

ICLA Executive Committee meeting report January 12-13, 2021, by videoconference (due to pandemic)

Due to the mode of the meeting, held via videoconference and hosted from Princeton, and to allow as much participation as possible despite significant time differences, sessions have been reduced to 2 hours daily, between 9:30 a.m. and 11:30 a.m. (EST). Consequently and for the discussion to be as efficient as possible during these two two-hour sessions, an electronic vote was held before the videoconference meetings and after distribution to the members of the executive committee of all the reports received on December 15, 2020. The reports of the President, the secretaries, the treasurers, the research committees were all approved (the financial questions concerning CHLEL and the request for transformation of the status of the "Scriptural Reasoning and Comparative Literature" committee having been excluded from the review vote and still to be debated). Regarding the development of the site, the newsletter and the list of members, the report submitted by Lucia Boldrini was approved as well as her request for funding: all voters expressed their gratitude and thanks to Lucia Boldrini and to Katharina Herold for the extraordinary work done. Regarding the journal *Recherche littéraire / Literary Research*, Marc Maufort's report has been approved (the request for funding until 2022 had already been requested in June). There was unanimous approval for the question concerning the renewal of the contract with Peter Lang under the same financial terms for the period 2023-2025, the renewal of Marc Maufort's mandate as editor during this period, and his proposal to transform the journal by establishing a system of peer review. All present expressed their admiration and recognition for the extent of the transformation that Marc Maufort has achieved by making *RL / LR* a real journal with academic standards and quality.

1st Session, January 12, 2021

Virtually Present (at the time the screen shot was taken):

Sandra Bermann, E.V. Ramakrishnan, Nicole Bergman, Helena Buescu, Stefan Buchenberger, Marie-Thérèse Abdelmessih, Takayuki Yokota-Murakami, Roberto Vecchi, Anne Tomiche, Liedeke Plate, Massimo Fusillo, Matthew Reynolds, Robert Gafrik, Karen-Margrethe Lindskov Simonsen, Stefan Helgesson, Paulo Horta, Tracy Lassiter, Kitty Millet, Adelaide Russo, Chandra Mohan, Haun Saussy, Lucia Boldrini, Isabel Gomez, Marko Juvan, Oana Fotache, Marc Maufort, Noriko Hiraishi, Ipshita Chanda, Toshiko Ellis, ZHANG Hui, Yang Huilin, Marcio Seligmann-Silva, Adam Kola, Wendy Belcher, Suzanne Nalbantian, Marina Grishakova, William Spurlin, Yougmin Kim, Mads Rosendhal Thomsen, Kathleen Komar, Rita Schmidt

The session started at 9:30 a.m. (EST). Sandra Bermann, ICLA President, welcomed the participants and thanked Massimo Fusillo and Mirko Lino for their efforts to organize the meeting online from Aquila. She also thanked Nicole Bergman who, following the difficulties encountered at Aquila, organized the virtual meeting from Princeton and whose help throughout the two sessions, in recording attendance and votes, was invaluable.

Sandra Bermann explained the procedures so that, despite the reduced duration of the sessions, the discussion can take place in the best possible conditions: there was to be no reading of the report, the agenda consisted of a series of questions to be debated, and no speech should exceed 3 minutes.

1. Financial matters: budget and membership

Sandra Bermann explained our predicament. The financial income of the ICLA comes exclusively from membership fees. However, these contributions are declining: the pandemic is not the only cause. The main cause is the growing reluctance of some national associations to pay their membership fees to join the ICLA, a reluctance due to questions from member associations about the very usefulness of their membership in the ICLA. What is more, almost any activity that would involve national associations in the activities of the ICLA requires money.

Sandra Bermann then gave the floor to the treasurers. Noriko Hiraishi, Treasurer for Asia-Pacific, announced the payment of the Indian membership fee and that the ones from China and Korea were yet to come but confirmed. Adelaide Russo, Treasurer for the Americas, talked about the importance of having a list of ACLA members. Regarding the ACLA which, to this day, refuses to renew its membership in the ICLA, Sandra Bermann indicated that she herself, Haun Saussy and Kathleen Komar would meet with the ACLA to try to convince them to remain members of the ICLA. They favored a financial agreement whereby the ACLA would pay 1000 euros per year in the form of a group membership fee and, in addition, would accept that the Association's website include on its membership form the option to join in a drop-down menu. which would allow an individual membership option to be offered to the ICLA. Paulo Horta indicated that the ACLA had, in the past, suggested a right of oversight over part of their financial contribution (for example, out of 1000 euros received from ACLA, 500 euros could go to a prize for which ICLA and ACLA would be associated). The idea could be extended beyond the ACLA.

The discussion transcends the relationship between the ICLA and ACLA. Helena Buescu asked about BCLA membership in the ICLA. Matthew Reynolds underlined that beyond a financial agreement, it is also the content of the relationship that must be rethought: what is problematic is the lack of representation of national associations as such in the ICLA while these are the sources of funding. The problem is both structure and organization. The ICLA should be more geared towards national associations and these should be represented in the ICLA. Sandra Bermann replied that the function of the new Committee "National Associations Plus" (NAPlus) is precisely to work to strengthen the links between the ICLA and its member associations. The committee's work has been delayed due to the resignation of its chairman, but it will resume. Kathleen Komar recalled that two measures have already been discussed: inviting the presidents of national associations to meetings of the executive committee and carrying out reciprocal exchanges, sessions or round tables during national congresses or conferences. Marie-Thérèse Abdelmessih stressed the importance of accepting individual memberships as many parts of the world do not have national associations (e.g. Iran).

Kitty Millet stressed that members of research committees should act as a conduit to promote through their networks the importance of joining the ICLA. Lucia Boldrini noted that individual memberships are often not very profitable because of the bank charges which are levied. She suggested setting up individual 3-year memberships. She added that another cause of the fall in the number of members is the consequences of the transfer of accounts from one treasurer to another: these transfers take time and the result is periods during which relations with national associations are interrupted, and then they need to be rebuilt. Lucia Boldrini suggested that an arrangement be put in place between the terms of treasurers with a period of overlap of their terms.

Roberto Vecchi, Treasurer for Europe and Africa, is very concerned. Financial receipts are lower than expenses. He stressed the importance of finding a balance between the inflow of income and outlays.

Sandra Bermann closed the discussion on this first point of the agenda, recalling that the financial resources are shared between the three accounts managed by the three treasurers (this is a single global ICLA account) and that the objective is therefore on the one hand to find a better distribution of income / expenses and on the other hand to give more reasons to national associations to want to contribute.

2. Research committees

Proposals from the Research Development Committee:

Matthew Reynolds, chairman of the new "Research Development Committee", presented his report. All of the proposals in the report are intended to make it possible to describe the practices of the ICLA and its research committees in a very transparent manner. In this context, and to clarify the working of the research committees, he recalled that he suggested, in his report, the possibility of subsidizing all the research committees. Given the financial difficulties which have just been discussed, this suggestion is more of a suggestion of principle, an aspiration. And he would understand if the executive committee decided to postpone the effective implementation of this suggestion until later.

Karen-Margrethe Lindskov Simonsen, chair of the Committee for the Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages (CHLEL), supported the idea that the criteria for granting research committees should be transparent and fair. She also understands that the financial situation of the ICLA is problematic. But, from the point of view of her committee, she stressed that the adoption of points 6 and 7 of the report of the "Research Development Committee" would pose a problem for the functioning of CHLEL. Funding conditional on open-access publication would mean that the committee could no longer be funded. And a maximum funding ceiling of 1,000 euros every three years would make the committee's work impossible. She is not in favor of all committees being funded at the same level, and she emphasized the importance of financial support for the Committee for the Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages, stressing the historical importance of this committee in ICLA and the fact that the grants fund linguistic revisions and editorial work on texts written by non-English speaking authors.

Anne Tomiche wondered whether it would not be appropriate, before making decisions on what funding to grant or not, to establish priorities. Helena Buescu agreed and underlines that it is a question of finding a balance between the money which comes in and that which leaves, and that this question is posed in new terms for the ICLA insofar as new needs have emerged (funding for the website, aid for young researchers, etc.).

Lucia Boldrini noted that, if necessary, she could make two proposals to reduce the costs of managing the site. On the one hand, if this were absolutely necessary, we could consider reducing the cost of the administrator / assistant: this cost has increased this year to allow the establishment of the lists of members, which has not been finalized. Katharina Herold didn't use all of her hours, and as a last resort we could reduce the current 7 hours to 6 or 5. However, it should be noted that these hours that have not been used will be necessary for the establishment of the list of members and will be used. Going forward, we should recall that the idea was, from the start, that once the lists are in place, it will be possible to reduce the hours to ½ day per week. On the other hand, Lucia Boldrini brought up a second idea. Goldsmiths University offers students the opportunity to do unpaid internships for which students receive credits in their academic program. Lucia suggested setting up such a student internship for the newsletter, the membership list, to create forms for the different types of grants, and all other types of site management needs.

Stefan Helgesson and Kathleen Komar both urged caution with regard to spending until there is a longer discussion. Kathleen Komar stressed the importance of seeing how the three financial accounts can work together to help balance the budget, and the importance of being very transparent about how funds are requested.

The motion to defer financial decisions until an accurate analysis of the overall situation was carried unanimously.

Proposal from the Scriptural Reasoning to become a permanent committee.

Matthew Reynolds, on behalf of the "Development and Projects Committee", had no objection. A discussion ensued. Lucia Boldrini pointed out that upon reading the report, a number of the activities mentioned do not seem clearly to fall under "scriptural reasoning" and seem to relate more broadly to relations between China and other countries. Lucia Boldrini therefore asked the question of whether the name of the committee is appropriate: if the issue of the committee is to place China in its relations with the rest of the world, perhaps a more appropriate title should be chosen. She also expressed concern about the Sinocentrism of the committee, and it had already been suggested in the previous report to open up the committee more widely in geographical terms. Yang Huilin replied that we must understand "scriptural reasoning" in its religious sense: the committee is made up of researchers in religious studies. The task for the committee is to place scriptural reasoning within comparative literature. Haun Saussy recalls that since the establishment of this committee the question of geographical focus has been raised, inclusive of the related matter of the geographical representation of its members. From the beginning the executive committee has recommended a broadening and an opening of the focus and membership of the committee beyond China. Haun Saussy

recommended openness not only to colleagues working outside of China but also to colleagues working in other religious traditions.

A motion was carried unanimously to defer the decision on its future as a standing committee consideration of the committee's until June, after consideration of a new report from the committee. The executive committee recommends including on the committee members working in other religious traditions and in locations other than those currently represented on the committee.

3. ECARE and Travel Grants

Sandra Bermann summarized the many efforts made to cater to early career researchers. A specific place is given to them in the next Congress (Tbilisi, 2022). The "Global Publishing and the Making of Literary Worlds" conference (June 4-6, Princeton 2021) has been organized specifically for them and will allow them to have direct contact with editors from the most prestigious presses. Sandra Bermann pointed out that the issue of travel grants is very important, especially since their absence was an explicit criticism by the ACLA and BCLA. Given the financial situation, she suggests that even if they need to be reduced for Congress 2022, one or two should still be considered, however small. Further, three prizes are to be set up:

- A prize for the best conference paper by a doctoral student, which could include publication as an article in *Literary Research*. The article could be written in English, French or the language of the country hosting the Congress.
- A prize for a grant for the publication of a first book. It would not be a question of financing the entire publication, but of offering a small sum.
- A translation prize, in which national associations could be directly involved and which would underline the plurilingual dimension and work of young researchers in comparative literature.

The prizes, even set at small amounts, are very valuable for their symbolic value.

Helena Buescu, who chairs the Travel Grants Committee, said her report was made without knowledge of the overall financial situation. The grant proposals are therefore to be read as aspirations. Given the financial situation, and given the priority to be given to young researchers, Helena even suggests a merger between ECARE and the committee she chairs, under the aegis of ECARE. The statutes that have been drafted for the Committee for Travel Grants would be irrelevant and could be included in the statutes of ECARE.

Regarding the translation prize, Isabel Gomez, president of the translation committee, said she was very favorable to this prize and pointed out that the translation committee could be a resource for constituting the jury. Marie-Thérèse Abdelmessih emphasized, with regard to the translation prize, that when it comes to translation it is not only a matter of expertise in languages but also of "translation politics". E.V. Ramakrishnan underlined the complexity of translation issues in the context of India.

Regarding travel grants, Kathleen Komar recalled that they were given in the past to members from financially disadvantaged countries, not just to early career researchers. The merger of the two committees would eliminate the possibility of funding members, not necessarily early career researchers but coming from less wealthy countries.

On the issue of book, paper and translation prizes, Kathleen Komar suggests creating a fund to finance all the prizes. She offers, to start this fund, a contribution of 5000 dollars. All the members of the executive committee present thank Kathleen Komar for her idea and for her extraordinary generosity.

Sandra Bermann proposes the constitution of a "Taskforce Committee on Finances and National Associations." This will be a working group whose objective will be, with a view to submitting a first report in June 2021, on the one hand to take stock of the financial situation by prioritizing the financial priorities of the ICLA, and to give an overview of its needs, and on the other hand, in terms of relations with the national associations, to work with the members of the national associations to improve relations. Kathleen Komar, president of the Structures Committee, Lucia Boldrini and Liedeke Plate will constitute this committee.

Regarding the merger between ECARE and the Committee for Travel Grants, Lucia Boldrini insists, like Kathleen Komar, on the fact that grants must be able to reach colleagues from disadvantaged countries. In addition, she wonders about the risk of conflict of interest in the event of a merger: the most active and active early career researcher members could be both those who request travel grants and those who would award them.

Sandra Bermann suggested two possible solutions: either create a sub-committee for travel grants within ECARE or keep the two committees separate while leaving the travel grant committee on hiatus for now in the absence of clarity on the financial situation. She added that the prizes would not be awarded by ECARE as such but by a specific ad hoc committee. William Spurlin has no firm position on the merger and leaves it up to the executive committee to decide. He confirms that scholarship requests and prize proposals will be evaluated by an ad hoc committee.

Sandra Bermann deferred the end of debate and a possible vote until the next day to decide on the organizational arrangements between ECARE and the Committee for Travel Grants.

At the request of Paulo Horta, it was decided that the votes would now take the form of private messages to Nicole Bergman and not to everyone. The session ended at 11:30 am (EST).

Session of Wednesday January 13, 2021

Virtually Present (at the time the screen shot was taken):

Sandra Bermann, E.V. Ramakrishnan, Nicole Bergman, Helena Buescu, Marie-Thérèse Abdelmessih, Takayuki Yokota-Murakami, Roberto Vecchi, Anne Tomiche, Liedeke Plate, Massimo Fusillo, Matthew Reynolds, Robert Gafrik, Karen-Margrethe Lindskov Simonsen, Stefan Helgesson, Paulo Horta, Tracy Lassiter, Kitty Millet, Adelaide Russo, Chandra Mohan, Haun Saussy, Lucia Boldrini, Isabel Gomez, Marko Juvan, Oana Fotache, Marc Maufort, Noriko Hiraishi, Ipshita Chanda, Toshiko Ellis, ZHANG Hui, Yang Huilin, Marcio Seligmann-Silva, Adam Kola, Suzanne Nalbantian, Marina Grishakova, William Spurlin, Yougmin Kim, Mads Rosendhal Thomsen, Kathleen Komar, Rita Schmidt, Isabel Gil, Robert Young.

The session was opened by Sandra Bermann at 9:30 am (EST). Before resuming the agenda, several questions were addressed or taken up:

Newsletter:

Lucia Boldrini said the January 15 newsletter will be slightly delayed. She asks committees that have a deadline in the next 3 months to report it as soon as possible so that it can appear in the newsletter.

Relations between ECARE and the Travel Grants Committee:

The two committees, contacted by Sandra Bermann since the previous day's session, prefer to remain separate. The situation therefore remains unchanged and they will work together. The statutes of the Travel Grant Committee prepared by Helena will be reviewed in June. Sandra Bermann asked whether there should be travel grants for early career researchers in view of the Georgia Congress. If so, what range should be considered for these grants: 2000 to 3000 euros?

The discussion began. Proposals were made to set up donation funding or a drop-down menu item in the Georgia Congress registration form, so that participants who wish to can contribute for prize or travel funds. There was unanimous approval for the motion proposing to postpone the decision until June and until the task force, in consultation with the three treasurers, has made an inventory of the situation so that a decision can be taken on grants.

Helena Buescu said her report for June could not be different from the one she delivered in December. She asks that in June we be able to vote on the proposals in her report because no response could be given to the various questions raised by her report.

Fund for an Awards Committee:

Sandra Bermann thanked Kathleen Komar for the 5,000 euros she donated to start the funding of an Awards Committee. These will be prizes specifically reserved for early career researchers. Kathleen Komar indeed wants a fund to be dedicated to this; she wants to start the movement so that donations constitute a sustainable fund. Paulo Horta asks the question of payment terms for modest sums: is Paypal an option? or what mode of payment can be found to avoid paying exorbitant bank charges? The question will be raised with the treasurers to find the most economical payment terms. Sandra Bermann asks Kathleen Komar to work with the treasurers to set up this fund.

Thanks to funding from Kathleen Komar, the creation of this prize fund could be announced at the Congress in 2022. The ECARE committee and William Spurlin must reflect on the announcements they will make, the scope of the prizes they will be announcing and the criteria for selection. William Spurlin thinks that ECARE could propose a project to define criteria and prize amounts. These would first be the three prizes mentioned in the January 12 session. He adds that he would like a greater representation of early career researchers on the committee and a link with the site that was set up by one of the early career researchers on the committee. The motion entrusting William Spurlin and ECARE to present a project in June (prizes, amounts and criteria) was passed unanimously.

Funding for the website and the establishment of membership lists

Regarding the financing of the site and the measures mentioned on January 12 by Lucia to reduce costs, Sandra Bermann recalls that Lucia Boldrini's report had been voted on even before the meeting. She suggested sticking to what was voted in terms of the budget, so that Lucia could establish the membership lists; and she asks Lucia Boldrini to explore internship possibilities for students. We are therefore waiting until June to possibly modify the contract of the site administrator, once the lists are established.

Regarding the financial request of the CHLEL Committee:

Karen-Margrethe Lindskov Simonsen suggested that 6000 euros are owed to CHLEL and have not been paid. She requested, moreover, 2000 euros for a new volume of the series, which corresponds to what she hoped would continue to be a recurring amount of funding that the committee would receive.

Discussion ensued. Paulo Horta suggested that the two issues should be separated. Anne Tomiche agreed and considered that no financial decision on new funding (2,000 euros) can be taken before the overall assessment of the situation by the Task Force. Kathleen Komar, while being sensitive to the request for funding, was also in favor of delaying the decision. Lucia Boldrini asked if the work for which the 6,000 euro grant was awarded has been done and therefore there is an overdue or if the money was not needed and the work has been done. Karen-Margrethe Simonsen replied that those concerned have not yet applied for the money because the projects have been delayed. She points out that she only recently became aware of this problem. She is ready to ask for an amount less than 6000 euros. Massimo Fusillo recalled the long-term agreement between the committee and John Benjamins Press, a large traditional publishing house with significant costs. He points out that the funding of CHLEL by the ICLA has been a long-standing source of recurring funding. Karen-Margrethe Simonsen clarified that the grants do not go to Benjamins but to the editorial work of linguistic revision and correction. The committee only applies for a grant from the ICLA when it has no other source of funding.

There was unanimous approval for the motion that Karen-Margrethe Simonsen consult with the treasurers, that we have the findings of the task force, and that we therefore wait until June to decide on the two issues.

4. AILC-ICLA Congress:

Congress 2022 in Georgia:

Sandra Bermann is delighted that the organization of the Congress is progressing very well and that the dialogue with colleagues from Georgia is very constructive. She thanked Anne Tomiche for the intermediary role she played in the process and gave her the floor to synthesize the questions raised by the members of the executive committee in their electronic responses to the Georgian report. In order to best advise the organizers of the Congress in setting up the activities and sessions for early career researchers recommended by the Programming Committee, Anne Tomiche suggested putting the Georgian Organizing Committee and ECARE in

direct contact. William Spurlin agreed. Anne Tomiche asked whether the Organizing Committee should not plan and announce specific rates in the event that the Congress is to be held online, obviously taking into account that these rates should be much lower than the rates for a face-to-face congress. Paulo Horta, who believes that registration fees for an online congress should be lower than for a face-to-face congress, also stressed that the Georgian Organizing Committee must indicate the date on which it will confirm whether the Congress will take place face-to-face or online. Regarding the requirement of ICLA membership to participate in Congress, it has always been mandatory, although until membership lists are established it is very difficult to control. Georgian colleagues can be asked to include a checkbox on the registration form so that future participants indicate if they are indeed members of the ICLA and that, if they are not, they can pay their individual membership fee. Finally, due to health-related circumstances, the launch of the congress site is slightly postponed: the organizing committee will send us, for comments, access to the site on February 15 and the launch for the general public is scheduled for the 1st. March.

Future congresses

Sandra Bermann presented the panorama. There has not yet been a call for proposals to host the Congress in 2025. There is an expression of interest from Abu Dhabi, which comes from a commercial enterprise. We have not included in the guide for future organizers the requirement that the Congress be organized by a university. This is the policy that has always been adopted by the ICLA. Should it be continued and formulated in the guide.

Stefan Helgesson said he is in favor of continuing this policy. He stressed that a policy of rotation is also needed regarding the geographical location of congresses. Sandra Bermann responded that this rotation of ICLA congresses is dependent on the proposals received. Isabel Gil recalled that in principle the geographical locations of Congresses must rotate and that it is important to have an open call. Yet, from a pragmatic point of view, we must be aware of the resistance of universities to embark on such an organization. It should be possible to provide a list of contacts in the comparative literature departments of the different countries. Helena Buescu recalls that the conference in Pretoria in South Africa like the one in Rio in Brazil took place thanks to the presence of a member of the executive committee who was in Pretoria or Rio. She therefore suggests having representatives from Africa on the executive committee. Robert Young said he is in favor of congresses in all locations of the world, but draws attention to the importance of taking into account the number of participants likely to participate according to the geographical location, and he suggested avoiding organizing conferences where there are very few comparatists, and hence fewer would be likely to come. Young asked: where are most of our members located? Lucia asked whether to post a "call for expressions of interest" on the mailing list and on the site? And should the hosting guide be made public by publishing it on the site or should we wait for expressions of interest to provide it to those who have expressed them? Sandra Bermann suggests that since the guide needs to be reviewed a bit anyway, it is better to wait for the revisions before it goes live to coincide with the publication of the next newsletter. In any case, Lucia Boldrini would like us not to wait until June.

E.V. Ramakrishnan returned to the question of whether the organization should be taken over by a university and says he thinks we should stick to this model rather than a business model. He insisted on the presence of local and regional authors, and researchers in the congresses.

The motion to maintain the requirement for a university to be a Congress organizer and to include it in the Guide was carried almost unanimously, minus one vote.

Helena Buescu recalls that the choice of location is up to the first General Assembly of the Congress preceding the one for which a location is proposed. The executive committee makes a recommendation and the General Assembly decides.

5. Nominations Committee

Isabel Gil, president of the committee, took stock of the procedures put in place by the committee to proceed with the constitution of the list of candidates submitted to the vote at the next Congress. The committee is made up of both comparativists who have long experience with the ICLA and more recent members of the ICLA. The Committee will consult with members of the Executive Committee who have the right to vote as well as other comparativists, both from the Executive Committee and outside the Executive Committee, to gather suggestions of possible candidates. The criteria for the composition of the list of candidates are: the relevance of the work for the comparative field, the articulation between tradition and innovation, diversity within the academic field represented and also diversity (of gender, geographical origin, age, etc.) of the members of the list. The idea is to have a list for discussion in June. Isabel Gil suggests that the list always introduce, whatever the position, at least two names, from the position of president to that of member of the executive committee.

A discussion ensues. It is recalled that the list proposed by the nominating committee can be extended because any member of the ICLA can be a candidate provided that they are supported by 7 other members. Information on how to become a candidate should be disseminated, not in the very next newsletter but in the following one. Helena Buescu pointed out that the bylaws of the Nomination Committee stipulate that only one name should appear for the position of president. She indicated that a modification of the statutes must go through the GA and not through the EC. Lucia Boldrini specified that a revision of the statutes goes through the GA; a revision of the bylaws is proposed by the committee and approved by the executive committee. Isabel Gil read the bylaws which state that a name is required for each position of the management team and at least one name for the positions of members of the executive committee. In fact, the last two lists proposed in 2019 and 2016 contained more candidates for the positions of vice-presidents than positions. Sandra Bermann concludes that there is a need to clarify the bylaws (Lucia Boldrini indicates that the bylaws are not on the ICLA site precisely because they are awaiting review) and resume discussion in June. The rest of the debate was therefore postponed until June.

6. Early career researchers conference at Princeton in June

Sandra Bermann was sorry to inform the executive committee that due to the pandemic there will be no possibility of inviting anyone in person to Princeton for the colloquium for early career researchers organized in early June and titled “Global Publishing and the Making of Literary Worlds: Translation, Media and Mobility”. Despite the organizational difficulties linked to the health crisis, the conference is going well. Sandra Bermann would like to thank Paulo Horta, who had the idea of bringing together the publishing world and academia during this conference. Early career researchers will be able to benefit from individual (virtual) consultations with editors who will react to the book proposal that participants will have previously submitted, and who will provide them with advice on the presentation of the project. Lucia will include an announcement in the next newsletter. Sandra Bermann recalled that the conference can accommodate up to 200 participants, that there are still places left and that information should be disseminated: the conference is completely free. Paulo Horta reminded board members that the deadline for applications (complete with book proposals) is February 15 and that the information must therefore circulate quickly. Marie-Thérèse Abdelmessih asked whether it will be possible for doctoral students to be simple auditors, and to attend without participating. Sandra Bermann replied that the participants must all have made a book proposal; but the conference will be recorded and available for future viewing.

7. The question of the languages of the ICLA:

The ICLA has two official languages: French and English. In addition to these two official languages, there is the local language of the country where the congress is taking place. The question is how to think about ways of including other languages in our work at the ICLA. The question arose when the African Studies Committee was set up. Lucia Boldrini then proposed that the committees be able to present all the information they consider useful in the various languages of their choice that they deem relevant. All Boldrini and her assistant would need to do is include on the site and on the committee page, as a link, a pdf document in the desired language.

At 11:30 am (EST), Sandra Bermann closes the two videoconferencing sessions with this question of how to include more languages in the ACLA, to be discussed in June. She reiterates her thanks to all of the participants and makes an appointment in June for the next meeting of the executive committee.

Report prepared by Anne Tomiche
January 17, 2021

English version of the report by Paulo Horta
January 29, 2021