions leading finally to a post gender identity in the wake of Haraway's becoming cyborg.

The embodiments of the posthuman often propose narratives of postness determined by a temporal rupture and speculations about the end (Gervais). Techno-prophets and bio-catastrophists (Lecourt) thus imagine past-futures (Langlet) in which possible worlds (Ryan/Besson) are often worlds that have been destroyed by human agency and by the consequences of ultra capitalism leading to hopeless apocalypses. Fiction thus often becomes political when end of the world narratives raise the question of ethnocentrism and of the dominant economic model along with consumers' society. Can a post apocalyptic perspective help imagine utopian perspectives, inevitable dystopian outcomes or can it lead to a reflexion on a possible future and a reconstruction outside the frame of productivist systems?

We welcome papers on different fields of American imagination.

Please send 300 word proposals and a short biographic note to H  l  ne Machinal (ln.machinal@gmail.com) and Sylvie Bauer (sylvie.bauer@wanadoo.fr) by January 31st, 2019.

WORKSHOP # 3:

What's the Matter with Literature? Inquiry into Post (New) Materialisms in Nineteenth-Century American Studies

Thomas Constantinesco (Universit   de Paris / University of Oxford) and C  cile Roudeau (Universit   de Paris)

The last generation of nineteenth-century American literary studies has been largely structured around "turns" – metadisciplinary shifts in critical inquiry that have capitalized on their newness as the transformative payoff of their methodological provocations (Blum, 2016). Recently, the new materialist turn has taken the field by storm (Arsi  , Bennett, Farmer, Luciano, Noble...), opening a new chapter in the complex relations between literature and philosophy in the US. An umbrella term for a broad range of scholarship that attends to matter as key to events, lives and worlds in literature but also in social and political theory, new materialism intends to "give matter its due" and focuses on the materiality of humans and nonhumans alike. As turns go, new materialism has been particularly provocative, offering a means of undermining classical ontologies and consistently repudiating dualistic thinking (organic/inorganic, human/non-human, materiality/culture). Lately, however, new materialism itself has come under scrutiny, paradoxically from some of its most eminent practitioners. At stake are the problematic "origins" of new materialism as post-constructivist and post linguistic. For some critics, its challenge to dualism and demarcations seems to shut it in from questions of race, gender and sexuality (Tompkins, Shomura, 2017). Others (Ahmed, 2008) argue for a contradiction at the heart of the project to the extent that a focus on "matter *only*" ultimately reintroduces the binarism between materiality and culture that new materialism claims to challenge. So, are we ready for one more turn of the screw? Is new materialism capacious enough to accommodate a mutual entanglement

of the discursive and the material and do justice to the “material-semiotic” and the “material-discursive”? And if so, how?

Starting from Barad’s materialist lament that “matters of ‘fact’ (so to speak) have been replaced with matters of signification,” this workshop proposes to return to literature as a signifying and material artefact – to the matter of textuality, to writing as material practice – and test the purchase of new materialism anew as a mode of reading nineteenth-century US literature. Papers may address – but should not be reduced to – the following questions:

- Critics have shown that from the 1840s nineteenth-century natural science and philosophy held matter “as ever in a state of change” and that metal, rocks, stones and dust particles were all considered to be vitally animated (Arsić; Luciano). To what extent does this historical knowledge necessarily mean that all nineteenth-century US literature was necessarily post-metaphysical, or that it was somehow already new materialist? In other words, to what extent should our contemporary fascination with Deleuze, Nietzsche and Spinoza blind us to the tremendous influence of say Kant, Descartes and Newton on nineteenth-century American authors? What impact would such referential swerve have on new materialist readings of literature?

- As insightful and productive as they have been, some materialist close readings would seem to have placed the interpretive cart before the textual horse, turning literary texts into endorsements of new materialism. And yet, should attending to literary texts as materialities not also prompt us to attend to their *resistance* to our own philosophical premises? How do texts themselves pressurize and complexify new materialist readings?

- What would a *critical* materialist reading of literary texts look like? New materialist readings tend to be commendatory, emphasizing the vibrancy of matter and equating such vibrancy with agency (Bennett). As Dana Luciano (2014) has observed however, all matters are not (ethically, politically, or sensuously) palatable. The ethical potential of new materialism may also need to be reconsidered. In a world in which “the effects of matter will become increasingly difficult to ignore as the seas rise and swallow land masses,” (Shomura, 2017) as droughts and storms intensify, and as ecosystems are challenged by the mass extinction of species, experiences of transmateriality do not automatically equate with desired social transformation. Does new materialism need to take heed in the face of environmental disaster?

500-word proposals and short biographical statement to be sent before **31 January 2020** to: thomas.constantinesco@gmail.com and cecile.roudeau@gmail.com

Selective bibliography / Bibliographie indicative

AHMED, Sara. “Open Forum: Imaginary Prohibitions. Some Preliminary Remarks on the Founding of Gestures of the ‘New Materialism.’” *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, vol. 15. 1, 2008, 23-39.

ARSIĆ, Branka and K. L. Evans. *Melville’s Philosophies*. Bloomsbury, 2017.

ARSIĆ, Branka. *Bird Relics: Grief and Vitalism in Thoreau*. Harvard University Press, 2016.

BARAD, Karen. “Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter.” *Signs*, vol. 28.3, 2003, 801–31.

BLUM, Hester. *Turns of Event: Nineteenth-Century American Literary Studies in Motion*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

BENNETT, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*, Duke University Press, 2009.

CASE, Kristen. “Thoreau’s Journal and Other Matters: Some Writing Toward the Transcorporeality of Writing.” Special Session: “What’s New About the New Materialisms?” *MLA* 2015.

- CONSTANTINESCO, Thomas and Cécile ROUDEAU. "The House of Thought': Nineteenth-Century American Literature and the Philosophical." *Textual Practice*, 33.10, 2019, 1649-1656.
- COOLE, Diana, and Samantha FROST. "Introducing the New Materialisms." *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Ed. Diana Coole and Samantha Frost, Duke University Press, 2010, 1-43.
- DOLPHIJN, Rick and Iris van der TUIN. *New Materialism: Interviews & Cartographies*, Open Humanities Press, 2012.
- FARMER, Meredith, ed. *Rethinking Ahab: Melville and the Materialist Turn*. University of Minnesota Press, forthcoming.
- GOODMAN, Russell B. *American Philosophy and the Romantic Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- HIRD, Myra. "Feminist Matters: New Materialist Considerations of Sexual Difference." *Feminist Theory*, vol 5. 2, 2004, 223-32.
- HUANG, Michelle. "Rematerializations of Race," *Lateral* 6.1, 2017.
- JONIK, Michael. *Herman Melville and the Politics of the Inhuman*, Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- LATOURE, Bruno. "Can We Get Our Materialism Back, Please?" *Isis* 98, 2007, 138-142.
- LEE, Maurice S., *Slavery, Philosophy, and American Literature, 1830-1860*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- LUCIANO, Dana. "Sacred Theories of Earth: Matters of Spirit in *The Soul of Things*." *American Literature*, Vol. 86. 4, 2014, 713-736.
- . "How the Earth Feels: A Conversation with Dana Luciano." *Transatlantica* [Online], 1 | 2015, Online since 31 August 2015, URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/transatlantica/7362>
- NOBLE, Mark. *American Poetic Materialism from Whitman to Stevens*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- TOMPKINS, Kyla Wazana. "On the Limits and Promise of New Materialist Philosophy," *Lateral* 5. 1, 2016.
- SHOMURA, Chad, "Exploring the Promise of New Materialisms," *Lateral* 6.1, 2017.
- TRUMPETER, Kevin. "The Language of the Stones: the Agency of the Inanimate in Literary Naturalism and the New Materialism." *American Literature* 87. 2, 2015, 225-252.
- URBAS, Joseph. *Emerson's Metaphysics: A Song of Laws and Causes*. Lexington, 2016.

WORKSHOP # 4:

Post-Fordist Workers, Post-Fordist Corporations : Emerging Figures

Daniel Hotard, IMAGER (UPEC) & LISE (CNAM) and Donna Kesselman, IMAGER (UPEC)

Beginning in the 1930s in the United States, the « Fordist compromise » gave corporations an intermediary role between the social movement and government. Given the relative weakness of the American welfare state, the corporation emerged, through a process of collective negotiation and its subsequent extension beyond the parameter of unionized industries, as the major source of the various social protections sustaining middle-class life for the majority of the population. As for the Fordist worker, the standard was full-time blue-collar employment, maintained with the same company through retirement, for men who in turn served as the breadwinners for their families.

Beginning in the 1970s, globalization brought about trends of de-industrialization and financialization, weakening worker collective benefits which had been within the framework of the national state, while corporations ceded managerial control to diversified groups operating internationally. In lieu of a unified figure characterizing the 21st century labor market, several new

representations of the post-Fordist worker and the post-Fordist corporation have emerged from this dynamic.

The progressive weakening of the Fordist employment relationship has resulted, according to one paradigm, in a polarized labor market, with growing diversity at the extremes : on one end, a core of highly qualified workers who benefit from stable career paths and well-paid employment, often in cognitive jobs, and on the other end, an unstable periphery of workers, generally in the service industry, with precarious employment contracts and substantially lesser pay, and characterized by a disproportional presence of women and of racial and ethnic minorities. Another figure of the post-Fordist worker is that of the independent contractor who desires and actively seeks flexibility and self-fulfillment through work. These workers are often active in the areas of information technology and communication. At the other extreme, there are independent workers who operate through online platforms, for whom flexibility is a requirement to be endured. Additionally, there are utopian workers who aspire to find new ways of organizing cooperative work, rejecting hierarchy in their quest for democratic governance. The figure of the worker-resistor is emerging at the same time, with an increase in the number of worker strikes involving teachers, automobile workers and miners, so as to win back previous gains and with an increase in union membership. Whatever the sector, most work figures find themselves in a « work and employment grey zone » whose boundaries are ill-defined.

The figure of the post-Fordist corporate employer has also evolved. Work conditions are increasingly shaped by the legal constraints which weigh upon the corporation as a person regulated under criminal law. The struggle for employment rights is increasingly waged in areas concerning the discernment between corporate responsibility and the personal responsibility of the employee, in matters where employee work becomes the center of a scandal. The corporation finds itself under tension between the figure of the corrupt criminal organization on the one hand, and the figure of the well-meaning ethical organization on the other hand. The employees are under tension between the figure of the whistleblower and that of the corporate scapegoat. The question remains open as to whether these individualizing roles — along with new instruments of corporate soft law — will eclipse the more collective, union-based means of articulating rights claims in the workplace.

Through this workshop, we hope to shed light upon the emerging figures which characterize post-Fordist work, along with new regulatory dynamics and new forms of working relationships. Notably, within these dynamics and complexities, how do workers go about acquiring social protection and reconciling their working life with their personal or family life?

Paper proposals from interested colleagues are welcome. Proposals should be one page in length and should include a short biography. They should be sent to Donna Kesselman (donna.kesselman@u-pec.fr) and Daniel Hotard (danielhotard@hotmail.com) by January 31, 2020.

WORKSHOP # 5: **Translating (in) the Aftermath**

Julie LOISON-CHARLES (Université de Lille) and Ronald JENN (Université de Lille)

Since every translation implies that there be a before and an after – if only because of the sheer existence of an original and a translated text – it is quite obvious that Translation Studies provide a privileged angle from which to look at the topic of our yearly conference.

On the literary side of things, the question of retranslation immediately comes to mind: how and why should retranslation take place, especially when the first translation is considered as a point

of reference? What is the aftermath of exegetical activity around a given text, when research sheds light on the meaning of the original, or, on the contrary, when the previously established outlines of the original are being redrawn by genetic criticism? The very notion of an After is blurred, and even more so if we consider that self-translation questions the very notion of an original. Are there, at the end of the day, a before and an after at all?

On the historical side of things, does it not happen that certain societal changes encourage us to speak differently about an event, or even to retranslate texts that were written before those changes took place? How did American independence or the abolition of slavery alter social representations and terms? What impact did events such as the 1929 Crisis, World War II, the Cold War, the Civil Rights Movement, 9/11, #metoo or the 2016 elections have on the translation of America? And, conversely, how is translation into America(n) to be reconsidered?

Where linguistic evolution is concerned, from what moment and in what way did the emergence of a specific brand of American English with a lexicon, syntax, and style distinct from British English influence translators and translations? In what way have French translators and/or commentators tackled this new language?

From a lexicological point of view, what is the impact of a globalized American culture on the translation of realia? Do words like “Halloween”, “cheesecake”, and “showrunner” need to be translated nowadays and if they do not, since when? Whither translation after the technological revolution of the Internet, Computer Aided Translation and Artificial Intelligence? What are the vocational prospects in this context?

It is to answer these various questions that the workshop calls for papers by Americanists specialists of different disciplines (Translation Studies, literature, civilization, linguistics, audio-visual, ...).

The abstracts should be about 300-word long and come with a short biography of its author; they can be sent to Julie Loison-Charles (julie.charles@univ-lille.fr) and Ronald Jenn (ronald.jenn@univ-lille.fr) before January, 31.

WORKSHOP # 6:

Shock Waves: replicating events in American arts and media

Emmanuelle Delanoë-Brun (Université Paris Diderot) and Alexis Pichard (Université Paris Nanterre)

American history has often been thought of in terms of shocks, trigger, or disruptive events (the Boston Tea Party, the “shot heard around the world”, Rosa Parks’ act of protest, the crash of 1929, Pearl Harbor, the Watergate, 9/11, etc.). The American national narrative abounds in founding moments, some galvanizing, others devastating, whose specific purpose however appears to be precisely to make history, to elaborate a structuring mythography for a nation lacking singular roots and a common past. In the Colonies first then in the budding nation, history is rewritten, humanity is reinvented, civilization is rebuilt, according to a model that aims at federating a multiplicity into an imaginary unity. As the United States gains increasing influence, “America” imagines itself via a string of shock moments. The media both witness and shape the narrative, making the most of new technological developments. Press photography emerges on the battlefields of Gettysburg, television gives international resonance to the images of Kennedy’s assassination, the world witnesses live the 9/11 attacks against the symbols of American power.

These events may be political, but they can also be climatic, ecological, social and criminal. Hurricane Katrina, or the 1906 San Francisco earthquake are part of the national narrative, as are the Three Mile Island disaster, the fall of Enron, the lynching of Emmett Till, the explosion of a church

in Birmingham, Alabama, or the massacres in Columbine, or Orlando. In these dark cases however the national narrative seems suddenly to stumble, letting other stories out, other narratives that prove far less glorious.

Be it founding or destructive, the event is at the heart of the “American” imagination, either deployed, disseminated, or contested. Its shock waves infuse culture, which in turn amplifies it, constantly rethinking or challenging the national narrative. Immortalized by Longfellow in 1861, Paul Revere's ride fueled a considerable iconographic production that lives on, even to the most popular cultural products, when teen drama *Sleepy Hollow* (Fox, 2013-2017) picks it up again to correct the dominant cultural narrative of the Revolution. Imbued with new historical, cultural and political awareness, the new narrative insists on the complexity of the colonial society, whose others – slaves, women, Native Americans – require that their stories be told. In doing so, however, the series perpetuates the everlasting myth of a harmonious national narrative, couched in the stereotypically Puritan idiom of good versus evil, in the common cause of more diversity.

It is these cultural “shock waves”, and their ability to recapture, update, amplify, rethink the event and the national narrative that this workshop wishes to explore. We would like to consider how American arts appropriate an event, its resurgence, its imaginary recreation, to question the way in which it amplifies or challenges the national narrative, and the very modes of narration and representation. We welcome papers on all media -- literature, theatre, photography, cinema, series, paintings, music, video clips, installations, performances – either singularly or in connection. They can focus on a specific work, process, or pay attention to a particular event, tracing what we could call its “cultural historiography”. We also invite participants to examine how an event can challenge modes of representation, thereby (de)structuring the historical, mythographic, or artistic discourse.

The abstracts (around 300 words) should be submitted as an email attachment to Emmanuelle Delanoë-Brun (delanoee@univ-paris-diderot.fr) and Alexis Pichard (apichard@parisnanterre.fr). Please include a short biography along with the proposal. **The deadline** for submission is **January 31th, 2020**.

WORKSHOP # 7

Postsecularity in fiction: a feature of the postmodern turn?

Claude Le Fustec (Université Rennes II) and Delphine Louis-Dimitrov (Institut Catholique de Paris)

As a sociological concept originally defined by Habermas in *Between Naturalism and Religion* (published in German in 2005), postsecularity refers to a resurgence of the religious in non-institutional forms in post-WW2 secular societies. It is critical of secular constructions of reality while rejecting institutional or dogmatic forms of religiosity. In the field of literature, the term has subsequently been used to describe a feature of contemporary fiction, notably postmodern, by such novelists as Thomas Pynchon, Don DeLillo, Toni Morrison, Alice Walker, Charles R. Johnson, Leslie Marmon Silko, Gloria Naylor, Toni Cade Bambara, or Louise Erdrich. Postsecularity participates in the ontological, epistemological and aesthetic questioning of the postmodern era.

As John A. McClure has shown in *Partial Faiths, Postsecular Fiction in the Age of Pynchon and Morrison* (2007), postsecular works invent religiously inflected modes of being that remain partial and open-ended. They dramatize processes of conversion and disrupt secular structures of reality while being at odds with dogmas and fundamentalism. They also articulate the religious with progressive political projects. Their apprehension of religion may take the form of spirituality or of a quest for transcendence.

As Amy Hungerford has suggested in *Postmodern Belief. American Literature and Religion since 1960* (2010), American authors are invested in imagining nonsemantic aspects of language in

religious terms as can be seen in texts by Allen Ginsberg, James Baldwin, Cormac McCarthy and Don DeLillo.

Besides, McClure and Hungerford have shown that postsecular fiction has roots among the Romantics and Modernists and particularly in the transcendentalist thinkers of the early nineteenth century, who resolutely opposed theological dogmas and institutional forms of religion.

This panel wishes to address the post-secular in contemporary fiction as well as examine earlier forms of expression. The papers may deal with literary works or popular culture (films and tv series notably).

A 200-word abstract in English or in French along with a short biographical notice should be sent to Claude Le Fustec <claude.le-fustec@orange.fr> and Delphine Louis-Dimitrov <d.louisdimitrov@icp.fr> by January 31st, 2020.

WORKSHOP # 8:

American popular music after the Second World War: a post-racial, post-class and post-national artefact?

Pierre Arnoux (Collège International de Philosophie) and Chloé Thomas (Université d'Angers).

When rock'n'roll, followed by rock music, understood broadly as a popular form of recorded music, first appeared in the early fifties, they were seen as symptomatic of a new, "youth" culture which was in many ways cutting across boundaries. In the years following the war, early rock music was indeed thought to transcend the color line or at least to displace and reshape it; its wide-scale distribution and broadcasting also seemed to pave the way for a crossing of class boundaries; finally, the commercial success it encountered in Europe and the cross-fertilizations that took place with British and continental music scenes suggested that the genre was to be considered beyond its national roots.

In this panel, we would like to reconsider these supposed crossings of racial, national and class borders. To what extent did American popular music after WWII reinvent the color line, and to what extent did it simply mask it, displace it, or even lead to processes of cultural, linguistic and aesthetic misappropriation? To what extent did it or did it not express and enhance a form of class struggle, through its lyrics as well as through the inner segmentation of the music market? Is it legitimate to consider rock and pop music as artefacts which have kept relating to the location of their production, manifesting it, claiming it as their own, or, on the contrary, should they rather be understood as transcending it in favor of a form of cosmopolitanism?

We welcome papers based on cultural history, aesthetics, musicology, the textual study of lyrics and of theoretical documents, and the history of ideas. Proposals (300 words max.) as well as a short biography and bibliography of the author shall be sent to both Pierre Arnoux (arnoux.p@gmail.com) and Chloé Thomas (chloe.thomas@univ-angers.fr) by January 31, 2020.

WORKSHOP # 9:

US Foreign Policy in a Post-Trump World

Pierre Guerlain (Paris Nanterre) and Luke Stewart (Institut d'Études Politiques, Lille)

We are going through a new "Machiavellian moment", that is, a "great disenchantment" and an "indeterminacy of time", which blur the consciences.

Thomas Gomart in a reference to Patrick Boucheron's reading of Machiavelli

Whether Trump is re-elected or impeached, it is legitimate to wonder what will be the record of his years as President and to assess the reorientation of US foreign policy. Though almost all scholars agree on the chaos and contradictions and amateurishness that characterize Trump's decision-making in all areas, one can analyze the lines of continuity in US foreign policy that persist amid the confusion and the real reorientations. We must not forget the devastation of the world caused by President George W Bush who today is sometimes celebrated by leaders calling themselves liberals. Is chaos a deliberate Trump strategy, a kind of Nixonian madman strategy, or the mere expression of the president's psychological dispositions?

Given the number of foreign policy actors and their frequent changes in their various positions of responsibility, it is difficult to discern what might constitute a political line or a hypothetical Trump doctrine. Nevertheless, if one considers deeds not rhetoric, one can determine lines of conduct.

In this workshop we could review American policies in the Middle East and relations with Israel, Saudi Arabia or Iran. Relations with Russia, which have been steadily deteriorating despite what is portrayed as proximity to Putin, or trade and geopolitical relations with China, the only competitor for world supremacy, are central to understanding of the reorientation of American foreign policy.

The latter is partly determined by domestic American factors but also by what is known as the reshaping of power distribution in the world. This is concomitant with the rise of China, which has formed a new alliance with Russia.

The withdrawal from the Paris agreement on the environment and the withdrawal from the Iran nuclear deal (JCPOA) are two areas where the difference with the Obama administration is flagrant. Environmental decisions have the greatest impact on the future of humankind and in this area the Trump administration, in agreement with the Republican Party which is hardly a conventional parliamentary party, has encouraged a "great regression".

Among the questions that can also be considered: Does Trump put NATO in danger, or is this organization "obsolete"? Does the current administration want to break the European Union? How do Trump's campaign promises and his effective decisions fit together? Is the Trump turning point the result of an American decline or is it the cause of this decline? Does American leadership mean imperial pretensions or is it a guarantee that the world system is governed by rules and norms? Why is Trump continuing the war in Afghanistan, an asymmetric and unwinnable war that he promised not to pursue?

In this workshop, we could also tackle the evolution of American militarism and its support from both parties or question the abandonment of preferences for free trade in favor of bilateral transactional relations. The link between domestic and foreign policy is an area to be questioned, especially the increasing power of the military-industrial complex.

The task of any analyst in uncertain times is to overcome the confusion caused by contradictory statements which are misinformed and marked by the narcissism of the American president. Therefore, it will be the task of this workshop to know if the developments observed during the Trump years will prove to be a "Machiavellian moment", if they will prove durable or, on the contrary, an epiphenomenon before a return to the characteristics of American hegemony established just after the Second World War.

Send your proposals (one page) and a short bio before January 31st, 2020 to:
Pierre Guerlain pierre.guerlain@gmail.com and Luke Stewart luke.stewart@sciencespo-lille.eu

WORKSHOP # 10:

Post-object literature and art in the United States? Materialities of the dematerialized work

Vincent Broqua (Université Paris 8 Vincennes-Saint-Denis) and Monica Manolescu (Université de Strasbourg/Institut Universitaire de France)

This workshop invites papers that deal with the processes of dematerialization/rematerialization of literary and artistic works, and more generally with the relationship between works and materiality.

The notion of “dematerialization,” introduced by Lucy Lippard and John Chandler in their article “The Dematerialization of Art” (1968), highlighted a widespread phenomenon in the art of the 1960s, whose conceptual dimension seemed to take precedence over the material object. This notion was formulated simultaneously with a redefinition of objecthood, especially in the debates surrounding minimalism (Donald Judd’s “specific objects,” Michael Fried’s “objecthood”). A few years later, Lippard and Chandler’s article was followed by Lippard’s *Six Years. The Dematerialization of the Art Object 1966-1972* (1973), in which post-object art was presented in terms of concept and action. Minimalism itself played with the questioning of the art object through its insistence on the phenomenological perception of the on-looker: the object existed insofar as it became an object of experience, and not as an art object in itself. A similar argument came to the fore in performance art: by seeking to produce an “event”, performance was coming close to a liberation from the finite object. Even if the notion of “dematerialization” was and still is very influential in art historical debates on post-1966 art, it has undergone critique and revision, since “dematerialization” has never been as radical as it seems and the total disappearance of the object has not occurred. The disappearance of the object has been redefined in terms of the expansion and transformation of artistic expressions. This tension between dematerialization and materiality is central to artistic practices after conceptual art (and in its various prolongations in Land Art and performance art) up to today.

Post-1960 and recent American literature, whether it conceives of itself in relation to the visual arts or not, foregrounds similar tensions between the book as object and its potential for material transformation. The relationship between the materiality of the book and performativity was prominent for poets such as David Antin, John Cage, Jackson MacLow, Steve McCaffery and, more recently, Stacy Doris, Douglas Kearney, Tracie Morris. Issues having to do with materiality are present in the reading processes that characterize several 20th century American novelists and poets hailed as authors of proto-hypertexts (Charles Bernstein, Robert Coover, William Gass, Susan Howe, Vladimir Nabokov, Thomas Pynchon). A whole series of recent novelistic and poetic experimentations (Jen Bervin, Mark Danielewski, Percival Everett, Jonathan Safran Foer) seeks to explore the hybridity of texts caught between materiality and rarefaction. This exploration suggests a reflection on the materiality of the page (minimalist poetry, the legacy of concrete poetry), while others address the question of rematerializing digital texts within textual space (Kenneth Goldsmith, Caroline Bergvall, Allison Parrish, Danny Snelson...) in an aesthetics marked by *re* (reappropriation, repurposing, reframing). Dematerialization is an important issue in electronic literature and in postdigital literature produced in response to new technologies. Even if the break between electronic literature and printed books is not total, their relationship to the book as object seems to invite very different approaches (see Joanna Drucker on the book and digital humanities). Conceptual literature and the practice of poetic performance (online poetic performance in particular) are central to the reflection on textual objects and the book.

All these distinct approaches form a constellation of practices of and reflections on materiality in 20th century and contemporary American literature which deserve to be considered and analyzed in their complementarity.

Proposals up to 300 words accompanied by a short bio (up to 150 words) should be sent jointly to [vincent.broqua\[at\]univ-paris8.fr](mailto:vincent.broqua[at]univ-paris8.fr) and [manoles\[at\]unistra.fr](mailto:manoles[at]unistra.fr) by January 31st 2020.

WORKSHOP # 11: **Popular Culture Workshop : SUPERNATURE**

Danièle André (La Rochelle Université) and Christophe Becker (Université Paris 8 – CRHIA)

The Nature the European colonists were faced with on their landing on the American soil was from the start problematic. Indeed, up until the end of the 15th century, herbaria were copied from Greek and Latin originals without any changes. Their botanical illustrations were most of the time of poor quality, and few scientists dared say there were plants Pedanius Dioscorides, a physician traveling throughout the Roman Empire with Emperor Nero's army, had not listed. The most widely spread idea at the time was that flora had been created by God and was evenly distributed across the Earth's surface. The scientists identified plants thanks to simple alphabetical lists that were obviously not comprehensive. The plant and wildlife species endemic to America were thus problematic because they clearly proved the common belief wrong. The yellow-billed magpie, the chipmunk or the American paddlefish were maybe harmless, but their very existence called into question a whole section of what was an unshakeable religious common belief.

It is clear from this first observation that natural sciences are also based on ideology and not only on science and biology. Even nowadays, Nature cannot be dealt with without political and economic bargaining. The Trump administration has helped defeat the laws that were supposed to protect biodiversity – it has weakened the Endangered Species Act of 1973; it has revoked California's authority to set stricter auto emissions rules – and still negates global warming despite the many alarmist reports from the IPCC or the NASA.

While constantly refusing to listen to the scientific community and trying to destroy the credibility of an ecological discourse that is now biased or caricatured, Humanity, and America in particular, hints at a planet where human beings would not be welcome anymore and would be condemned to disappear like so many species before them. A new (hi)story is about to start: After the Anthropocene and the triumph of human beings' industrial genius, a period when flora and fauna, now finally rid of humanity, can grow again and evolve towards new forms through both endogenous and exogenous factors.

This post-historical era (post-human by definition) does not announce the end of the world. Instead it incites writers to question the role and situation of human beings on Earth. Margaret Atwood, for instance, imagines a world where genetically-modified organisms rule the planet then finally rid of most people (*The Ory and Crake* trilogy from 2009 to 2013), Jeff Vandermeer remembers his trip to St. Marks National Wildlife Refuge in Florida to dream up "Area X" whose ecosystem is an enigma that remains impenetrable to naturalist (*The Southern Reach* trilogy, 2004).

Several questions arise:

- Can civilization exist without Humanity?
- What is the link between post-nature and the notion of apocalypse, destruction as well as revelation (*The Genocides* by Thomas M. Disch, 1965).

- What is the form of tomorrow's biodiversity? (*Mother of Storms* by John Barnes, 1994; the comic book *Trees*, by Warren Ellis, 2014/6).
- What does the concept of post-nature say about our incapacity to understand our own environment? (the comic book *Oblivion Song* by Robert Kirkman, 2018/9).
- What is the role of popular culture in our relation to nature and post-nature? According to Selin and Pelin Kesebir, since the 1950s, nature has become less present in works of popular culture (films, songs, novels...), which shows and reinforces the break between human beings and their natural environment. Moreover, some academics (such as Lauren Holt) are interested in species considered post-natural, such as those that can be seen at *The Center for PostNatural History*, and artists, such as Vincent Fournier, imagine other post-natural creatures (White Fennec, Rain Bird, etc.).
- Which role does post-nature leave to mankind? Human beings have been overrun by Nature but does this mean we have to evolve to adapt to the new ecological niche, or will we be led to devolve? (*The Sheep Look Up*, John Brunner, 1972). How can mankind react to the existence of new species and to its obvious decline?

In a transdisciplinary perspective, the workshop is open to all approaches which may further the understanding of these questions. Proposals may put forward different fields of study and theoretical frameworks and approaches.

Proposals (from 300 to 500 words approximately) and a short biography are to be sent to both Christophe Becker (fcaranetti@yahoo.com) and Danièle André (daniele.andre@univ-lr.fr) for January 31st 2020 at the latest.

WORKSHOP # 12:

“Hyphenated literatures”: new American identities

Maud Bougerol (Université de Rouen) and Anne-Laure Tissut (Université de Rouen)

A plurality of “hyphenated literatures” have been entering American Letters since the second half of the 20th century: Asian-American, Chicano, Native American literatures, mostly, coming to widen and diversify the field of so-called minority voices, thus adding to the already large concert of Afro-American voices. Political crises keep adding new tunes to the polyphony, coming from the Middle East (Jamil Jan Kochai), the Balkans (Aleksandar Hemon, Ammiel Alcalay), or from India (Kanishk Tharoor). A relatively new phenomenon in the publishing milieu, such opening of American-English Literature may also be envisaged as an evolution of the ideal of the “melting-pot”, shaped by the course of history, and that would do justice to cultural singularities.

A great number of those works are animated by a double impulse: while claiming their belonging to the American nation, they also question and criticize a monolithic cultural vision relegating them to instances of the exotic. Said vision is challenged and refashioned from the inside, by texts that both adopt and adapt the dominant language to let minority voices be heard. Such multiplicity of more or less openly dissident voices thus works to revise the official discourse of History.

Do the currents formed by these works – if one may admit that they come together into currents beyond their singular identities and features – bring about an explosion of the United States’ literature or do they lay the foundations of a unity to come, by contributing to the quest of a more respectful balance doing justice to the diversity of the country and its population? Do they launch an injunction to the U.S., thus reminded of their democratic calling and welcoming tradition? Do they continue the Frontier tradition, giving it new forms by taking part in these American dynamics of ever pushing the limits, be they geographical or symbolical?

This workshop will lay the emphasis on the various forces coming to work on language and cultural representations so as to question the conception of North American identity. Studies may focus on the often ironical use of clichés (Percival Everett), the transformation and appropriation of literary genres and categories (Maxine Hong Kingston and, to a certain extent, Azareen Van der Vliet Oloomi); the invention of an American English merging with other languages (Chinese for Karen Tei Yamashita, Spanish for Junot Diaz), the elaboration of hybrid myths taking up the Frontier tradition into which native elements are integrated (N. Scott Momaday, among others, and, in a more oblique fashion, Hernan Diaz); or the rewriting of American History from its victims' points of view (Viet Than Nguyen). The notions of origin and belonging may be explored, as well as the distinction theorized by Werner Sollors, between “consent” and “descent,” the better to go beyond such dualism towards more nuanced visions, and above all towards processes rather than frozen postures. The questions related to writing in a non-maternal tongue, as well as the political – among others – stakes of translating open out other paths to the analysis, or again the notions of territory, anchoring, heritage and exile.

The integration of such hybrid works into a North American tradition will be addressed, as well as their taking part in the invention of a yet-to-be-defined post-America, be it envisaged as a sheer aspiration or as a reality about to be concretized. Reflections may be extended to the notions of literary canon and history: how are influences passed on and marriages and cross-fertilizations achieved? Do the victims and vanquished of History eventually find a voice according to poetic and artistic modalities, that may be the only ones able to go beyond the violence of the unsayable?

Abstracts (of 500 words maximum) should be sent by January 31st 2020, together with a short biographical note, both to Maud Bougerol (Université de Rouen, ERIAC, EA4705, maud.bougerol@gmail.com) and Anne-Laure Tissut (Université de Rouen, ERIAC, EA4705, altissut@yahoo.fr).

WORKSHOP # 13: A Post-liberal America?

Jean-Marie Ruiz (Université Savoie Mont Blanc) and Mokhtar Ben Barka (Université Polytechnique Hauts-de-France)

In many ways, the history of liberalism - both political and economic - and the history of the United States have been intertwined. From the very beginning, “English liberties” have shaped the white colonial societies, and the latter have declared their independence with the avowed aim of making America a sanctuary for these liberties. As Louis Hartz emphasized a few decades ago, the lack of feudalism and distance from London have created societies that required and valued individual initiative. Though initially in favor of classical republicanism, Americans have put their federal republic on a firm liberal track by adopting a Constitution aimed at protecting individuals from the twin tyrannies of the state and the majority. Endowed with all the attributes of the rule of law - separation and balance of powers, a (belated) bill of rights and limited prerogatives - the federal government created in 1787 represented the first experiment in liberal democracy, and one that federalism made compatible with continental expansion. Later on, the rise of the US and the advent of an “American century” allowed the Federal republic to expand its influence overseas and shape a new, liberal world order, based on free-trade and multilateralism.

Obviously, Trump’s election represents an “illiberal” departure. Not only has Trump utterly failed to promote liberalism abroad but he has openly supported its foes, and seems determined to destroy the liberal international order the United States have built in the wake of WW2. In his own country, he has also consistently tried to undermine the rule of law and checks and balances mechanism by attacking the press, his political opponents or other federal or state powers. The brutal

and sudden change he embodies is so profound and far-reaching that we may appropriately ask ourselves if America has not become, or is not about to become, a post-liberal nation.

This panel welcomes contributions discussing that proposition, either to confirm or contradict it. Three main policy areas seem particularly relevant, possibly in a comparative perspective: Trump's foreign policy (especially the promotion of liberal or illiberal democracy); the impact of his policy on the rule of law and liberal democracy in the United States; the consequences of his policy on the liberal international order.

Please submit your proposals (250-300 words abstracts) with a short bio before January 31st, 2020 to Jean-Marie Ruiz (jean-marie.ruiz@univ-smb.fr) and Mokhtar Ben Barka (mokhtar.benbarka@uphf.fr)

WORKSHOP # 14:

Postapocalyptic Fiction: What Modes of Representation on the Big and Small Screens?

AM Paquet-Deyris (Université Paris Nanterre) & G. Menegaldo (Université de Poitiers)

The apocalyptic era is one of the most hotly-debated issues in the media. Variations on the end of times on film and in TV series are now everywhere to be found ever since the major trauma of 9/11. As a consequence, adaptations and new creations are flourishing hence contributing to the creation of a new apocalyptic sub-category within the larger category of the supernatural genre. Its status is highly ambiguous in between critique of the current management of the climate, socio-economic and political crisis in a context of mass-consumption and cultural productions which are highly profitable for the screenwriters, directors, producers and distributors, on public networks to cable channels and VOD platforms such as Netflix and Hulu. Interestingly, the latter mostly try to obfuscate the absence of any real efforts to remedy the crisis.

This workshop will deal with the representational strategies of the apocalyptic disaster in films such as *Twelve Monkeys* (Terry Gilliam, 1995), *Children of Men* (Alfonso Cuarón, 2006), *The Road* (John Hillcoat, 2009) adapted from Cormac McCarthy's 2006 eponymous novel or the blockbuster *Mortal Engines* (Christian Rivers, 2018), as well as shows like *The 100* (Jason Rothenberg, 2014- , CW), *The Walking Dead* (Frank Darabont & Robert Kirkman, 2010- , AMC) or *The Leftovers* (Damon Lindelof, 2014-17, HBO) and *Game of Thrones* (David Benioff et D. B. Weiss, 2011-19, HBO). It will explore their modes of inscription of apocalyptic figures and locations and of the types of creatures these opuses create, as well as their survival and remedial strategies or, on the contrary, absence of remediation and hope, which echoes various conflicting interpretations in the current globalized society.

Which functions do these narratives fulfill when rooted in a systematized staging of the major disruptive factors preventing the return to a state of relative order and harmony? For instance which inscriptions of the new socio-political order brought about by Donald Trump from January 2017 onward do these contemporary American films or TV series materialize on screen ?

One page (or less) proposals for papers of 25mn are to be sent *conjointly* to : Anne-Marie Paquet-Deyris, apaquet-deyris@parisnanterre.fr & Gilles Menegaldo, gilles.menegaldo@wanadoo.fr by January 31st 2020 at the latest, along with a short bio (5-6 lines).

WORKSHOP # 15:

The post-welfare state: Trajectories of solidarity in contemporary America

Marion Douzou (Université Lyon 2) and Elisabeth Fauquert (Université Paris I)

Over the past two decades, the concept of a “post-welfare state” has gained significant traction in academia. This concept presupposes that the 20th century US welfare state, that is the collection of responsibilities that befall on the state to ensure the social and economic welfare of its citizens, is undergoing rapid and deep transformations. Indeed, US social reformers and political leaders seem to have come to a crossroads, at which they are tasked with the arduous responsibility to strike a balance between the inherited welfare state and ever-changing demands for social provision. The causes (and strains) at the heart of the advent of the US “post-welfare state” and the redefinition of solidarity fall within three broad categories.

The first set of causes has to do with the changes in the labor market. In a country in which social protection is neither dependent on citizenship nor universal, disruptions in employment (induced by globalization, economic crises and austerity), have raised numerous dilemmas on the best course to reshape and rethink the structures of solidarity. Paul Pierson identified several “post-industrial shifts” which have caused severe pressures on “mature” welfare states: the shift from manufacturing to services; the maturation of governmental commitments; the transformation of household structures, and population ageing. These structural changes have created renewed challenges for political leaders and social reformers alike (Pierson, 2001).

The second category of causes has to do with ideological transformations. The shift from a Keynesian to a neoliberal paradigm of social protection has been amply documented. From the 1960s onward, the two cornerstones of the legitimacy of the welfare state, the legitimacy of state intervention and fiscality, have been the object of repeated attacks. The latter were waged by an *ad hoc* coalition of forces which include libertarianism; the New Right; social and fiscal conservatism; the business community and *think tanks*. This coalition has supported limited government, limited social expenditures, and encouraged a return to voluntarism and local responsibility in social provision. The retrenchment of the welfare state has created a hostile terrain for reformers: by “starving the federal beast”, underfunded social and welfare programs appeared inefficient, which, in turn, justified more public retrenchment; in parallel, the monetarist fiscal policy supported by the Republican party (cutting taxes on the wealthy) reduced the public resources needed to support or create new programs, furthering the dilemmas of social reformers.

The third and last category of causes have to do with political transformations. The Democratic party has historically defended a more robust welfare state than the Republican party. However, the gradual realignment of the Democratic party towards the center of the political chessboard has made the defense of inherited social solidarity arrangements more difficult. While “entitlement programs” such as Social Security and Medicare still enjoy some degree of protection from the political elite, welfare programs and more generally the US safety net has eroded considerably both under democratic and republican administrations (Daguerre, 2017). The Obama administration has attempted to rehabilitate both the state and fiscality, but was relentlessly attacked for doing so, as the battle surrounding the adoption and implementation of the *Affordable Care Act* testifies.

The aim of the proposed panel would be to study the trajectories of solidarity and the redefinitions of the social contract in the contemporary United States. This field of inquiry seems topical for various reasons.

Firstly, studying the US “post welfare state” matters for scientific reasons. The US has historically been conceptualized as a “social laggard”, a country naturally bent on individualism and self-reliance. Many US scholars such as Judith Agassi (1991), Theda Skocpol (1992), Christopher

Howard (1997), Laura Jensen (2003) and Suzanne Mettler (2011) have attempted to put these culturalist and eurocentric analyses to the historical and structural test. What these scholars show is that the US was never hostile to the idea of social protection and solidarity; they account for the development of a “hidden”, “submerged” US welfare state which is very large, but whose social provisions are almost invisible to their beneficiaries. From this perspective, it might be interesting to analyze to what extent the concept of “post-welfare state” is Eurocentric, and to what extent it applies to the US context.

Secondly, studying the US “post welfare state” matters because it would refine our understanding of the current trajectories in intellectual history. In the current hyperpolarized political landscape, at least two distinct paths of solidarity have consolidated. Following F. Hayek in the *Road to Serfdom* and B. Goldwater and his defense of voluntarism in *The Conscience of a Conservative*, many conservatives argue that the welfare state destroys both the economic and social fabric. To put it in the words of Tom G. Palmer in his book *After the Welfare State* (2012): “*Young people today are being robbed. Of their rights. Of their freedom. Of their dignity. Of their futures. The culprits? My generation and our predecessors, who either created or failed to stop the world-straddling engine of theft, degradation, manipulation, and social control we call the welfare state.*”

In parallel, new voices have emerged to call for a social protection renaissance in the era of the “new gilded age”. Some scholars like Jacob Hacker and Paul Pierson have waged a battle on what they call “American Amnesia” (2016), tying the war on government with skyrocketing inequalities that the US welfare state no longer has the resources and capacities to address. Civil society and political leaders have also been the vector of a programmatic redefinition of the US social contract: social movements such as Fight for Fifteen or the defense of a universal public health insurance (most famously championed by Bernie Sanders) attest to the challenges levelled against a deeply unequal status quo. One should note that this schematic distinction between conservatives and liberals does not account for the overlap between the two poles, which is a function of the categorical protection at the heart of the US welfare state. Indeed, categorical social protection has created situations in which Tea Partiers and then candidate Donald Trump defended popular social programs such as Social Security and Medicare, on a par with political reformers who identified themselves as liberals.

Thirdly and lastly, this panel would be the opportunity to reflect collectively on the future of solidarity in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis: the rise of the gig economy and of the precariat; the decline in union membership and the erosion of the safety net are some of the issues that need to be analyzed in a country which has historically tied social protection to work.

This panel will welcome contributions exploring the following themes: the future of the safety net ; new voluntarism; philanthropy; faith-based initiatives; the decline in union membership; the future of entitlement programs; solidarity in the gig economy; the influence of expertise on the redefinition of social priorities; social provisions for the precariat; socialist thought in the contemporary US... While the goal of this panel is primarily to focus on redefinitions of the US welfare state in the 2000s and the 2010s, the panel also welcomes proposals which offer historical perspective on the topic.

Abstracts (approximately one page long with a short biography of the author) should be sent before January 31, 2020 to Marion Douzou: m.douzou@univ-lyon2.fr and Elisabeth Fauquert: elisabeth.fauquert@univ-paris1.fr

WORKSHOP # 16:

Intermediality as Post America or creative reinterpretation?

Isabelle Labrouillère, (ENSAV, Ecole nationale supérieure de l'audiovisuel, Toulouse) and Anne-Catherine Bascoul (Université de Cergy-Pontoise)

Intermediality, or the mixing of several media can be seen as a symptom of Post America and reflects a crisis of representation and a questioning of the subject. At the end of the 20th century, the use by cinema of patrimonial figures can be interpreted as a loss of the affects already questioned in the 60s by Fredric Jameson in his founding book *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. In Jameson's view, the number of artworks more and more cut from reality¹ manifests the death of the subject and the rising of new subjectivities, synonymous with the decadence of postmodernism. A film like *Maps to the Stars* by David Cronenberg, released in 2014, can be read as an illustration of Jameson's theories. A violent accusation against Hollywood, the film denounces the deviations of an industry enclosed in a logic of imitation which, far from the Aristotelian mimesis, keeps promoting new objects devoid of creative transformation.

Yet, it seems that the concerns expressed by the representation of the subject in postmodernism are more than ever at the core of issues raised in every artistic domain. Works of art today cannot be dealt with outside a network structure. As Jay Bolter and Richard Grusin remind us, "[no] medium today, and certainly no single media event, seems to do its cultural work in isolation from other media, any more than it works in isolation from other social and economic forces."² The questioning initiated by the postmodern movement – postpostmodernism, hypermodernity, metamodernity – is now spreading to all the cultural fields. In literature for instance, novels like Richard Powers's *The Gold Bug Variations*, Jennifer Egan's *A Visit from the Goon Squad*, Ellen Feldman's *The Boy Who Loved Anne Frank* or W.G. Sebald's *Austerlitz*, resort to images, music, all forms of texts or new technologies in a pervasive way. The questions dealing with inter/intra/multitextuality are now part of new artistic propositions, and we may wonder whether they take part in an entropic movement or in a creative rhizomatic abundance.

In this perspective, different issues, mainly in the fields of literature and audiovisual media, will interest us:

- Should we see, in today's abundance of intermedial propositions, the sign of a postmodern logic at its worst, or should we consider, along with theoreticians like Barbara Maria Stafford, Jay Bolter, Richard Grusin, Justin Wyatt or Angela Ndalians, at the origin of the post classical or neo baroque theory, that they are means of rewriting and revitalizing former medial forms?
- Shouldn't we consider a redefinition of the subject, founded on the complex transformation of how we relate to representation? Indeed, the multiplication of media has transformed our ways of "consuming," images in particular, and has turned us into hyperconnected beings in such a way that the concept of "spect/actor"³ is now being developed in relation to these new modes of interaction with the image.
- Must intermediality be perceived, in accordance with the prefix post used in post-America, as a form of transition oscillating between destruction and reconstruction or as a possible renewal leading to the advent of new paradigms?

Proposals, in English or French, (200-300 words) along with a short bio should be sent to ilabrouillere@yahoo.fr and anne-catherine.bascoul@u-cergy.fr by January 31st, 2020.

¹ This new relation to reality is not without reminding us of the concept of hyperreality as developed by Jean Baudrillard.

² J.D. Bolter and R. Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, Cambridge (MA), The MIT Press, 2000, 15.

³ Armand Amato, Etienne et Jean-Louis Weissberg. « Le corps à l'épreuve de l'interactivité : interface, narrativité, gestualité. », *Interfaces, Anomalie digital_arts*, n°3, 2003, sous la direction de Aktypi Madeleine, Lotz Susanna et Quinz Emanuele. Last consulted 10/01/2018.

WORKSHOP # 17:

Post-Scriptum America: Trace, Reversibility and Climate Change

Thomas Dutoit (Université de Lille) and Cécile Roudeau (Université de Paris)

The purpose of this panel is to address, post-scripturally, the specifically fossil-fuel driven “motion” referred to in the 2020 AFEA Congress’s “call” (“The history of the United States has been defined by an ideology of motion”). Under the highly problematic equation “Post-America”/ “Post-United States”, “post-” here refers to a consequence (the climate-changed atmosphere) that in large measure originated in an “American way of life” redefined post-scripturally, as in an obsequy, as a dead-end. What if post-scripturality (the structure and genesis of the post-scriptum) writes the narrative with which to comprehend the United States as a Post-United States? What if post-scripturality is the awareness of the results of petro- or fossil-fuel culture?

Jacques Derrida’s essay, “Freud and the Scene of Writing” (1967), introduces the post-scriptum as a concept through the figure of a mole:

The metaphor of the breached path, so frequent in Freud’s descriptions, communicates always with the theme of *supplementary postponement* and of reconstitution of meaning *afterwards*, *after* a mole’s path-making, after the subterranean labor of an impression. This latter left a working trace that has never been *perceived*, lived in its meaning presently, that is to say, consciously. The post-scriptum that constitutes the past present as such does not, as perhaps Plato, Hegel and Proust thought, merely wake up the past present or reveal it in its truth. The post-scriptum produces the past present.

We posit that climate change is this post-scriptum. The movement of the mole is underground, invisible, until it has already occurred. The underground labor of the impression implies that the work of the trace was itself not perceived, was not conscious. It is only because after the inscription we add a note to it, a post-scriptum, that we know about it. Knowledge comes after the fact. Repetition, the post-scriptum, is what produces the inscription. In that sense, the so-called first time, the moment of the forcing or the tracing (“American motion,” if one will), is only produced by reversibility itself, the backward or reverse movement that constitutes the post-scriptum.

Post-scripturality illuminates our past and present, our “past present.” What we know about fossil fuel extraction over the past 230 years alters what we hitherto thought we knew about these past 230 years, but the production of this new knowledge also erases the knowledge we had about our extractivist period. The post-scriptum, i.e. climate-changed truth, not only produces the past present as truth (of CO₂ and CH₄ on the Keeling Curve), but erases it as truth (of the “ideology of motion”). The truth that is emerging as *simultaneously* what erases the readability of all our narratives of the past present and what produces a radically different narrative of the past present is baffling; it alters or revises our notions of identity itself no longer defined as based on subjectivity or individuality.

Climate change is the afterword, and the afterward, to an extractivist period. This afterword, and afterward, is the time we live in, the time of the supplement. This afterword, or afterward, requires another foreword and forward: a radical re-writing of history (“Post-America”), a new position of what is understood under the name of temporization and under the so-called “non-temporality” of the unconscious. In his essay, Derrida returns to Freud’s “sexual postponement” and the “unconscious” sexual identity of early childhood. We propose that climate change is analogous to this unconscious during the period of fossil-fuel addiction, but unconscious does not mean *absolutely* repressed. Timothy Clark’s work on emergent unreadability argues that this unconscious does express itself during our past 230 years, especially but not only now from our vantage point. In the case of sexuality, this unconscious is the knowledge of the primitive scene. What is the unconscious knowledge in the case of climate change? The unconscious is only considered or defined as non-temporal by opposition to a common concept of time. This concept of time is mechanical. It is a time understood, dogmatically, in terms of consciousness. If time is redefined according to the movement between an initial happening and its post-scriptural constitution as present, then climate change awareness is to

this very unconscious what that non-temporality is to the vulgar concept of time. In other words, climate change awareness is not only today in its obvious conscious manifestations. When it began, it was already in time.

This panel calls for papers that re-read the long nineteenth “American” or United States culture according to this post-scriptum, papers that follow the mole-like traces left by the emergence and installation of fossil-fuel culture. Papers might follow the literary leads from Timothy Clark’s accounts of “emergent unreadability” or “scalar effects” (Clark 2015) that stress how we occupy a “shadowtime,” a time of at least two scales—one the “ideology of motion” we grew up on, the other its incontrovertible revelation as fossil-fuel driven and causing mass extinction (Clark 2019). Or, contributors might want to adapt to “the American scene” Jesse Oak Taylor’s study of British fiction in which climate itself is shown to be an art work, “the sky of our manufacture,” and literary art part and parcel with climate change (Oak Taylor 2016). The tools developed by Clark, Oak Taylor, and others generate “Anthropocene Reading” (Menely, Oak Taylor 2017) for American or U.S. writers across the long 19th century. Other approaches could, following works such as Richard Powers’ *The Overstory* (2018), study how literature is changing its inheritance from this same 19th century, not only thematically but also in the form literary composition takes. Still other approaches, following historians such as Dipesh Chakrabarty (Chakrabarty 2009, 2019), or earth system scientists (Lewis and Maslin 2018) could return to archives (historical, geological, philosophical) in order to reflect upon how the present anthropogenic climate catastrophe was already, year after year after year, recorded in them.

500-word proposals and short biographical statement to be sent before **31 January 2020** to: thomas.dutoit@univ-lille.fr and cecile.roudeau@gmail.com

Selective bibliography:

- ANGUS, Ian. *Facing the Anthropocene: Fossil Capitalism and the Crisis of the Earth System*. New York: Monthly Review P, 2016.
- BEHRINGER, Wolfgang. *A Cultural History of Climate*. Cambridge: Polity P, 2009.
- CHAKRABARTY, Dipesh. “The Climate of History: Four Theses.” *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2009, pp. 197–222.
- , “Humanities in the Anthropocene: The Crisis of an Enduring Kantian Fable,” *New Literary History*, 47 (Spring/ Summer 2016), 377-97.
- , “The Planet: An Emergent Humanist Category,” *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 46, 2019, pp. 1-31.
- CLARK, Timothy. *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and the Environment*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.
- . (Ed.) *Deconstruction, Environmentalism, and Climate Change*. Special issue of the *Oxford Literary Review*, vol. 32, no. 1, July 2010, pp. 1-167.
- . (Ed.). *Deconstruction in the Anthropocene*. Special issue of the *Oxford Literary Review*, vol. 34, no. 2, Dec. 2012, pp. 165-338.
- . *Ecocriticism on the Edge*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015.
- . (Ed.) *Overpopulation*. Special issue of the *Oxford Literary Review*, vol. 38, no. 1, July 2016, pp. 1-171.
- . *The Value of Ecocriticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2019.
- COHEN, Jeffrey Jerome and Lowell Duckert (Eds.). *Veer Ecology: A Companion for Environmental Thinking*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2017.
- COHEN, Tom (Ed.). *Telemorphosis: Theory in the Era of Climate Change, Vol. 1*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan Library, 2012.
- DIMOCK, Wai Chee. *Through Other Continents: American Literature Across Deep Time*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006.

- GARDINER, Stephen Mark. *A Perfect Moral Storm: The Ethical Tragedy of Climate Change*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011.
- HAMILTON, Paul. *Defiant Earth: The Fate of Humans in the Anthropocene*. Cambridge: Polity P, 2017.
- HANSEN, James. *Storms of My Grandchildren: The Truth about the Coming Climate Catastrophe and Our Last Chance to Save Humanity*. New York: Bloomsbury USA, 2009.
- LATOURE, Bruno. *Face à Gaïa: huit conférences sur le nouveau régime climatique*. Paris: La Découverte, 2015.
- LEWIS, Simon A. and Mark Maslin. *The Human Planet. How We Created the Anthropocene*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2018.
- MARSHALL, George. *Don't Even Think about it: Why Our Brains Are Wired to Ignore Climate Change*. New York: Bloomsbury USA, 2014.
- MENELY, Tobias and Jesse Oak TAYLOR (Eds.). *The Anthropocene Reading: Literary History in Geologic Time*. University Park: Penn State UP, 2017.
- MILES, Malcolm. *Eco-Aesthetics: Art, Literature and Architecture in a Period of Climate Change*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
- MOORE, Jason (Ed.). *Anthropocene or Capitalocene?: Nature, History, and the Crisis of Capitalism*. Oakland: PM Press, 2016.
- MORTON, Timothy. *The Ecological Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2010.
- . *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2013.
- NIXON, Rob. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2011.
- OAK TAYLOR, Jesse. *The 'Sky of Our Manufacture'. The London Fog in British Fiction from Dickens to Woolf*. Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 2016.
- RUDDIMAN, William F. *Plows, Plagues, and Petroleum: How Humans Took Control of Climate*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.
- SEMALS, Luc. *Face à l'effondrement. Militer à l'ombre de la catastrophe*. Paris : PUF, 2019.
- SZEMAN, Imre, Adam Carlson, Sheena Wilson. Eds. *Petrocultures. Oil, Politics, Culture*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP 2017.
- THOMASHOW, Mitchel. *Bringing the Biosphere Home: Learning to Perceive Global Environmental Change*. Cambridge: The MIT P, 2002.

WORKSHOP # 18:

Post-White America?

Cécile Coquet (Université Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines), Pierre Cras (Université Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines) et Nicolle Herzog (Université de Tours)

By the turn of the twentieth century, two dominant trends in the demographic evolution of the population of the United States of America—the natural increase of Americans of Hispanic descent and the access of multiracial individuals to more accurate self-definition on census forms—prompted many demographers and sociologists to herald the “browning” or “beigeing” of America in the twenty-first century. The claims laid by historian David Hollinger about cosmopolitanism becoming the new norm⁴, or by cultural critic Touré that the millennial generation of Black Americans could transcend assignation to a single racial identity that erased their ethnic and individual singularities⁵, have been promptly dismissed as utopian and misguided in their blindness to the persistence of

⁴ David Hollinger, *Post-Ethnic America : Beyond Multiculturalism*, New York: Basic Books, 1995.

⁵ Touré, *Who's Afraid of Post-Blackness? What it Means to Be Black Now*, New York: Free Press, 2011.

institutional racism in the social mechanisms and fabric of the country, particularly as these affect poor communities of color and racialized LGBTQ+ Americans. More recently, the presidential campaign of 2016 seems to have offered durable avenues to the unfiltered expression of White backlash, pitting White supremacists and nationalists fearful of the so-called “Great Replacement” against “antifas” who may still be regarded with some suspicion by #BlackLivesMatter activists, as the latter doubt the ability of the dominant to actually listen to the subaltern.

Meanwhile, the increasing numbers of US-born children being raised by foreign-born parents who identified in terms of nationality rather than just race in the 2010 census may be an indication that not only are racial categories felt to be too broad to adequately reflect the variations within any given group, but that new generations of Americans are unwilling to buy into the belief that identifying as White will give them protection from discriminatory policies. Furthermore, class-based othering within Whiteness expressed by terms like “White trash”, “hillbilly”, and “redneck” complicate monolithic interpretations of Whiteness, further upending understandings of Whiteness as protection and privilege in the view of Whites anxious about losing their political and social standing.

This workshop seeks to interrogate the possibility of imagining—and actually visualizing—a post-White America, as opposed to a “post-racial” one which would simply mask the socio-economic structures of White supremacy, negating the class- and race-based origins of residential and educational (self-)segregation, job insecurity, differential access to health care or mass incarceration, in order to preserve the status quo. It welcomes the contributions of scholars of critical race theory, Whiteness studies, ethnic studies, mixed-race studies, and gender and sexuality studies, as well as historians, geographers, political science specialists, demographers and film and media studies.

Please send your abstract (500 words maximum) and a short bio by January 31, 2020 to cecile.coquet-mokoko@uvsq.fr, pierre.cras@uvsq.fr, and nicolle.herzog@univ-tours.fr.

WORKSHOP # 19: **Postwar Poverty in the United States**

Tamara Boussac (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales) and Esther Cyna (Columbia University – Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris 3)

After World War II put an end to the financial crisis of the 1930s, the 1950s were a decade of unprecedented prosperity in the United States. As economic growth reached record highs, a great number of Americans gained access to the middle class and became property owners in newly developed, sprawling suburbs. However, postwar America was also defined by the paradox of persisting poverty in the “affluent society,” as economic John Kenneth Galbraith put it in 1958. The 1950s did not eradicate poverty, and despite economic growth, an increasing number of people received financial support from public assistance. Americans “rediscovered poverty” in the early 1960s as political scientist Michael Harrington’s work shed light on rural poverty in white Appalachia and as the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations launched an “unconditional war on poverty,” which did not survive the conservative ascendancy and the neoliberal turn of the 1970s.

This workshop seeks to investigate poverty in the postwar United States. With the paradox of poverty in an era of economic prosperity as its starting point, the workshop will facilitate discussions

about the uneven distribution of capital and the evolution of welfare reform in the country. It will also include reflections on the material and cultural dimensions of poverty.

Although poverty is here primarily analyzed as an economic condition, that is to say the lack of sufficient resources to meet one's basic needs, the workshop will emphasize the complexity of the term and its connotations in the specific social context of the United States. The meaning of poverty has ignited heated political and scholarly debates, most prominently through Oscar Lewis' social theory of a "culture of poverty" in the early 1960s, which pathologized poverty as a negative value system. Competing definitions and understandings of poverty have held deep implications for social policy and public discourse. In the early 1970s, after a series of watershed Supreme Court decisions that established significant gains in civil rights, the United States' highest court ruled in *San Antonio v. Rodriguez* that the poor were not a protected category: as opposed to race, religion, gender and nationality, the Court did not consider wealth to be a suspect class. The workshop directly asks why U.S. institutions have resisted class-based analyses.

The long chronological perspective that this workshop takes will allow participants to study the evolution of public policy and public discourse over time to identify continuities as well as turning points since the postwar era. Did social policy work to reduce inequality or did it strengthen patterns of social exclusion? How have race and gender contributed to a stigmatization of the poor in the United States? How are the poor depicted in the media and in cultural productions? Proposals on the disciplinarian turn in social policy and on the criminalization of poverty in the 1970s after the War on Drugs and the policy of mass incarceration are particularly welcome. How does space come into play in poverty? How does urban poverty differ from rural poverty? Finally, how have poor people organized to defend their rights? Do current social movements mobilize the notion of poverty? The panel is looking to explore—but is not be restricted to—those questions. Proposals on the contemporary period are also welcome.

Paper proposals (one page maximum) with a short bio to be sent to Tamara Boussac (tamara.boussac@gmail.com) and Esther Cyna (cynaesther@gmail.com) by January 31st, 2020.

WORKSHOP # 20:

Post-9/11 Arab-American Literature

Karim Daanoune (Université Bretagne-Sud, Lorient) and Salah El Moncef (Université de Nantes)

This panel focuses on the literary works—poetry, fiction, non-fiction, drama, or graphic novels—published by Arab-American writers after 9/11. The attacks perpetrated on American soil in a "sky awash in the false comfort of blue" as poet Lena Khalaf Tuffaha wrote, suddenly put Arab-Americans at the forefront of scrutiny by the public and by the legislative and security apparatuses of the state. Considered up to that day as one of the least visible ethnic minorities in the USA—Joana Kadi went as far as to call them "the Most Invisible of the Invisibles"—they have become the target of negative perceptions defining them as a radically disloyal and antagonistic presence within the United States of America. From the poetry of Suheir Hammad—notably her viral "First Writing

Since”—to the works of Samuel Hazo and D. H. Melhem, what is striking about this literature, besides its reflection on shock and mourning, is the fear of potential retaliation directed towards the Arab community living in the US.

Since the attacks brought about a traumatic rift between a before and an after 9/11, novelist Laila Halaby in her post-9/11 novel *Once in a Promised Land*, uses and abuses that chasm by opening her novel with a prologue entitled ‘before,’ the purpose of which is to render the supersession of that (by now) famous fixture of American airport: the TSA agent. Body searching and questioning are now applied to the readers: in order to enter this particular piece of Arab-American fiction, they find themselves having to be “relieved of their excess baggage,” namely, their prejudices and stereotypes. Halaby captures the suspicious atmosphere weighing down the lives of Jordanian-American Salwa and her husband Jassim. Post-9/11 America will bring an end to *their* American dream when FBI agents begin to investigate Jassim on the sole ground of his ethnic background. Indeed, as direct consequences of 9/11, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the implementation of the Patriot Act have increased the stigmatization of Arabs and Muslims, effectively turning them overnight into putative anti-Americans.

Once they have become (hyper)visible, these “Other Americans,” to borrow the title of Laila Lalami’s latest novel have also ironically brought to light the existence of a group of prolific artists eager to voice the concerns and defend the rights of the Arab community living in the US but also to call into question American foreign policy in the Middle-East. Some critics even argue that 9/11 literally gave birth to Arab-American drama and its most eloquent representative, Yussef El Guindi who, thanks to humor, has ceaselessly been deconstructing stereotypical representations aiming at either delegitimizing the Americanness of Arab-Americans or intensifying their supposed intrinsic “violence.” In all its diversity, post-9/11 Arab-American literature takes a stand against such essentialist, simplistic and ultimately Islamophobic and xenophobic representations, inviting readers to reflect upon the possibility of a common destiny, an idea that protean artist Etel Adnan has been suggesting throughout her career: “*To be an Arab is already being a bit an American. And being an American is already being almost an Arab, even without knowing it. Americans are a nomadic people. Arabs are a nomadic and restless people. Both are restless and reckless.*” Presentations may address the consequences of 9/11 on the Arab-American community or any other aspects of that community and its literary production.

Abstracts in English or French, of roughly 250 to 300 words, along with a short biography are to be sent to Karim Daanoune (karim.daanoune@univ-ubs.fr) and Salah El Moncef (salah@salahelmoncef.com) before January 31st, 2020.

WORKSHOP # 21: Post-identity and Social Movements

Guillaume Marche and Antoine Serval (University of Paris-Est Créteil, IMAGER)

Since the beginning of the 2000s, it has become more and more usual to consider that the United States has become a post-identity society. This idea has triggered vivid debates in the media as well as in academic and activist circles. This panel does not aim to answer the question of whether the United States has actually entered a post-identity stage, but rather to examine what the debate itself entails for social movements. Does the post-identity debate lead social movements to move

beyond, ignore, or transform identity politics? Does it require the adoption of post-movement modes of action?

To a large extent, the social movements that emerged in the mid-twentieth century were mobilized and structured around the collective identities of minority or subordinated groups—be it in terms of race, ethnicity, sex, gender, or sexuality. The impact of these social movements has led to deep changes in social relations, politics, and cultural representations. Hence two types of questions arise: 1) have proponents of post-identity implemented or recommended forms of collective action that are a significant departure from those inherited from the twentieth century? 2) Has the very existence of this debate constrained social movements to restructure, reconstruct, or rethink their practices and, if so, how? One may also wonder about the role played by conservative and reactionary movements in these—actual or intended—reconfigurations.

At the same time, in order to grasp these issues, is it probably useful to do away with the biases of evolutionism, teleology, or presentism that may lead us to think that contemporary debates are necessarily new, unprecedented, or unavoidable. Assuming that identity-based social movements are a twentieth-century invention, is post-identity a return to a—presumably non-identity-based—paradigm that prevailed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, from pre-revolutionary mob revolts, to Shays' Rebellion, the Grange movement, and the rise of the labor movement? Or on the contrary, what lessons can we learn for the twenty-first century of the experience of past centuries? Ever since the nineteenth century, how has identity politics manifested itself in movements where, for instance, men fight for women's rights and white people fight for black or Indian people's rights? Similarly, whether in the past or present, do movements rooted in religious and spiritual communities—e.g. Quaker, Mormon—engage in the same type of identity strategies as movements based on identities of race, ethnicity, sex, gender, or sexuality? Or are they instead exempt from this type of identity work? And what happens when a religious identity—e.g. Muslim, Catholic, or Jewish—is perceived as the expression or rejection of a national identity?

Similar questions may be asked about the labor movement, whose history in the United States oscillates, depending on the time period, between the rejection of minority and subordinated social groups—African Americans, immigrants, women, LGBTQ+ people—and a growing openness to the expression of these identities. To what extent does the notion of post-identity allow us to grasp its comprehensive, inclusive ambitions? One may also wonder if other universalistic movements—e.g. for environmental protection or against climate change—seek to transcend, dodge, or reorganize the deployment of particular identities.

Finally, if the more and more frequent or recurrent emergence of movements like Occupy or Extinction Rebellion—whose proclaimed horizontality, absence of tangible claims or attainable goals, and rejection of traditional modes of representation challenge standards organizational or analytic patterns—is to be read as the dawn of a post-movement era, does this mean that they also seek to transcend identities? Or should this be seen, rather, as reinvention and reinterpretation of identity politics? In particular, should the more and more frequent deployment of intersectional language—e.g. Black Lives Matter, the Women's March—be read as a way to move beyond or rethink the identities leading to collective mobilizations?

Paper submissions may concern various periods from pre-revolutionary times and the Early Republic to the present. Submissions based on empirical data (archives or fieldwork) and dealing with specific case-studies are especially welcome. Submissions may also discuss the theoretical and methodological issues raised by works in progress or as yet exploratory research. Papers submitted collectively, that have a comparative scope, or engage the American studies community in debate are also welcome.

Paper submissions (approx. 300 to 500 words) with a brief biographical note should be sent to Guillaume Marche (gmarche@u-pec.fr) and Antoine Serval (antoine.serval@u-pec.fr) by January 31st, 2020.

WORKSHOP # 22

Movement and Progress: Beyond, Ahead, and Post- in American Dance and Music

Adeline Chevrier-Bosseau (Université Clermont-Auvergne) and Mathieu Duplay (Université de Paris)

The American ethos of movement and progress, the constant desire to go beyond what is known into undiscovered territories, is deeply rooted in the history of American dance. From the European exile of the first American dance pioneers – Isadora Duncan and Loïe Fuller, who, like Gertrude Stein or F. S. Fitzgerald found in Europe a fertile ground where American modernism could blossom – to the relation to the American topography in the works of Martha Graham, Ruth Saint Denis, Ted Shawn or George Balanchine, the founding mothers and fathers of American dance have always associated choreographic creation to going beyond the Frontier (the literal Frontier, in the eponymous ballet by Graham, or metaphorical frontiers, anything they perceived as limitations to the development of indigenous American movement). This particular relationship to American spaces attests to a refusal to stand still and a desire to consider creation as perpetual motion; for Gertrude Stein, this refusal of fixity and the constant preoccupation with going beyond, moving forward, is typically American (“it is something strictly American to conceive a space that is filled with moving, a space of time that is filled always filled with moving”, *The Making of Americans*). We therefore invite papers which interrogate the connection between the dancing body in motion and an ever-changing geographical space – in the works of the pioneers of American dance but also in more contemporary productions, such as Michael Cunningham’s *Summerspace*, which focuses on entrances and exits, or Justin Peck’s *The Times Are Racing*, for example, which is danced to Dan Deacon’s *America*.

Interrogating “Post-America” also leads us to wonder what it means to dance “after”: after Duncan, after Balanchine, after Forsythe, after the great social and political changes – dancing post-feminism, dancing and choreographing (and managing a company) after the #metoo movement, dancing after the Civil Rights movement, ... – or after major historical events (after the two World Wars, after 9/11, ...). How did American dancers and choreographers engage with these events or their predecessors’ works? How can the very notion of *after*, of *aftermath* be understood and staged choreographically? Another possibility is to consider this question from a technical standpoint: what is post-movement? What happens after the choreographed gesture, after the steps? How are transitions integrated in a dance piece? What about music? Dancing on the music is a major imperative in dance, but what happens when choreographers try to think about dancing *after* or *before* the music? How are the moments before and after the dance integrated in certain pieces – the silences, the moments when dancers catch their breath, what lies within or beyond the margins of the stage?

American music is also notable for its complex relationship to the question of the *aftermath*. The reasons for this are, first and foremost, chronological. Successive waves of immigrants all brought along a wealth of musical materials taken from well-established traditions with long histories in their countries of origin; American composers, performers, and audiences retain close ties to this rich past. In 19th-century New York, Walt Whitman enjoyed Italian opera; a close collaborator of Felix Mendelssohn and an influential supporter of the *Bach-Renaissance*, the Swedish soprano Jenny Lind introduced American music lovers to artistic practices popular in the leading European capitals; at the turn of the twentieth century, Enrico Caruso – a Neapolitan tenor – became the cultural ambassador of Little Italy, where he was seen as a spokesperson for Italian music; and the 1893 work known as the *New World Symphony* was actually written by Anton Dvořák, a Czech composer who drew inspiration from the tunes sung all over the Midwest by newly arrived immigrants from Slavic countries. In the mid-20th century, Igor Stravinsky and Arnold Schoenberg settled in California where they trained several generations of promising young musicians. Meanwhile, Kurt Weill fled the Nazis and took up residence on Broadway, where his impact was considerable. To this day, European influence remains perceptible; a poll carried out in 2010 by the League of American Orchestra reveals that there is not a single American among the ten composers whose works are most frequently

performed in the United States (unsurprisingly, the list includes Beethoven, Mozart, Tchaikovsky, and Brahms, leading representatives of the Classical and Romantic traditions). This continuing preoccupation with the past may, to some extent, account for the nostalgic tone that characterizes several major works of American music, latecomers to a world filled with unquestioned masterpieces of a much older vintage. *Vanessa* (1958), Samuel Barber's opera to a libretto by his Italian-born lover Gian Carlo Menotti – itself based on a story by the Danish writer Karen Blixen – is a case in point: in the final scene, the characters sing their endlessly protracted goodbyes in a Gothic mansion haunted by the ghosts of a past they feel unable to leave behind.

On another level, American music is frequently preoccupied with a sense of belatedness in that many important compositions are modeled *after* famous precedents, which may include literary works, paintings, movies, etc. (cf. Nelson Goodman's *Languages of Art*). Without leaving her Paris studio, the French pedagogue Nadia Boulanger trained successive generations of American composers, from Aaron Copland to Philip Glass; and Schoenberg's influence gave rise to a school of American serialism whose main representatives include Milton Babbitt, Charles Wuorinen, and Mel Powell. Other musicians enjoy parodying European models in order to develop a style of their own; John Adams adopted this attitude when he gave one of his compositions, the neo-tonal *Harmonielehre* (1985), a title ironically borrowed from Schoenberg, a pioneer of atonal music. Others try to get rid of the entire heritage of European art music, for instance John Cage who proudly claimed to have done the exact opposite of what Schoenberg advised him to do – a radical gesture of defiance, or a paradoxical form of imitation, depending on one's point of view. Yet others unwittingly innovate while seeking to follow established models, for instance the Broadway composers who gave birth to the modern musical as they tried to emulate the runaway success of *The Merry Widow* (1905), Franz Lehár's classic operetta. A similar logic underpins all forms of adaptation, especially in the case of vocal music where the literary (pre)text plays a complex role.

It is useful to recall that belatedness (*Nachträglichkeit*) is also a psychoanalytical term; as such, it can designate the aftershocks of a historical, political, and/or aesthetic trauma which initially leaves witnesses dumbfounded and therefore needs to be interpreted at a much later date. American opera did not truly come into its own until the 1970s, and it is noteworthy that many of the major works in that now flourishing tradition are explicitly concerned with the historical past; Philip Glass's *Akhmaten* (1983) is set in ancient Egypt, and John Adams's *Girls of the Golden West* (2017) evokes the California Gold Rush. These operas seldom rely much on suspense; the point is not to work out what is about to happen – audiences usually know the answer long before the curtain rises – but to meditate on what happened a long time ago, and the goal is to make sense of an event hitherto rendered incomprehensible by its shocking nature and/or by its inadequate treatment at the hands of historians (thus, *Girls of the Golden West* focuses on mid-nineteenth century Californian women, about whom conventional accounts of the Gold Rush have relatively little to say). As operas of this kind become increasingly common, it is tempting to suspect that history in its totality, and in particular American history, are experienced as a succession of traumas: America belatedly becomes conscious of itself, *via* music theater, as the protracted, belated aftermath of its own founding.

Lastly, it is increasingly relevant to inquire about what comes *after* American music, whose emergence was long awaited by many but whose disappearance is already being heralded, if not treated by some as a *fait accompli*. Toni Morrison once stated that African-American music has lost its unique function: it no longer expresses the unique character of black culture now that it has been enthusiastically adopted by the whole of American society; as a result, it befalls literature to take up a task that music no longer fulfils. A similar suggestion could be made about American music in its totality, considering that Beyoncé is now a global icon and John Adams's music is beloved of European audiences. What other artistic disciplines are about to take up the task no longer performed by the formerly "American" music, and are forms of "post-American" music already emerging in the United States?

Abstracts (300 words max) must be sent both to Mathieu Duplay (mduplay@club-internet.fr) and Adeline Chevrier-Bosseau (achevrier.bosseau@gmail.com) along with a short bio before January 31, 2020.

WORKSHOP # 23:

"A common destiny"? Anticipations and stakes of a "post-slavery" America

Anne-Claire FAUCQUEZ (Université Paris 8) and Pierre-François PEIRANO (Université de Toulon)

The quote inserted in the title, borrowed from Frederick Douglass, reveals the desire to bridge the gap - or, rather, the chasm - between former slaves and the rest of the American population at the end of the American Civil War, in order to fully adapt to the "world war has engendered," to rephrase Illinois Senator Sidney Breeze, which Eric Foner echoed in his book on Reconstruction. However, the mixed legacy of this historical period has often overshadowed the expectations of a "post-slavery" America, both in the years before and at the end of the conflict, when political, economic and social upheavals were shaking the United States as a whole. The purpose of this workshop will be to study these anticipations and perspectives in their historical context, from the end of the 18th century to the beginning of the 20th century, in order to extend the studies on the true scope of the abolition of slavery and to question the possibility to build an American nation faithful to its founding principles.

The presentations could be articulated around the following lines:

- the anticipation of the emancipation of the slaves, accompanied by a moral condemnation of slavery from the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century. These were present in Thomas Jefferson, in Query XVIII of the Notes on the State of Virginia, or in the later writings of Benjamin Franklin ("Plan for Improving the Condition of the Free Blacks"). On the contrary, a few decades later, John C. Calhoun gave free rein to his pessimism about the prospect of total emancipation;
 - the visions of politicians, between realism and utopia: the failure of the Back-to Africa or colonization movement; the speeches of President Lincoln in early 1865 revealing the desire to heal the deep wounds of the conflict, while Andrew Johnson compared himself to a Moses guiding emancipated slaves to a new Promised Land in 1864. In the light of this example, the gap between these theoretical visions and the reality of the facts deserves a thorough study;
 - a reflection on the social, economic and political upheavals that were to come: the end of slavery corresponded to the standardization of paid work but also gave way to the establishment of labor camps for former slaves in the North, with mixed results;
 - the resistance to these upheavals: if it is easy to mention the Ku Klux Klan, several other components of society worried about a "post-slavery" America. The emancipated slaves of New Orleans, for example, most of whom had reached a comfortable standard of living, were concerned that social differences would be eroded in the future;
 - the different states in which the most significant changes have been observed, which does not always correspond to the image of a progressive north and a frozen south.
-
- the narrative and rewriting of the history of slavery and the Civil War as initiated by the instigators of the "Lost Cause" in the South on the one hand and on the other hand, by the Northerners promoting an amnesic watered-down abolitionist version of the history of slavery in the North.

You can send a 400-word proposal and a short biography to Anne-Claire Fauquez acfaucquez@gmail.com and Pierre-François Peirano: pierre-francois.peirano@univ-tln.fr before January 31 2020.

WORKSHOP # 24

The Age of *Post-Photography*? Rethinking the Uses and Practices of 21st Century American Photography

Carolin Görgen (LARCA/Université Paris Nanterre) and Camille Rouquet (Université de Cergy Pontoise)

Starting as an analog medium, photography has evolved incredibly fast over the last two centuries. Following science and new technologies, it was first considered a modern invention, then a piece of documentation, tangible evidence to various factual reports, and finally illustration. But photography's esthetic potential was also recognized early: photography became art and visual representation. Photographers and photoreporters always tried to show off their talent and the excellence of the photographic medium, even in their most practical and information-centered practices; photojournalistic prizes are living proof of that history. But nowadays, photography is ubiquitous and has decisively become the most popular art medium. Photographic practices have multiplied: photography is digital, portable, instant, and infinitely transmissible. It is now among the trendiest and most versatile tools of communication.

The tremendous spread of photography, its quick mutation from an analog to a digital form, and its reproducibility and wide circulation have all led academics to think of the 21st century as the age of "post-photography" (Jonathan Lipkin, Robert Shore). This new concept resists specific definition, but it does seem to designate primarily a recent era during which a new photographic language has visibly started to emerge. Along with this new language, new visual practices and new forms of exchange come to contradict, or at least challenge, the way we have been accustomed to think of photography since it was invented. Post-photography is tightly connected to the digital age, to the viral spread of images and their versatility, and, often, to their capacity to live and define themselves autonomously. The digital, dematerialized image is in fact at the center of current discussions on post-photography—and yet, can we say with certainty that the 21st century will be the stage of a new photographic revolution?

People continue to look for unique photographs that summarize events or actions and embody visual perfection. But even contemporary photography cannot escape the *archive*, a compulsion to store and record images that has always closely followed photographic practices. Whether it be material or digital, often researched or completely abandoned, the photographic archive seems a natural grouping—sometimes more or less structured and organized—of memorable or easy-to-forget images. Prizes for excellence in photography and social networks are also seemingly unable to counter this natural process of accumulation. Instagram draws focus to specific images but creates a need to consume even more; Snapchat promises ephemeral images but cannot escape screenshots and screen recorders. In short, it still seems that, even in the 21st century, photographic memory cannot operate without an archive—and the most democratic and popular practices are no exception. Photography might now be mostly an online digital medium, but the ongoing uses of analog cameras and new academic research on the materiality of photography also come to strengthen this contemporary process.

This panel will center on the notion of "post-photography" in the United States and offers the following as possible, though non-restrictive, guidelines:

- Is the 21st century an era of photographic contradiction? Will photographic excellence be destroyed by the multiplication of viral images circulating on an international scale? Are iconic photographs—now true cultural landmarks—doomed to oblivion?
- Are the new distorted sociopolitical realities of the “post-fact” era connected with digital manipulations of photographs and their exponential virality?
- What is the nature of photography in the 21st century? Will it be a decisive tool in the circulation of fake news or is it, on the contrary, becoming the new reflection of a much-needed era of truth?

The panel will welcome pluridisciplinary papers in all fields of the humanities. Papers can choose to approach their topic from perspectives as varied as visual studies, historical, sociological, esthetic, rhetoric, political and economic. The speakers can focus their proposals on methodological questions or use a variety of theoretical literature. The notion of “post-photography” can be treated as a topic in art or in media practices, as documentation or as memorialization; it can relate to private or public spaces, to collectives, communities, or individuals.

Please send 300-word proposals and a short biographic note to Carolin Görgen (carolin.goergen@web.de) and Camille Rouquet (camille.rouquet@u-cergy.fr) by January 31 janvier, 2020.