The 38th GSA Conference in Kansas City (September 18-21, 2014) will again host a series of seminars in addition to its regular conference sessions and roundtables.

Seminars meet for all three days of the conference during the first morning slot to foster extended discussion, rigorous intellectual exchange, and intensified networking. They are led by 2 to 4 conveners and will consist of either 12 to 15 or 16 to 20 participants, at least some of whom should be graduate students. In order to reach the goal of extended discussion, seminar organizers and participants are expected to participate in all three installments of the seminar.

The following seminars have been selected and approved for enrollment at the 2014 GSA Conference:

1. After Critique: Models of Thinking and Writing Beyond the School of Suspicion
2. Aesthetischer Eigensinn | Aesthetic Obstinacy
3. German-Jewish Literature after 1945: Working Through and Beyond the Holocaust
4. Turkish-German Studies: Past, Present, and Future
5. Art, War, and Trauma
6. Germany-Poland: Webs of Conflict and Reconciliation
7. Black German Studies Then and Now
8. Cosmopolitan Spaces, Cosmopolitan Exchanges, and Cosmopolitan Ideals in Contemporary German-Language Literature, Film, and Media
9. Theories of/on sexual pathology from 1800 to the Present
10. New Direction in Pop-, Sub-, and Lowbrow Cultural Studies
11. The Future of Teaching the Holocaust in German Studies, History, and Comparative Literature in the U.S.
12. Religion in Germany in the 20th Century: Paradigm Shifts and Changing Methodologies
14. Berlin in the Cold War—the Cold War in Berlin
15. On War Trauma and its Consequences in the Twentieth Century
16. Film in the German Language, Literature and Culture Curriculum
17. Rethinking Migration and German Culture
18. Conversion in the 18th Century: Narrative, Spirituality, Aesthetics
19. Liebe-Sex-Krieg
21. Shift: Culture, Society, and Change
22. German Community - German Nationality? Perceptions of Belonging in the Baltics
23. Teaching Fascist Culture
If you wish to participate in a seminar, please visit the GSA Website and enroll electronically under “membership services > conference proposals.”

Participation in a seminar involves intellectual work akin to preparing a paper and will thus count as such. All seminar participants will be listed by name in the program. If you are accepted to be an active participant in a seminar, you may not give a paper in panel sessions. However, you may moderate or comment on a panel.

Some individuals may choose to be a silent auditor to a seminar. Slots for auditors are limited; the enrollment process for interested auditors will only take place after the entire GSA program is set.

**Applications for enrollment are due by January 30, 2014.** We will inform applicants by February 6, 2014, whether they have been accepted or not. Please do not send your applications directly to the seminar organizers.

Please direct all inquiries directly to the GSA Seminar Program Committee:

Lutz Koepnick, Chair (Vanderbilt University) | lutz.koepnick@vanderbilt.edu
Elisabeth Herrmann (University of Alberta) | elisabeth.herrmann@ualberta.ca
Emre Sencer (Knox College) | esencer@knox.edu
Seminar 1
After Critique:
Models of Thinking and Writing Beyond the School of Suspicion

Conveners
- Michel Chaouli (Indiana University)
- Amir Eshel (Stanford University)

Seminar Description
For some five decades now, many of us working in North American German studies have been thrall to what Paul Ricoeur termed “the school of suspicion.” He had in mind the habits of thought and institutions of critique that are heir to the modern Titans of Suspicion, Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud. Our own field traces its genealogy through the Frankfurt School to all three, and thus the stance of suspicion has been part of our *habitus* for quite some time. We tend to ennoble it by calling it “critique” (often understood as shorthand for “critique of ideology”), and as critique it suffuses much of what we do in the classroom and on the page. It stands to reason that one would wish to call into question this invisible force, to expose it to daylight and reveal it for what it is. Yet that is precisely the method critique has found for replicating itself. Its main achievement lies in provoking more—and more uncompromising—critique, and once it gets going, the game of trumping critique with critique can be played without end, thus opening new domains for suspicion.

We would like to take a different tack. We propose a series of panels in which scholars develop alternative models of thinking with and through cultural formations (literature, film, visual arts, popular culture, intellectual history, and the rest), models that start from a position other than the critical crouch. We are motivated by a sense that the tradition of thought that saw in “Kritik” the cultivation of what Alexander Kluge calls *Unterscheidungsvermögen* has been too often neglected; that viewing “Kritik” as what Joseph Vogl calls *zaudern* all too often gives way to criticizing the artist or the work of art for failing to comply with our expectations of what should have been created. This rather narrow reign of critique has been fatiguing for many of us, not merely for the predictability of its outcomes that everyone laments, but because of the effects it leaves on its practitioners. The posture itself—waiting to pounce—depletes one’s energies and, worse, limits the range of what one can see and say. We would like to expand the range of things that can be seen and said. We think that our much-vaunted methodological pluralism is not pluralistic enough. The panels we propose are thus meant to serve as an occasion for presenting and reflecting upon multiple ways of teaching and writing that attempt to develop alternate attitudes and techniques. The aim is to learn how we can articulate interpretive, historical, philological, and philosophical understanding that is not fueled by suspicion, but that nonetheless furthers the cause of insight and truth.

These attitudes and techniques we seek need not be new. They may, and likely will, have pedigrees reaching back to a variety of thinkers and traditions. But we would hope that they are neither merely antiquarian nor quixotic, but rather speak to our current moment, the more urgently so, the better. We stand in need of ways of grappling with the past and the present that do not exhaust themselves in gestures of unmasking falsehoods. Some scholars steadfastly devote themselves to historical analysis. Others reach back to the origins of the discipline in philology. Still others look to the natural sciences for orientation; cognitive and neuroscience are attracting a lot of attention. Others seek inspiration in phenomenology, philosophy of language, linguistics, or hermeneutics. Yet others experiment with religious or quasi-religious discourses of communion or presence. There are no doubt many others of which we remain unaware. It is not clear which of these efforts, if any, will bear fruit. What is clear is that they all attempt to develop a language of analysis and criticism not indebted to critique.
We would ask presenters to lay out a argument for a theoretical model. They may also wish to exemplify the theory through a case study (an interpretation, for example). Ideally, they would do both. Highlighting these models at the convention would be helpful to individual scholars as well as to the discipline as a whole. It will enlarge our collective theoretical and methodological toolbox. It will sharpen our sense of our own stance, even if we decide to stick with it.

**Seminar Format**
Participants would be asked to present papers of 15 minutes *maximum*. After each paper, a respondent takes five minutes to raise questions, extend the argument, rebut it, or propose alternate readings. After three such pairings of paper and response, the panel is opened to a wider discussion. Every presenter of a paper would be asked to serve as respondent to a paper on a different panel.

**Proposed Size**
- 12-15

**Silent Auditors**
- 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
**Seminar 2**

**Ästhetischer Eigensinn | Aesthetic Obstinacy**

**Conveners**
- Claudia Benthien (Universität Hamburg)
- Richard Langston (The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)

**Seminar Description**

_Eigensinn, der eigene Sinn._ The very meaning of the word itself is “eigensinnig.” Is it best rendered in English as obstinacy? What of other possibilities like stubbornness, autonomy, willful meaning, or self-will?

On the occasion of Zone Book’s forthcoming English-language translation of Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge’s magnum opus, _Geschichte und Eigensinn_ (1981), this seminar seeks to mine the meaning and manifestation as well as the utility and breadth of the concept of “Eigensinn” as it applies not to material human bodies—as is the case with Negt and Kluge—but rather to contemporary literary texts. Transplanting “Eigensinn” from the realm of embodiment brings with it a bevy of pressing questions: What does it mean for a text—in terms of its literariness or poeticity—to be “eigensinnig”?

Whereas “Eigensinn” shall operate as the seminar’s lodestar, participants will focus their attention concretely on a second related concept, namely obstinate “literariness” (or “poeticity”). To this end, we shall consider how Russian formalists, who once sought to distinguish literary from non-literary texts through forms of language that create an aesthetic surplus of meaning, can influence a contemporary theory of “Eigensinn.” One formalist concept that may operate as corollary to “Eigensinn” is that of “deviation.” Linguistic deviations in literature are often accompanied by an increased selfreferentiality—an attention to the act of uttering as well as to the material substance of the representation. Roman Jacobsen also uses the term of a “perceivability of signs,” while Jan Mukařovský claims that the “function of poetic language consists in the maximum of foregrounding of the utterance”, this “foregrounding,” he adds, is “the opposite of automatization, that is, the de-automatization of an act.”

The historical frame for the discussions slated for this seminar will focus on literature as well as the “written” word in the media arts since 1960. The rationale for this focus is threefold. Firstly, the seminar will focus on the historical conditions for “Eigensinn” and its literariness with respect to literature reflexively situated within the larger field of new media contemporary art practices. Secondly, if “Eigensinn,” as Negt and Kluge conceived it, is another name for the microphysics of resistance, then how, we wish to ask, do deviations within literary texts vis-à-vis the larger ecology of media since 1960 function as resistance and, if so, against what? How, in other words, is “Eigensinn” a form of textual politics? Thirdly, we wish to establish the concept of “Eigensinn” apart from other homologous concepts like the punctum (Roland Barthes), the traumatic gap (Cathy Caruth), affective intensities (Brian Massumi), or the parallax (Slavoj Zizek). How does Eigensinn address what these concepts have overlooked, misconstrued, or maligned?

This seminar shall be an open-ended reading group framed by the topic of aesthetic obstinacy and its literariness, but designed such that contributors can bring to the table their own illustrations and inflections of the concept. As such, the seminar seeks to convene a group of scholars mutually invested in building parameters for an aesthetic theory and a reading practice of obstinacy useful for critical analysis.

**Seminar Format**

Three pre-circulated articles on the topic of “Eigensinn” and its literariness as well as excerpts from literary texts (totaling no more than 90 pages) will be circulated to participants shortly after their acceptance. By the end of July 2014, seminar participants will be required to submit a seven-to-eight page written engagement with a particular
facet (of their choice) from one of the three theoretical texts to be discussed during the seminar. These engage-
ments should strive to illuminate, challenge, extend, or modify a particular aspect from one of the three assigned
texts. In order to focus discussion on the three assigned texts, participants will be requested to forge dialogue be-
tween one of the assigned readings and a close reading of a short manageable excerpt taken from literary text (or
media artefact) of their choice. Conveners will then review the submissions, post them online for everyone to re-
view, and subdivide participants into three groups of fours according to kindred interests as articulated in their
written work. These working groups will be then be asked in advance to organize a group presentation for one of
the three meetings on their shared interrogation into and/or illustration of “Eigensinn.” In order to guarantee a
productive dialogue, each working group will be asked to prepare in advance an outline of their discussion to be
shared with the entire group. In order to build a sense of community, day one of the semester will focus on ex-
cerpts from Negt and Kluge as well as literary texts. This initial discussion will be led by the conveners. On days two
and three of the seminar, time will be divided evenly for all three working groups to
present and discuss their findings with the other participants.

At the time of submission of this proposal, the three proposed texts to be pre-circulated (in both English and Ger-
man depending on availability) shall include:

- Roman Jakobson, “Linguistics and Poetics” (1960)
- Jan Mukařovsky, “Standard Language and Poetic Language” (1938)

In addition to these three theoretical texts, conveners will distribute short literary texts (The “Stubborn Child” by
the Brothers Grimm, poems by Paul Celan, an excerpt of an Elfriede Jelinek drama text, e.g.) in order to help initi-
ate discussion.

Proposed Size
- 12-15

Silent Auditors*
- 0

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 3

German-Jewish Literature after 1945:
Working Through and Beyond the Holocaust

Conveners
- Helen Finch (University of Leeds)
- Katja Garloff (Reed College)
- Erin McGlothlin (Washington University)
- Agnes Mueller (University of South Carolina)

Seminar Description
This seminar examines the creation of a ‘new’ German-Jewish literature in the wake of 1945. Its aims are twofold: to create a robust and close network of scholars working on related aspects of German-Jewish literature, and to create a volume examining the central questions to be discussed at the seminar in 2014. It is particularly concerned with the following intersecting set of questions:

- German-Jewish literature:
  - How can we re-interrogate the terms ‘Jewish’ and ‘German’, particularly as these identities reconstituted themselves in the wake of 1945?

- German-Jewish literature working through the Holocaust:
  - What relation did German-Jewish literature post-1945 bear to the tradition of German-Jewish literature that existed prior to the Holocaust?
  - How did German-Jewish literature by exiles relate to literature written by remigrants?
  - How does German-Jewish Holocaust literature relate to transnational questions about Holocaust literature, especially since this literature is by definition transnational? Here, we think for example, of Jean Améry’s correspondence with Primo Levi, or the ways in which Edgar Hilsenrath was received outside the German-speaking world.

- German-Jewish literature beyond the Holocaust:
  - To what extent did the caesura of 1989 create a renewed impetus in German-Jewish literature?
  - Can we speak of generational discourses within German-Jewish literature?
  - How has literature by Jewish immigrants to Germany after 1989 (such as Maxim Biller, Julya Rabinovitch) reconfigured the German-Jewish literary landscape, in particular its relationship to the Holocaust and to the German past?
  - To what extent can we now speak of a transnational, hybrid or cosmopolitan German-Jewish literature?

- German-Jewish literature and the canon:
  - To what extent has the Holocaust influenced the creation of a new “canon” of German-Jewish literature after 1945?
  - What topics and authors became ‘canonized’, and which fell out of favor? What methodological tools, such as Bourdieusian ‘field’ theory or the analyses of the German canon initiated by Saul and Schmidt (2007), can help us to interrogate the formation of such a canon and how its status might have shifted in the period 1945-present?
  - How does German-Jewish literature relate to Jewish literatures outside Germany and in other languages? Does literature written in the German language have an uncomfortable relationship to post-war Jewish literatures?
- How does German-Jewish literature interact with the wider canon of post-1945 German-language literature?
- How has German-Jewish literature travelled, transferred or been re-mediated in the digital age?

**Seminar Format**

The seminar will meet three times over the three days of the conference. Participants will be asked to read pre-circulated position papers of ca. 1000 words each, sent by each of the participants one month in advance of the conference.

- Suggested readings will be distributed to all participants in early February.
- Participants will be asked to submit their position papers by July 1, 2014, giving the conveners time to read and comment on these initially.
- Position papers will be distributed to all participants by August 1, 2014, along with a proposal for a volume based on the submissions.
- The first seminar will be dedicated to a discussion of the readings and the key questions arising from the topic. The subsequent two sessions will be dedicated to reading and discussion of the position papers. The final session will also discuss the volume to emerge from the seminar, including prospective publishers.

**Conveners will:**

- read and comment on initial position papers
- compose a volume prospectus for discussion at the seminar
- moderate discussions at the seminar
- revise and submit volume prospectus to publishers.

**Proposed Size**

- 12-15

**Silent Auditors**

- 1-5

---

*Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.*
Seminar 4

Turkish-German Studies: Past, Present, and Future

Conveners
- Ela Gezen (UMass Amherst)
- David Gramling (University of Arizona)
- Berna Gueneli (Grinnell College)

Seminar Description
We would like to propose a seminar that assesses and discusses the current state of scholarship in the interdisciplinary field of Turkish-German Studies, while at the same time providing a forum to identify possible "blind spots" and directions for the future. Central to Turkish-German Studies have been questions regarding intersections of nation, citizenship, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, and religion. This field has been influenced and invigorated by scholars from a variety of disciplines whose work examines these complex relationships in the post-war period: Leslie Adelson, Tom Cheesman, Rita Chin, Deniz Goktürk, Kader Konuk, Ruth Mandel, B. Venkat Mani, Azade Seyhan, Karin Yeşilada, and Yasemin Yıldız, to name a few.

While much important work has been done in investigating “the cultural effects of migration” and examining “re-configurations of the German national archive” the seminar would like to shift the focus to an examination of the implications for the Turkish archive. At the same time, this seminar provides a forum to identify and examine the significance of Turkish contexts—cultural, political, historical, and social—for our research questions. If Bertolt Brecht is central to Emine Sevgi Özdamar’s oeuvre, what was the Brecht reception in Turkey prior to her emigration? If Yesişam, Young Turkish Cinema, and contemporary Turkish TV with their music, stars, and stock figures are significant for Fatih Akin’s films, how does this affect his or our perception of European cinema? If Nazım Hikmet’s works were translated and performed in the GDR during the 1950s, deemed to match its socialist agenda, how did Turkish and East German perceptions of the aesthetics of socially engaged art overlap? What do the interventions of 19th and early 20th century Turkish literary travelers to and commentators on Germany (Sabahattin Ali, Ahmet Hâşim, Nazım Hikmet, Ahmet Mithat Efendi and others) add to the historical and aesthetic repertoire of Turkish-German Studies?

In the past two decades critics have productively explored the significance of the Turkish-German subject within German public-political and memory discourse, specifically focusing on representations of the Holocaust, 1968, the Cold War, and reunification. However recent publications indicate new directions by expanding our geographical (Turkey, Europe) focus and temporal (pre-1945) scope: Kader Konuk’s investigation of the impact of German-Jewish exiles on modern Turkey, Randall Halle’s work on production guidelines and practices in a Turkish and European context, Yasemin Yıldız’ in-depth engagement with the Turkish historical context during the 1960s and 1970s in her analysis of translational practices and Deniz G.ktürk’s work in film studies with emphases on institutional frameworks, tactical role-pay and humor, and digital spectatorship. In line with this recent scholarship, we invite contributions that offer new insights into areas of Turkish German entanglements, encounters, and exchanges by expanding geographical, methodological, and temporal frameworks. Particularly, we hope to encourage inquiry into areas—historical, aesthetic, social and medial—that may have eluded German Studies thus far. We invite scholars from all disciplines, periods, and ranks.

Possible Discussion Questions:
- What is the significance of the Turkish historical, cultural, and political archive in our research questions?
• How do research presumptions in Turkish-German scholarship tend to differ, based on the North American, German, European, and/or Turkish institutional context in which it is pursued?
• How can we strengthen and expand interdisciplinary/transatlantic conversations?
• How do the research phenomena we work with redefine or critique terms like transnational, hybrid, post-national, multilingual, World Literature and others?
• How would the inclusion of underexamined objects of study, such as online film festivals, fashion and lifestyle magazines, digitally distributed music, and LGBQT venues, expand the scope of Turkish-German studies?

Seminar Format
As seminar conveners we envision our role as recruiting participants, facilitating and moderating the discussion, and identifying connections and divergences on and between each day of the seminar. We will ask seminar participants to pre-circulate 8-10 page papers in early August. For this purpose, we will set up a cloud file sharing account for easy access and distribution (e.g. Box or Dropbox). After submission of all papers, we will group the papers depending on method, focus, and theme and prepare for the seminar in formulating specific questions for each session to facilitate and guide the discussion. Following the participants’ introduction, we will open each session for discussion, beginning with the questions for each session provided by the conveners as well as by the respondent. During each session, we will make sure that participants have the opportunity to equally contribute to the discussion. For the final day of the seminar, we envision to set aside 15 minutes for concluding remarks, including a summary of our findings as well as impulses for the future.

Proposed Size
• 12-15

Silent Auditors *
• 1-5

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 5

Art, War, and Trauma

Conveners
• Deborah Ascher Barnstone (University of Technology, Sydney)
• Thomas O. Haakenson (Minnesota College of Art and Design)

Seminar Description
War and Trauma are fundamental human experiences and central to German history. War and trauma cause extreme conditions that can be negative and destructive like deprivation or dislocation, as well as emotional and psychological stress, but war and trauma can also lead to positive outcomes like deepening interpersonal relationships, intellectual insights, and new, unforeseen opportunities.

This seminar anticipates the imminent anniversary of the outbreak of World War One but seminar conveners encourage submissions related to other conflicts and other historic periods. In addition to a focus on World War One, participants could examine the Thirty Years War, the Napoleonic Wars, World War Two, contemporary conflicts, or others historically significant or lesser-known conflicts. Papers could address the psychological effects of war and trauma on designers or artists, ways in which war and trauma have been treated in visual media, art theoretical responses to war and trauma, and more. Authors may choose to address war in less direct or less militaristic ways, such as the “war on poverty,” gender war, global capital’s conflicts with the nation-state, terrorism and war, non-military political wars, or culture wars, for example.

Seminar Format
Barnstone and Haakenson will circulate recommended readings among accepted participants and registered auditors by 1 June 2014. Participants will be asked to submit full draft essays by 31 August 2014 to Barnstone and Haakenson. Barnstone and Haakenson will circulate draft essays from all authors to all participants on 1 September 2014. Participants will read all essays and supplemental readings prior to the GSA conference.

On each of the three days of the conference, our five authors will present key points of theirs essays for 10 minutes each during the seminar sessions, with remaining time devoted to discussion of essays and their relationship to supplemental readings. The conveners will introduce the seminar topic during the first session of the seminar, using the additional readings as their framework for the seminar’s discussion sessions. Additionally, the conveners may engage as contributors to the seminar, and facilitate presentation and discussion sessions on each of the three days by acting as moderators.

Barnstone and Haakenson will work with select authors to revise a draft of seminar essays, due by 1 January 2015, for a volume on “Art, War, and Trauma” for the book series German Visual Culture with Peter Lang.

Proposed Size
• 16-20

Silent Auditors*
• 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 6

Germany-Poland: Webs of Conflict and Reconciliation

Conveners

- David Johnson (University of Alabama at Huntsville)
- Jesse Kauffman (Eastern Michigan University)

Seminar Description

Interactions between Germans and Poles have historically been fraught with conflict. More recent exchanges have focused on dialogue and reconciliation, with mixed results. German and Polish historians have developed a common high school history textbook. The German and Polish foreign offices, along with support from the European Union, have sponsored joint educational efforts. Recent museum exhibits in Berlin have highlighted the continuing cultural bonds between the countries. German and Polish artists, writers, and filmmakers have likewise grappled with the complex history between Germans and Poles. The public reception in both countries to these developments has been mixed, with political ideologies and national memories on both sides shaping the variety of responses.

The proposed GSA Seminar, “Germany-Poland: Webs of Conflict and Reconciliation,” will enable scholars from a diversity of disciplines as well as scholars of Germany and Poland to assess the continuing and emerging trends in Germany-Polish studies and to foster a multi- and interdisciplinary network of scholars. Longer-term goals include exploration of an edited collection of essays or a special edition of a journal.

In order to help focus each day’s discussion, participants will prepare thought papers on three conceptual categories: “Memories,” “Territories,” and “Dialogues.”

- Memories: Participants will discuss the temporal manifestations of the German-Polish relationship. Possible areas of focus include: How have Germans and Poles remembered their shared histories? How have these memories changed over the course of different political regimes in both countries? How do the physical and spatial manifestations of these pasts differ and resemble each other? How do Poles and Germans engage the histories and lives of Jews in both countries? How have artists and writers grappled with the complexities of German-Polish interactions over time? How have they portrayed the memories of expulsions after WWII in both countries? How has the recent effort to construct a museum in Berlin commemorating these expulsions unleashed a flurry of debate as well as desires for reconciliation?

- Territories: Seminar participants will explore topics that examine the dialogues and debates concerning the German-Polish borderlands. Possible topics include: How did Poles initially seek to define the “recovered territories” from Germany as Polish? How have Poles more recently begun exploring the multicultural heritage of these territories? How have Polish and German artists, writers, and filmmakers grappled with the cultural, linguistic, and ethnic complexities of these lands? How are the recent calls from German and Polish minorities in both countries for greater support of their language and cultural traditions reflective of broader trends of “ethnic reassertions” as well as components of the reconciliation process?

- Dialogues: This final session will enable participants to reflect on discussions from the first two days and also identify and assess the recent efforts at reconciliation between Germans and Poles. What are the motivations of German and Polish politicians in highlighting points of commonality and shared interests? How successful have these efforts been? Does the recent increase in novels as well as dramatic and documentary films about the Polish-German past and present reflect a broader societal rapprochement in both countries towards their neighbors? How do continuing prejudices and feelings of mistrust on both sides manifest themselves? Will the growing economic ties between the two countries foster or complicate efforts towards dialogue and reconciliation?
Seminar Format
The structure is based on the successful model of the Southeast German Studies Workshop in which participants contribute papers on specific conceptual categories. For this GSA seminar, the three conceptual categories, “Memories,” “ Territories,” and “ Dialogues,” will form the basis of discussion, dialogue, and debate. The categories are specific enough to elicit contributions that fit into the overall frame of each panel day, but also broad enough to enable participants to think creatively about how they want to develop their contributions. The result will be a good variety of contributions that promise to spur valuable scholarly discussion and exchange from participants across academic disciplines and German and Polish studies. Each day of the seminar will be dedicated to a particular topic. Participants will write a short, two-page thought piece on each topic. These will be circulated among all seminar participants. A moderator will prepare a short summary of the papers and pose questions to initiate discussion. Moderators will have the choice of submitting their own thought paper to the session they are moderating.

Pre-Conference Communication and Role of the Conveners:
Conveners will maintain regular contact with participants. Upon notification of acceptance of the GSA Seminar, solicitation of thought piece contributions will be sent out to participants. Contributions will be due by August 1. The conveners will compile and distribute the contributions to participants. The conveners, who have conceptualized the three main topics of discussion, will also invite certain participants to serve as the moderators of each day’s discussion.

Proposed Size
• 12-15

Silent Auditors*
• 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Black German Studies Then and Now

Conveners

- Tiffany Florvil (University of New Mexico)
- Vanessa Plumly (University of Cincinnati)

Seminar Description

Black German Studies (BGS) has experienced significant growth over the past three decades outside and within the academy, integrating disciplines such as Gender Studies, Diaspora Studies, History, Media and Performance Studies. The past decade saw an increase in the volume and visibility of Black German cultural productions. The launching of Black German author Sharon Otoo’s English-language Witnessed Series (2012), as a space for Black German cultural expression, has expanded the transnational dialogue first initiated with the translation of the volume *Farbe bekennen* (1986) in 1992. These developments continue, especially with the Ballhaus Naunynstraße’s staging of a month-long celebration in September 2013 entitled, Black Lux Heimatfest, which showcased Black German aesthetic productions across multiple genres in Berlin.

The Black Book: *Deutschlands Häutungen, Not So Plain as Black and White*, and *Mythen Masken und Subjekte*, as well as historical analyses of race relations and racial discourse outlined by Katharina Oguntoye, Fatima El-Tayeb, Tina Campt, and Maria Höhn represent the significant academic output and impact that BGS has had in the past decades. These works along with those of Leslie Adelson, Rita Chin, and Andreas Huyssean have interrogated the categories of race, gender, diaspora, and nation within the German multicultural context. As a result, this seminar asks where the field is now? This seminar explores the nuances of how the colonial, Weimar, National Socialist, post-1945, and post-Wende pasts inform the present and the future of BGS; how present generations of Black Germans look to those of the past for direction; how discourses shift due to diverse power structures; and how Black Germans affirm their agency and cultural identity through cultural productions, engendering counter-discourses and counter-narratives. In appraising BGS as a critical, hermeneutic field of inquiry, participants will complicate narratives, interrogate interdisciplinary methods, and introduce theoretical approaches to advance the field. The seminar is organized around three themes: Practices, Productions, and Progressions.

- Practices: Afro-German poet May Ayim’s inclusion of Ghanaian Adinkra symbols into her collections offers one example of integrated practices used to express the “textured identities” (Campt) of Black Germans in their cultural (con)texts. Exploring Black German intellectual, cultural, and artistic practices this session questions: What other African diasporic practices have been and are being utilized and transformed by current generations of Black Germans? What German cultural elements have Black Germans re-imagined or repurposed through their works? What transnational trends and technologies have been employed?

- Productions: The cultural productions of People of Color embody the idea of the “Fugitive Archetype of Resistance” (Ajalon), by escaping classification and rendering categorization obsolete via elision of ‘clearly’ delineated boundaries. Examining the range of genres through which Black German subjectivity is polyphonically (Bhaktin) performed, this session investigates how norms are made visible; generic conventions are combined, mixed, and adapted; and new spaces are created and imagined for individual and collective expression vis-à-vis contemporary Black German productions, evinced, for example, in the performances of the Berlin-based theater troupe, Label Noir.

- Progressions: This final session explores how Black German identity, activism, and politics coincide with current developments in the socio-political landscape of contemporary Germany. From the Kinderbuch- and Blackfacingdebatte to the court cases abolishing the legality of racial profiling and Karamba Diaby’s delegation as the first Black German parliament member in 2013, the session interrogates how positive change has
been enacted and what (f)actors, including Merkel’s comment on the failures of multiculturalism, Thilo Sarrazin’s publication, and the integration debate, have worked to inhibit the improvement of race relations and social equality in the German nation.

**Seminar Format**
The seminar format will include preparation of an 8-10 page pre-circulated paper from each participant that will be due to the organizers by August 1. This deadline will allow for timely distribution and reading of the seminar papers. At the GSA seminar, each participant will provide an individual commentary of 5-7 minutes, in which participants will outline points of comparison and tension with other papers and the main points of the individual’s contribution. Ideally, we envision around 15 participants, not counting the organizers, in order to generate thorough and fruitful discussions. The individual commentary will be presented on the assigned day, chosen by the section leaders according to topic. Furthermore, we will also circulate selected theoretical texts to all participants in preparation for the seminar discussion. For each section, the section leader(s) will provide an overarching 5-minute introductory commentary and summary on the submitted papers, and for the second and third sessions integrate the previous discussions where appropriate. After the presenters/participants have given their reprisal, the leader will open up the floor with certain questions for discussion, drawing connections to what has been introduced by each of the individual participants. The section leader(s) and organizers will be responsible for pre-circulation of all papers for their assigned days and for all communication regarding the seminar layout and preparation prior to the GSA conference. We view our role as conveners of this seminar as the structural, organizational, and intellectual support for the discussion of theoretical approaches and methodologies as well as the fostering of transnational dialogue across the disciplines represented under Black German Studies. We anticipate developing the themes addressed in the GSA seminar into a scholarly edited collection over the next two years.

**Proposed Size**
- 12-15

**Silent Auditors**
- 1-5

---

*Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.*
Seminar 8
Cosmopolitan Spaces, Cosmopolitan Exchanges, and Cosmopolitan Ideals in Contemporary German-Language Literature, Film, and Media

Conveners
• James Hodkinson (University of Warwick)
• Carrie Smith-Prei (University of Alberta)
• Stuart Taberner (University of Leeds)

Seminar Description
Building on the seminar on transnationalism at GSA 2013 (Taberner, Smith-Prei, Elisabeth Herrmann), this seminar focuses on the interest in cosmopolitan thought among contemporary German-language cultural producers and their elaboration of cosmopolitan ideals, exchanges, and spaces—but also failures—in their literary fiction, essays, film, media, and public-political interventions. Since the Cynics and Stoics, cosmopolitanism has been variegated defined, but in essence the term suggests a sense of loyalty, responsibility, belonging, or even moral obligation that extends beyond the polis, or nation state, to encompass humankind. The Cynic Diogenes famously declared, “I am a citizen of the world (kosmopolitês),” signaling his relativization of the city-state’s particularity and his gesturing toward the universal. In eighteenth-century Germany, Lessing’s Nathan der Weise stands out for its proclamation of the unity of humankind notwithstanding difference; Kant’s Zum ewigen Frieden lays the foundations for modern-day cosmopolitan law. Today, political scientists and philosophers such as Arendt, Nussbaum, Hannerz, Beck, Giddens, Fine, and Appiah have returned to enlightenment thought to elaborate cosmopolitan responses to questions such as how to reconcile nationalism with global responsibility, how to confront today’s “world risk society” (Beck), how to elaborate global Human Rights, and how to “live ethically in a world of strangers” (Appiah). From postcolonial theory, Homi Bhabha and James Clifford have written of a “vernacular cosmopolitanism” or “discrepant cosmopolitanism” to counter western (neo-colonial) conceptualizations. More generally, Levy and Szaider have spoken of a “cosmopolitan memory” based on the globalization of Holocaust memory, whereas John Urry has referred to a “banal cosmopolitanism” in which the circulation of products suggests global familiarity, and Derek Rushbrook to a “queer cosmopolitanism” that can be instrumentalized as confirmation of or resistance to neoliberal commodification of sexuality. Gerald Delanty, alternatively, outlines a “critical cosmopolitanism” entailing a fundamental transformation of the self through engagement with difference—others frame this as a cosmopolitical intervention (Cheah).

Participants in this seminar will discuss explicit and implicit engagements with cosmopolitan thought in contemporary German-language literature, film and media. Papers should approach cultural producers of a variety of backgrounds, for example, Trojanow, Kermani, Zeh, Wolf, Hoppe, Walser, Akin, Tykwer, Herzog, Wenders, Maccarone, or Dörrie, and/or broader considerations related to media, the digital economy, or political frameworks. Papers should critically (re)assess specific theoretical approaches to cosmopolitanism through close-readings and might address the following questions:

• Why has cosmopolitan thought become important again?
• What particular challenges of German, Austrian, or Swiss society do contemporary German-language writers address through the elaboration of cosmopolitan ideals, exchanges and spaces?
• Which historical models do they draw on, and how?
• What are the varieties of cosmopolitan thinking in their work?
• How do their elaborations of cosmopolitanism relate to the idea of the nation, and the world?
• What is the significance of “cosmopolitan memory” in German language culture?
• When is cosmopolitanism seen to fail, and why?
• When, if at all, can we speak of negative cosmopolitanism?
• How does cosmopolitanism intersect with aspects of gender, sexuality, race, or class in their work?

Seminar Format
This seminar series is a collaborative project between the University of Alberta (Canada), the University of Leeds, the University of Warwick, and The Arts and Humanities Research Council (UK). The convenors will work together intensively by email in advance of the seminar to ensure the success of the seminar. Each of the convenors is an experienced seminar organizer and also an experienced editor. Further participants will be invited from Canada, the UK, the US, Germany, Ireland, and Greece. The format of the series will be pre-circulated papers to be discussed intensively over the course of the three days. These papers will be 5000-6000 words and should be in an advanced draft form with intent to publish. We will also provide a short list of theoretical readings to guide people during the writing process, although we will not discuss these in detail during the seminars themselves; instead we will focus on how these theories feed into close readings of texts offered by the papers.

All participants are asked to read all papers before the seminar. We will have a deadline of mid-August for submission of the papers, giving the participants around a month to complete their reading. Prior to the seminar, participants will be kept regularly informed by email of the progress of the organisational arrangements. We envisage 5-7 participants per session (=16-20 in total). During the seminars, each participant will offer a 5-minute “bullet point” summary of the key innovations of his or her paper (= 40 mins), the summaries ending in a 10-minute comment emphasizing shared or divergent theoretical issues and questions (total: 50-60 mins). There will be 45-55 minutes of open discussion. The conveners will each take on the comment and moderation of one session, outline in advance broad areas for discussion, introduce the topic on the day, and facilitate discussion. We anticipate an edited volume or special edition of a journal to be the primary outcome of the seminar, assuming high-qualities submissions.

Proposed Size
• 16-20

Silent Auditors *
• 1-5

---

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 9
Theories of/on Sexual Pathology from 1800 to the Present

Conveners
• Japhet Johnstone (University of Washington, Seattle / University of Münster)
• Ina Linge (University of Cambridge)
• Robert Tobin (Clark University)

Seminar Description
The history of sexual pathology from the nineteenth and into the twentieth century in German-speaking Europe continues to be a source of scholarly debate, especially when it comes to questions of methodology and theoretical frameworks. The slash in the title of this seminar ("of/on") implies a dual purpose. On the one hand the seminar encourages participants to present research on historical theories of sexual pathology (from Heinrich Hössli to Richard von Krafft-Ebing to Otto Weininger). At the same time participants are invited to bring with them questions and ideas about theories on the history sexual pathology, that is to say, theoretical and/or methodological frameworks used to analyze the history of sexual pathology and perversions, be it a Marxist-materialist approach, queer-feminist, post-structuralist, or literary sociological. Whether scholars scrutinize the racist, sexist, and anti-Semitic premises of historical theories or whether they are concerned with building innovative methodological apparatuses for investigating the pathologization of certain desires, theories of and on sexual pathology often generate tensions due to epistemological, political, social, and personal differences.

The goal of this seminar is to bring together scholars working on this volatile area of cultural history in order to develop and exchange ideas about theoretical approaches to the history of sexual pathology. Rather than swapping anecdotes about archaic and contemporary practices of corporeal and social control mechanisms against sexual perversions, the seminar will look at questions of methodology and theory both among participants and in some prominent works of research on the topic. Some of the questions guiding the seminar might include: How do scholars position themselves in terms of the politics of sexual pathology, especially in terms of historical scholarship concerning desires still considered pathological today? How do anachronistic concepts of sexual pathology facilitate or impede historical argumentation? And what trends in current literary and cultural studies more broadly might open up new possibilities for our own research?

The seminar also has the goal of bringing together members from a vibrant community of scholars working on issues of the history of sexuality within German Studies worldwide and at various stages in their academic careers. Recent published scholarship includes "After the History of Sexuality" (2012), edited by Scott Spector, Helmut Puff and Dagmar Herzog). In North America, conferences such as PopSex! (University of Alberta, 2011) and The German Discovery of Sex (Clark University, 2011) have built up expertise in the subject. Building on momentum from the "Crimes of Passion" conference in Münster (July 2013), the seminar seeks to foster exchange between scholars on both sides of the Atlantic and beyond working on this diverse field of research. The seminar focuses the considerable interest in the history of sexuality in German Studies on questions of pathology, while at the same time expanding the field to include less frequently studied pathologies.

Seminar Format
We hope to create an environment in which participants can productively pursue answers to questions regarding sexual pathology. We envision the seminar as a workshop that goes beyond the traditional model of short talks followed by ever shorter discussions. Instead, each day will focus on a series of questions generated by the participants. In order to make sure that all the participants are able to respond to the questions in
an informed way, we will also expect participants to have read short readings also supplied by the participants.

Once officially enrolled in the seminar, participants are asked to submit a short statement of interest (500 words maximum), indicating the focus of their research and the questions that they are currently pursuing, to the seminar conveners by e-mail. By May 6, we would ask that participants enhance their statement of interest with a suggested reading of approximately 20 pages. The reading can be original work written by the participant, an important historical or literary document, or published scholarship by others that the participant believes raises provocative questions. We hope to put together a mixture of excerpts from unpublished writings, historical and literary texts, recent scholarship and classic studies. Upon receiving this material in early May, we will distribute it to the participants, so that there is a small shared corpus of knowledge. In addition, we will divide the participants into three subgroups. Each group will have responsibility for leading the discussion on a particular day. We will use the initial statements of interest to formulate the questions for each day, and we will request that each subgroup further polish and elaborate the set of questions for the day.

We assume that the focus of the sessions will evolve in the course of the coming year based on participants’ specific interests, but for now we imagine the following three sessions:

Day 1: (En)Gendering and (E)Racing Sexual Pathology:
- questions about the fundamental role of gender norms in the establishment of sexual science both in the medical field and in artistic/literary representations; also the role of women writers, activists, and scientists in the field of sexual science; questions about the role of race in determining what was or what was not a sexual pathology; minorities and sexual pathologies, majorities and sexual health.

Day 2: Inclusions and Exclusions
- questions about the inclusion of certain discourses into the mainstream, into university departments and established medicine, and the exclusion of others, which are pushed to the fringe; where does psychoanalysis fit in the history of competing theories of sexuality? What is included as legal under the law? What as illegal?

Day 3: Transitions
- questions concerned with the changes in media technologies and their different possibilities for presenting sexual pathology (film, photography, sound recordings?); intersections between theories of sexual pathology and media theories (Benjamin, Kracauer, Kraus, Adorno); questions about the flow of information internationally and globally, both within the German-speaking world (Berlin-Vienna-Zürich) and beyond (France, England, Holland, Italy, Russia, the United States, China, India, the colonies).

Proposed Size
- 12-15

Silent Auditors*
- 0

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 10
New Directions in Pop-, Sub-, and Lowbrow Cultural Studies

Conveners
• Alex Fulk (University of Texas at Austin)
• Cyrus Shahan (Colby College)
• Kai Werbeck (University of North Carolina at Charlotte)

Seminar Description
This seminar will reflect on the growing body of current scholarship in German Studies that has made unmistakable how texts once looked down upon from an academic standpoint—underground horror films, street-art, or punk music, to name a few—can no longer be treated as trivial or be pushed to the periphery as exotic but ultimately useless surface ephemera. Exciting scholarly projects ranging from the underlying tensions in Heimatfilms (Johannes von Moltke) to representations of the ghetto image in German gangsta-rap music (Maria Stehle), and from an interest in the aesthetics of graffiti (Johannes Temeschinko) to the rising fascination with German Science-Fiction (Sonja Fritzche, Sunka Simon), testify to the critical currency such materials bring to discourses on globalization, politics, labor, and free time in Germany. The artistic practices under investigation have in common that they challenge rigid and stereotypical notions of German identity, create sites of resistance, and query the role of nationalism in the age of globalization.

This avenue of research simultaneously illustrates the critical edge German Studies brings to broader intellectual and academic-institutional problems with aesthetics, politics, identity, technology, and economics. While we are all well aware of the siren cry of the “crisis in the humanities” and the fear that German Studies will be deemed inessential in light of STEM-rhetoric, pop-, sub-, and lowbrow cultural practices are indeed particularly adept at not only responding to such challenges, but also critiquing them. The new and, at times, revitalized and retooled aesthetic/artistic practices that make up this cultural triumvirate, from technologies of détournement (via turntables, hacking, or found film) to the ways that science fiction and steam punk narratives speak and subvert the language of the STEM-imperative, expand the ways in which German Studies has and can continue to argue convincingly that serious engagement with these practices produces critical insights into the socio-political issues haunting the public sphere. Concurrently, such interventions into and interruptions of the STEM paradigm tend on a humanist level to the inescapable concerns of the economic-employment based logic that constitutes the “realities” of higher education and continue to assert the relevancy and necessity of cultural and aesthetic critique, in particular, and critical thinking, in general.

With sessions on the present and future of pop-, sub- and lowbrow cultural studies, the field as a foil for the discussion on the future of German Studies, and the practice of non-traditional work in the classroom, this three-part seminar wishes to offer a forum to rethink the place of these productive sub-categories within the field of German Studies. In our discussions we seek to address bigger intellectual questions about media censorship after the Third Reich, the emergence of political violence in West Germany, or reunified Germany’s coming to terms with its newfound multi-cultural self-understanding through non-traditional texts and practices. It is our goal to create an interdisciplinary discussion that sketches out the future direction of research agendas on pop-, sub-, and lowbrow cultures, enables scholars to devise publishing strategies outside the canonical narrative of the scholarly manuscript, and evaluates the prospects of firmly establishing courses on the topic in higher learning.
Seminar Format
Participants will be asked to write and read pre-distributed 5-page papers on a broad variety of subjects relevant to the branch of German Studies covered in this seminar. These short papers should briefly establish a current topic relevant to the seminar's goals, give an overview of the state of scholarship, and present an original argument that will trigger and facilitate group discussion. We, the conveners, will not assign any additional reading but encourage all participants to familiarize themselves with the topics discussed in the papers to the best of their ability. Therefore, the conveners will require all presenters to distribute their papers in a timely fashion via a seminar listserv approximately one month before the conference. In addition, participants will be asked to fill out a Google doc that specifies their primary text(s) so that others have the chance to look at the texts in advance. As some of the texts selected for discussion (such as underground horror films or rare Punk audio materials) may not be easily available, it is advisable to create this document in early 2014. If possible, it would also be helpful to create a password protected Web site to which texts can be uploaded and shared. Ideally, papers will then be grouped into topic clusters so that for each of our three meetings 4-5 papers are the basis for the discussion.

The conveners define their roles as organizers and moderators, but only to a certain extent. It is our goal to foster a discussion among equals in which the conveners are also participants of the discussion. The conveners will ensure that sessions start and end on time, that papers are submitted in time, and that every presenter has the opportunity to participate in the discussions in a cordial yet critical environment. Beyond these duties, the conveners wish to be part of a research group that seeks to define the situation in field of sub-, pop-, and low brow cultures, illuminate its strengths and weaknesses, and assess its viability for teaching, bouncing off ideas for further projects and collaborations.

Proposed Size
• 12-15

Silent Auditors*
• 1-5

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 11
The Future of Teaching the Holocaust in German Studies, History, and Comparative Literature in the U.S.

Conveners
• Natalie Eppelsheimer (Middlebury College)
• Marcel Rotter (University of Mary Washington, Fredericksburg)
• Iris Bork-Goldfield (Wesleyan University)

Seminar Description
This seminar builds on the discussion about the past, present, and future of Holocaust Studies that was central to last year GSA conference in Denver, CO. Based on Ruth Klüger’s observations in her keynote address about “The Future of Holocaust Literature” as well as Marianne Hirsch and Irene Kacandes’ seminal work on Teaching the Representations of the Holocaust (2004), our session seeks to continue and extend the conversations about “The Future of Holocaust Studies,” asking how (and if) to learn from the past is still relevant for today’s students and what new approaches might be necessary to teach the Shoah and its legacies. We hope that these seminar discussions will allow us to assess and discuss how this complex topic is taught in today’s language, literature, culture, and history courses and in the digital humanities at U.S. universities and colleges.

We envision three main points of departure for seminar discussions, which, depending on the nature of the submissions, could be the foci for the three seminar days:

The first is Alan Rosen’s question pertaining to the use of English in teaching the Representation of the Holocaust: "How does a teacher resolve the tension between the centrality of English to teaching the Holocaust, on the one hand, and its marginality to the events, on the other?" We would like to extend his notion to the Teaching of Holocaust-related topics in the German-language classroom.

We are equally interested in discussing how the increasingly digitized classroom as well as digitized forms of memorialization have impacted our teaching and the selection of teaching materials at a time when we commemorate the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the camps in 2014 and 2015, and when the era of the living witnesses to the events of the Holocaust is coming to a close. What is the role of Holocaust literature in German Studies at times in which apps for smartphones — such as the recently launched “Stolpersteine -App” in Munich — are developed to offer digital, virtual versions of memorials for the modern tourist? How has the public history of the Holocaust changed with digitized forms of memorialization? What is the degree of complementarity of all these forms as they enrich Holocaust Studies?

Third, we would like to take a look at the dual roles that many of us assume as researchers and educators, and consequently the challenges that we face when working at U.S. institutions of higher learning. One central issue we would like to debate in our respective roles concerns the different nature of questions about the Shoah and its legacies. We hope that our seminar discussion will initiate a fruitful debate on whether the demands of our classroom — be it in German Studies, History, or Comparative Literature — are reflected in the questions that are posed by researchers.

Possible discussion questions:

• How do we teach the history, memory, and memorialization of the Holocaust in the different disciplines (i.e. German Studies, cultural component of language instruction, History, Comparative Literature)?
• In what way do memorials and memorialization impact and complement the teaching of Holocaust literature in German Studies and German language instruction?
• How can the revival of Jewish life in Germany impact the teaching of the Holocaust in German Studies and German language instruction?
• How is the Holocaust addressed in the digital humanities?
• How do pedagogical questions differ from research questions. Do pedagogical questions reflect research questions – and vice versa?
• What are the pedagogical concerns in teaching courses (or parts of a course) in either German or English? How do our learning objectives differ in courses taught in English versus those taught in German (and in those that use both)?
• Is it possible to teach original German texts in an undergraduate (third- or fourth-year) German course without risking the loss of in-depth discussions?
• Does the discussion of German texts allow for a deeper focus on philological aspects rather than on contents? Do seminal German texts translated into English undermine students' confidence in the "authenticity" of what they read?
• As a case in point: Which of Ruth Klüger's childhood memoirs should be read in a course taught in German at a U.S. College or University: Still Alive, which was written for an American audience, or weiter leben, which was intended for German readers?

This seminar solicits paper proposals from literary, cultural studies, and history teacher-scholars who investigate various strategies (including the use of digital teaching materials) for teaching the Representation of the Holocaust in German Studies, and who address pedagogical concerns related to the choice of the language of instruction.

Seminar Format
The conveners will collect proposals, group the papers by topic and develop a list of relevant readings and talking points for discussion that will be made available to all participants by mid-July. All participants will be asked to pre-circulate 7-8-page papers by mid-August, most probably in a digital format via Dropbox or in Google drive, to allow participants ample time to read and reflect on all contributions.

During the conference, the conveners envision their roles as facilitators and moderators who prepare discussion questions and identify connections between seminar meetings. Rather than reading papers at the sessions, participants will each be asked to offer a 5-minute bullet point summary of their paper and to reflect on how the teaching of the Holocaust and its legacies has changed over the last decade in German Studies, including German language instruction. This process will be followed by open discussions, moderated by the conveners, who will make sure that all participants have equal opportunities to contribute. Hoping to initiate interdisciplinary discussions between seminar participants, we would ideally like to alternate among History, German Studies, and Comparative Literature papers as well as traditional text-based and digital approaches.

On the final seminar day, we will reserve about 20 minutes for concluding remarks, including a summary of our seminar discussion (provided by the conveners) and options for future collaborations.

Proposed Size
• 12-15

Silent Auditors
• 1-5

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 12
Religion in Germany in the 20th Century:
Paradigm Shifts and Changing Methodologies

Conveners
- Thomas Großbölting (Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster)
- Mark Edward Ruff (Saint Louis University)

Seminar Description
In the last two decades, scholarly interest in German religion has undergone not only a breathtaking resurgence but also a fundamental transformation. Older models of church history and secularization paradigms have largely been displaced. Younger scholars, in particular, have taken the lead in challenging old models of church history that all too frequently painted a narrow picture of theologies and old men in church towers. They sought to broaden the canvas to include social forms, political networks, societal relationships, gender, religious vocabularies and alternatives to Christianity that range from Islam to political religions, cults and new forms of religious spirituality.

These younger scholars critical of old orthodoxies, however, have been unable to achieve any sort of consensus in their picture of the German religious landscape not just for the postwar era but also for the first half of the 20th century. This lack of consensus stems, at least in part, from the fact that they share few methodological assumptions. Sociologists, confessional theologians, scholars of religious studies and historians have long often used different vocabularies; they operate under vastly different definitions of religion and how it is to be analyzed. The spectrum of definitions includes those of traditional church historians and postmodern scholars who search for the emergence of spirituality outside church walls. Definitions of the transcendental, the immanent and the spiritual thus vary widely.

This seminar is intended to take stock of these fundamental transformations in the historiography of German religion from the 1960s to the present. Its focus is on methodological shifts that have shaped the rapidly changing historiography. This seminar will specifically examine changes in concepts of religion, spirituality and transcendence and their impact on historical research. It will analyze the strengths and weaknesses of an ongoing series of models of religious, old and new, that have been offered to describe the religious history of Germany in the 20th century. It will provide the opportunity for the participants to venture hypotheses and consider new models of religious transformation to account for key religious changes. Most significantly, it will not focus on any particular confession, historical era or German state. It will include scholars of the German Empire, Weimar Era, Nazi Era, Federal Republic and German Democratic Republic. Since many of these scholars are also well-versed in the religious histories of other nations, participants will be in a position to assess the singularity of German religious experiences.

The first day of the seminar will explore traditional models of church history and the changes wrought by models derived from social history, including models of so-called religious "milieux" pioneered from the 1960s through the 1990s. The second day will examine recent challenges to both models as well as models of secularization that center on religious transformation and are rooted in the analysis of spiritual movements and everyday spirituality outside of the two major confessions. The third day, finally, will analyze the current state of fragmentation - one similar to that of other historical subfields - and offer potential directions forward.

Seminar Format
This seminar is structured around key questions and seminal texts that will be circulated among the participants in the early summer of 2014, several months before the seminar will be formally convened. These readings will include short several-paged précis of the key questions written by the seminar conveners. The common readings will
also include approximately six more substantial essays and book chapters of approximately twenty-five pages that capture the essence of particular approaches to religious history or methodological challenges. While the exact readings have yet to be determined, they will address the following methodologies and paradigm shifts. One reading will reflect upon traditional church history. Two essays will introduce the models of the social-moral milieus, one derived largely from social and political history, the other adding approaches from cultural history. Another essay will present the postmodern challenges to models of church history and social-moral milieus. Yet another will offer criticisms of models of secularization and put forward an alternative model of religious transformation. Upon completion of these readings, seminar participants will be expected to reflect upon each of the key questions and the corresponding readings. They will bring their reflections with them to the seminar. They will also be asked to pen a formal statement of 400 to 500 words that sums up their own historical and theoretical methodology. This statement should ideally reflect not only the thrust of the larger historiography but insights gained from their own research, past and present. These statements will be distributed approximately two weeks before the start of the seminar in order to facilitate the third day’s discussion, which will offer seminar participants the opportunity to chart directions for future inquiry. Finally, seminar participants will also be asked to compile a bibliography of works germane to each of these approaches to religious history and to the methodological challenges offered by critics.

The two conveners, Thomas Großböltling and Mark Edward Ruff, will be responsible for providing the Leitfragen and circulating the texts beforehand. They envision using either an electronic list-serve or a newly created portal on the new electronic journal, *Contemporary Church History Quarterly*, to launch the conversations before Kansas City. The conveners will also facilitate the discussions in Kansas City. Both are fluent in both German and English, the two languages of the seminar. On the third day of the seminar, they will also raise the question of how these topics and questions might be pursued further in the form of either a follow-up conference, joint article or edited volume. Both conveners plan to take the lead in pursuing whatever option is decided upon by the participants.

**Proposed Size**

- 16-20

**Silent Auditors**

- 6-10

---

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 13
Das Kalb vor der Gotthardpost:
Swiss Culture, History, and Politics in the Work of Peter von Matt

Conveners
- Peter Meilaender (Houghton College)
- Hans Rindisbacher (Pomona College)

Seminar Description
In 2012, Peter von Matt capped a long and impressive career as Switzerland's preeminent literary critic by winning the Schweizer Buchpreis for his collection of essays, Das Kalb vor der Gotthardpost, the only non-belletristic work ever to have received the prize. Like his earlier collection Die tintenblauen Eidgenossen, Das Kalb vor der Gotthardpost strikingly displays the most noteworthy element of von Matt's criticism: a virtuosic ability to move back and forth between literature, history, and politics, so that the reader feels he has caught a glimpse into unexplored nooks of the Swiss soul. Sometimes von Matt accomplishes this through close analyses of particular authors; at other times, he ranges more broadly, following specific themes or historical trends as they appear in a range of literary works. Invariably, however, the reader of von Matt's essays walks away with a richer understanding of Swiss identity and its broader place within European and Western culture.

The purpose of this seminar is to use these two volumes of Peter von Matt's essays—especially the more recent, prize-winning Das Kalb vor der Gotthardpost, but also Die tintenblauen Eidgenossen—as an interdisciplinary window onto the intersections between Swiss history, politics, and literature. We are interested both in exploring his own thought and in using his work as a jumping-off point for considering the issues with which he deals. Alongside the books' examinations of major Swiss authors or particular works, two themes in particular reverberate throughout the essays: Switzerland's encounter with the broader trends of European modernity, as it has experienced phenomena such as industrialization, liberalization, or globalization; and an attempt to discern the meaning and value of Swiss nationalism and patriotism.

The seminar thus presents an opportunity both to assess the work of Peter von Matt and also to honor his example through an examination—in the interdisciplinary spirit of his own work—of the themes he has discussed so insightfully.

We have some hopes of partnering with the Swiss consulate in order to bring Professor von Matt to Kansas City in order to participate in the seminar himself, but at this point those plans are not definitive. Should Professor von Matt attend, the seminar would be conducted in German."

Seminar Format
All participants will be expected to have read Das Kalb vor der Gotthardpost in advance of the seminar. They will also be encouraged (though not required) to have read Die tintenblauen Eidgenossen. The three days of the seminar will be structured thematically along lines hinted at in the preceding description of the seminar's goals:

- Day One: Focus on Switzerland's experience of and confrontation with European modernity, including phenomena such as industrialization, liberalization, and globalization
- Day Two: Focus on Swiss nationalism and patriotism, their meaning, content, and value
- Day Three: Focus on particular authors or works examined in von Matt's essays.
Participants will have written and submitted short 2000-2500 word essays on one of these topics. These essays will be distributed in advance and will form the basis of each day's discussion. Because the essays will have been distributed in advance, we will not have formal paper presentations during the seminar itself; rather, the conveners will use the day's essays to structure and moderate each morning's conversation.

The conveners will be responsible for collecting essays ahead of the conference and distributing them to participants, and they will share the duties of moderating each day's discussion. On the basis of their reading of the day's essays, they will formulate a short set of discussion questions to focus the morning's conversation. These can be distributed to participants (who will have already had the papers) shortly in advance of the conference--a week should suffice--and will then serve to structure the daily conversations.

The conveners hope that the revised essays might form the basis for an edited collection engaging von Matt’s work.

**Proposed Size**
- 16-20

**Silent Auditors**
- 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 14

Berlin in the Cold War—The Cold War in Berlin

Conveners

- Stefanie Eisenhut (Humboldt Universität Berlin)
- Hanno Hochmuth (Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung Potsdam)
- Konrad H. Jarausch (University of North Carolina)
- Scott Krause (University of North Carolina)

Seminar Description

Literatures discussing the GDR, Federal Republic, and Cold War all place great importance on Berlin. However, the entanglements between these three distinct historiographies are still an open question. This seminar, Berlin in the Cold War—The Cold War in Berlin, seeks to debate the repercussions of the seminal processes that simultaneously divided and coalesced in Berlin in order to explore (I) local consequences of international relations, (II) persisting ties across the global political divide and (III) different ways of making sense out of this unique experience. We have therefore chosen a three-dimensional approach:

- **Locating Berlin in the Cold War.** The struggle between two superpowers over Berlin captured the attention of contemporary policy makers, the international public, artists, and historians alike. Highlighting dramatic events such as the Airlift and the Wall's construction in their symbolism for the Cold War, scholars have largely glossed over their impact on local Berliners. Refigured architectures, spatial structures, and economies shaped the everyday life of more than three million individuals. Instead of being bystanders, Berliners in East and West gradually developed strategies to thrive within and with the Cold War paradigm. Such a microhistory of the Cold War would enable us to better understand the agency of locals in a global conflict.

- **Disjointed and resilient local entanglements in the Cold War.** Since 1947/48, Berlin became increasingly politically divided. The erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 eventually cut most connections between East and West. Despite the manifest division, however, shared challenges on both sides prompted mutual reactions. Hence an integrated post-war history would go beyond the contrasting comparison of dictatorship vs. democracy and would offer a window to explore overlapping processes and entanglements between East and West Berlin as well as the mutual perception of the city’s inhabitants.

- **Remembering Cold War Berlin.** Berlin has been the preeminent symbol of the Cold War for decades, and it still is. Numerous memoirs, museums, and plaques attempt to keep experiences of Cold War Berlin tangible. Buildings such as the former Allied Headquarters, the Free University, the Congress Hall, and several Soviet War Memorials stand as indelible legacies of the Cold War – while globally exported segments of the Wall reinforce Berlin’s reputation as the conflict’s epicenter. In this segment, we want to analyze Berlin as a global “lieu de mémoire” – not to distinguish between facts and fiction, but to compare competing narratives and discuss their political intentions.

Taken together, a discussion of these three dimensions within a GSA seminar would jumpstart interdisciplinary work towards an integrated Cold War Berlin history. A GSA seminar on Berlin would offer a unique opportunity in breaking down traditional barriers. It would bring together researchers from different generations and both sides of the Atlantic to intensify fruitful conversations between different scholarly disciplines. The benefits of an integrated Cold War Berlin history would be considerable: Each day, throngs of tourists from across the world visit Berlin in search for Cold War authenticity, only to find the tacky circus of Checkpoint Charlie. Their strong interest deserves better answers.
Seminar Format
Taking advantage of the new format, we will structure the seminar to start the conversation early online and intensify discussions on site.

Preparation stage: We will start the seminar by soliciting papers form the participants in early June. These short but tangible pieces of scholarship will be circulated through an online platform, Moodle. This platform offers the opportunity for crucial scholarly work before the seminar convenes. To this end, participants will afterwards be assigned to three groups that will explore one intellectual dimension of the topic each. Participants will be grouped according to their papers topics and methodologies. Facilitated by a convener, each discussion group will be tasked to prepare one 20 minutes workshop-like introduction. Through the online platform, group members can introduce themselves to each other, discuss common themes, and identify key readings for all seminar participants by late August. This set-up will maximize the time allotted in Kansas City to discuss first results of an ongoing conversation, rather than starting one at the GSA conference.

The seminar: We will organize the actual seminar in an introductory workshop and a following structured and moderated discussion exploring one intellectual goal per session. On each day, one group will present some introductory remarks (“Impulsreferat”) concerning the intellectual goal at issue. We expect them not to present their papers, but rather to provide some first thoughts on the subject of the day based on their own research and their preceding discussion online. These statements, combined with already posted online comments and assigned readings are intended to quickly initiate a fruitful discussion among all participants. On the last day, Konrad Jarausch will synthesize first findings of the seminar to spark a concluding discussion of its overall results. The resulting seminar structure will look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1: September 19th</th>
<th>Day 2: September 20th</th>
<th>Day 3: September 21st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General topic: Dealing with and making sense out of the Cold War on a local level</td>
<td>General topic: Transcending boarders – mutual reactions and perceptions between East and West</td>
<td>General topic: Remembering Cold War Berlin – social practices of remembrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Conveners introduction to problems posed by Berlin’s history (10 min)</td>
<td>(I) Conveners introduction to an entangled history of East &amp; West Berlin (10 min)</td>
<td>(I) Conveners introduction to Berlin as a Cold War lieu de mémoire (10 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II) Group I: Locating Berlin in the Cold War (20 min)</td>
<td>(II) Group II: Disjointed and resilient local entanglements in the Cold War (20 min)</td>
<td>(II) Group III: Remembering Cold War Berlin (20 min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(III) Moderated discussion about Berlin’s role during the Cold War and on how the Cold War affected the city’s history – Berlin as a part of Global History (90 min)</td>
<td>(III) Moderated discussion surveying the current state of Berlin’s historiography – the city’s history as an entangled “microhistory”? (90 min)</td>
<td>(III) Concluding discussion facilitated by Konrad Jarausch (90 min)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Size
- 12-15

Silent Auditors*
- 1-5

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 15

On War Trauma and its Consequences in the Twentieth Century

Conveners

• John Zilcosky (University of Toronto)
• Wolf Kittler (University of California, Santa Barbara)

Seminar Description

Together with the luxury and comfort of nineteenth-century industrialization came new risks for the body and soul. One of these disorders was called railway spine, a name that was soon replaced by the more general “trauma,” which included all kinds of insurable damages to the psyche caused by accidents in the workplace and on the rails. During World War I, the first industrial war, a specific new form of trauma appeared: shell shock. This disease interested not only military psychologists but also legal, medical and insurance experts on the home front.

In our seminar we propose to study the term trauma, as it was newly conceived and re-defined during World War I, under the following aspects:

• Diagnostic tools and therapeutic methods developed by various competing schools of psychology and psychiatry such as Fritz Kaufmann’s technique of Faradization, Max Nonne’s treatment of shell-shocked soldiers through hypnosis, and, finally, the psychoanalytic cure that was developed by Freud’s disciples Sandor Ferenczi, Karl Abraham, Ernst Simmel, and Ernest Jones.
• The role of shell-shock for Freud’s revision of his system in the nineteen twenties which is most famously documented in his essay Beyond the Pleasure Principle, but can also be traced as a less obvious, but nonetheless effective subtext in his work on The Uncanny.
• The institutional shift in the field of psychology and psychiatry that occurred when Freud received promises from the Central Powers in 1918 that, should the war continue, psychoanalytic centers would be created at the front, and which was confirmed when, in the early nineteen twenties, he was called as an expert witness in the trial of a prominent psychiatrist accused of maltreating traumatized soldiers with electroshock.
• Shell-shock as both insurable risk and late effect of the war, as it appears not only in Franz Kafka’s official writings for the Workers’ Accident Insurance Company for the Kingdom of Bohemia, but also in his fragmentary story “The Burrow” that is based on a reportage about the subterranean activities under the trenches of the Great War.
• The transformation of the concept of trauma during and after World War II which includes not only the notion of post-traumatic stress disorder as it was defined by medical specialists in the time of the Vietnam War, but also the discussions about the compensation of Holocaust victims and survivors, in the nineteen nineties.

The goal of the seminar is to trace the medical, legal, and cultural history of the term trauma which, since the nineteen nineties, has played such a crucial role not only in the discourses of deconstruction and postmodernity, but also in international relations and politics.

Seminar Format

Participants of the seminar are expected to write a paper of 10 to 12 pages length, which will be pre-circulated at the latest two weeks before the first day of the GSA conference. While this will ensure that everyone will be have had an opportunity to study all the different contributions to the topic, we propose to have the papers read in full again at the conference itself. This will ensure that the discussion sections are closely tied to the material evidence and the arguments of each participant. We are planning to compose a bibliography which will be circulated among the participants at the latest at the end of spring 2014. The participants will be invited to add their own sources
and suggested readings to this list. The conveners of the conference will communicate with the participants via email, in urgent cases perhaps also over the phone. The role of the two conveners will consist in the following tasks:

- Identify and contact scholars who have done important work in the fields of war trauma, psychoanalysis, and insurance law.
- Identify and contact especially graduate students working in these same fields.
- After having read proposals and abstracts of papers suggested by these senior scholars and graduate students choose the best and most relevant contributions to the topic of the seminar.
- Compose and circulate a bibliography for all the participants to share.
- Facilitate communication between the participants in the months leading to the conference.
- Make sure that the papers are finished and circulated in time.
- Contribute one paper each on a specific aspect of the seminar topic.
- Make sure that the appropriate technical equipment such as beamers and screens are provided at the conference.
- Lead the discussions at the conference.
- Decide whether some or all of the papers are good enough to warrant publication after the conference. If so, they might serve as editors of a volume about war trauma in the twentieth century.

Proposed Size
- 12-15

Silent Auditors*
- 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Film in the German Language, Literature and Culture Curriculum

Conveners
- Eva Russo (Washington University in St. Louis)
- Astrid Klocke (Northern Arizona University)

Seminar Description
This seminar proposal was inspired by the panel on Film in the German Language, Literature and Culture Curriculum (GSA 2013). The discussion that ensued made clear that GSA members desire in-depth treatment of film pedagogy at all levels of German, but that more far-reaching discussions would require a three-day seminar.

German language specialists integrate films into all levels of language, literature and culture instruction as an engaging, contextualized source of authentic language that model culture and can be reproduced and extrapolated upon by students. Scholars teaching languages to students accustomed to a multi-media environment utilize film to illustrate authentic culture and provide varied language input. At lower levels, instructors capitalize on students’ innate interest in film and create activities to stimulate active language production and hone listening skills. Faculty teaching advanced undergraduate and graduate film seminars in German or those who teach German film to a general campus audience have considerations, ranging from course focus and audience, film selection, screening options, and student projects. Courses run the gamut from defining the film studies within the humanities, national film and culture (e.g. Die Kultur des Dritten Reiches), migration (e.g. Transnational Film), to seminars on literature and film adaptations, film analysis, film theory, and cinematic expression (e.g. Avant-garde Cinema).

The Humanities crisis has necessitated a re-thinking of undergraduate and graduate German curricula. In order to attract students to the study of German, lower level courses incorporate specific films to convey information about contemporary culture or history, upper-level courses teach a body of film —either in German or in English. Depending on a program’s needs, courses focus on national culture, globalization, artistic and cinematic approaches to film analysis or socio-cultural aspects of film. As national accreditation bodies increasingly require outcomes-based assessment metrics for undergraduate and graduate programs, German curricula which incorporate film are pressed to integrate media literacy training and assessment into their courses, while most faculty charged with teaching these courses often have no formal training in film or media studies.

The purpose of this seminar is to think constructively through the concerns raised in Denver regarding the different needs and interests of heterogeneous groups in the class and motivating students to think more analytically beyond understanding content. Seminar conveners will explain how film instruction is integrated into their programs. They will discuss how to spiral critical film analysis and the development of visual literacy through the entire or large sections of the curriculum, discuss how determine what kind of film course(s) complement and extend existing curricula, share their own approaches to course development, and discuss effective teaching and assessment strategies at all instructional levels.

Seminar Format
As participants prepare their own contributions, some suggested readings would be sent to participants. These readings include (but are not limited to) excerpts from some of the bibliography listed below. Readings will be determined in conjunction with conveners and will total no more than 150 pages total (in response to feedback from one of last year’s seminars).
The seminar is divided into three parts: treatment of film in lower-level German classes (day 1), in the advanced undergraduate or graduate seminar taught in German (day 2), and finally for the general campus audience (day 3). Participants will consider how to incorporate the same two to three films in each of these individual settings. Films will be selected by conveners from the following list of eight: Die drei Räuber (Hayo Freitag, 2007); Jenseits der Stille (Caroline Link, 1996); Das Wunder von Bern (Sönke Wortmann, 2003); Die Welle (Dennis Gansel, 2008); Almanya - Willkommen in Deutschland (Yasemin Samdereli, 2011); Sophie Scholl - Die letzten Tage (Mark Rothermund, 2005); Goodbye, Lenin! (Wolfgang Becker, 2003); and Die fetten Jahre sind vorbei (Hans Weingartner, 2004). Participants will be asked to submit lesson plans, syllabi, assignments, and assessments from the courses in which they have incorporated the selected films selected, as well as a brief position paper regarding their reasons for the choices made. Materials should be e-mailed to seminar proposer, Eva Russo, who will assume responsibility for circulating these to all participants. In addition, participants will be asked to look at some excerpted materials on film analysis, to be determined in conjunction with conveners. All materials will be sent to participants no less than 6 weeks in advance of the conference.

Proposed Size

• 16-20

Silent Auditors*

• 1-5

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Rethinking Migration and German Culture

Conveners
- Brent Peterson (Lawrence University)
- Robert R. Shandley (Texas A&M University)

Seminar Description
A quick survey of the 2013 German Studies Association’s annual conference program shows a decline in the number of sessions devoted to migrant literature and film. There was a three-part series devoted to Transnational Hi/Stories, a panel on Navid Kermani, sessions on trans-cultural narratives and transnational drama, but nothing on major authors or filmmakers. It might simply be that Akin, Özdamar, and Zaimoglu have not produced anything recently, that Özdogan is not quite up to serious scholarly attention, and that Thilo Sarrazin is no longer making headlines; but it is likely that the topic will rise again, once the next set of novels and films, perhaps produced by a new, as of yet unfamiliar set of creative artists, appears in cinemas and bookstores. Turkish German writers and filmmakers may no longer dominate, but migrants will probably remain a central force in contemporary German culture. It is, however, just as possible that Zaimoglu was correct in his 2006 assessment: “Migrationsliteratur ist ein toter Kadaver.” If so, we need to reassess interpretative works by Adelson, Cheesman, Fachinger, Mani, Seyhan, and others, because they describe a passing fashion rather than a “Turkish turn in contemporary German literature” (Adelson). A third option, which serves as the organizing principle behind this seminar, would be to use the tension between these two views as the starting point for a broader rethinking of migration in German culture.

With very few exceptions, the scholarly discourse surrounding migrants as a cultural force assumes that migration to Germany began in 1955, when the Federal Republic started recruiting “Gastarbeiter.” While it is certainly true, as the previous paragraph suggests, that this paradigm helped scholars deal with literary and filmic texts that broke through the canon of previous literary history, the object of inquiry has always been oddly narrow. Migrant literature began to gain legitimacy within Germany in 1985, when the Chamisso-Preis was first awarded for “important contributions to German literature” by “nonnative German authors” (Weinrich). Not only does that definition cry out for unpacking, but the prize’s namesake was also an early nineteenth-century refugee from the French Revolution who was able to enter the canon of German literature with a work about migration, Schlemihl. In other words, migration, including culturally significant migration, has a much longer history. It was well underway by the eighteenth century, when it coincided and conflicted with early theories of ethnic and linguistic nationalism, which meant that Jews, starting with Moses Mendelssohn, were treated as migrants. Huguenots extend the timeframe into the seventeenth century. In the twentieth century a re-imagined category might include the Vertriebene (Grass, Lenz, Wolf, Hein) and citizens of the GDR, groups whose writers and filmmakers often explored the same questions of status within the hegemonic culture as their post-1955 compatriots. Using integration and identity to describe these efforts binds us to contested terms, so rethinking would have to explore categories such as post-migrant, global, and trans-national. The time seems ripe and a GSA seminar the perfect venue for such a reexamination.

Seminar Format
This seminar proposes a restructuring of the way scholars conceive of and deal with the issue of migration in German culture. Participants might find these ideas stimulating or crazily unproductive, but it would be useful for them to respond to the provocation that we are presenting in writing so that the seminar can start from a set of shared positions, questions, and ideas that need clarification. The conveners propose starting that conversation by asking participants to respond to essays that they have been working on, in part as presentations at previous GSA conventions: Brent Peterson, “Adelbert von Chamisso’s Schlemihl, the Chamisso Prize, and the Status of Migrant Literature in Germany” and Robert R. Shandley, “Siegfried Lenz’s Heimatmuseum as Migrant Literature.”
would circulate our essays by late spring, and ask for responses by September 1, in order to give everyone a chance to read the entire set of essays before the seminar begins. Five- to seven page papers would give participants enough space to stake out their own positions, which would not necessarily involve any research on their part, although it would be welcome.

In addition, we would ask participants to read Zaimoglu’s very short essay, “Migrantenliteratur ist ein toter Kádaver” and Olga Grjasnowa’s 2012 novel, *Der Russe ist einer, der Birken liebe*, because it raises the issues of language and belonging in a manner that might be unfamiliar to people who specialize in Turkish German texts. The novel’s heroine is a Jewish refugee from Azerbaijan who came to Germany with her family and acquired German citizenship, but ends up in Israel. A talented linguist—she speaks Russian, German, Turkish, French, and Arabic, but not Hebrew—she, like the cast of characters in Akin’s *Auf der anderen Seite* (2006), is at home everywhere and nowhere. These two works provide the starting point for a discussion of what the future of migrant literary and cinema studies might look like once we have expanded its past. The arc of our deliberations over the seminar’s three meetings would take us from the eighteenth century to the present.

As conveners, we see our role as helping to make the seminar as productive as possible for all participants and the larger group of scholars in this field. We would like to suggest that not everyone responds to the same text, and we would use whatever powers of persuasion we have to encourage the broadest possible discussion. We would be happy to respond to essays during the writing process. Given the level of interest in the past in the topic of migration and German culture, even without many of our ideal participants, there is more than a critical mass of potential participants ready to think about moving the discourse in new directions.

**Proposed Size**
- 12-15

**Silent Auditors**
- 1-5

---

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
**Seminar 18**

**Conversion in the Eighteenth Century:**

**Narrative, Spirituality, Aesthetics**

**Conveners**

- Peter Erickson (University of Chicago)
- Jonathan Strom (Emory University)
- Christopher Wild (University of Chicago)

**Seminar Description**

This seminar considers the German eighteenth century's intellectual and cultural engagement with practices of conversion (Bekehrung). On the one hand, the emergence of evangelical Christianity seemed incompatible with the goals of the late German Enlightenment. Pietist conversion was frequently condemned as Schwärmerei, as irrational, and as affect-driven. On the other hand, however, narratives of religious conversion were profoundly influential for secular discourses concerned with self-formation (Bildung). Not only literary autobiography but the Bildungsroman were clearly marked by the influence of conversion narrative — in a way that complicates traditional narratives of secularization.

In this seminar, we will examine some of the contradictions, paradoxes, and controversies that have surrounded conversion's persistent presence in an increasingly secular society, and we will investigate efforts — in philosophy and aesthetics — to develop transform it or to develop alternatives. We foresee dividing up the papers into three sections: (1) Pietism/Enlightenment; (2) Literature/Theater; (3) Aesthetics/Psychology. In this way, we hope to bring together contributions from scholars representing a range of disciplines and theoretical approaches.

1. First, did Pietist conversion represent an innovation over the forms and structures of spiritual experience that had come before it? Are there a variety of genres of Pietist conversion narrative in the eighteenth century and, if so, how can we distinguish them from one another? How were the processes and various modes of conversion within and between traditions understood? How were these narratives circulated and intended to be read? Finally, how did conversion come under pressure from the Enlightenment, and were there practices of conversion that were adapted and transformed by the Enlightenment? Contributions are also welcome that place conversion in the eighteenth century within the context of canonical examples from early Christianity (Paul, Augustine) or within the context of recent theoretical contributions on the topic.

2. Second, the influence of Pietist conversion narrative on the German tradition of literary autobiography has been widely researched and commented upon. In this session, we would especially like to consider the influence of models of conversion on other genres of literature, such as theater, poetry, and the novel. Were there models of conversion besides Pietism (e.g. ancient philosophy, Catholicism, etc.) at play in literature? How are we to understand the relationship between religious concepts of conversion and rebirth and the emerging secular discourse surrounding Bildung? Contributions are welcome that engage with literature of the long eighteenth century, up to and including the Romantics. Authors considered might include, for example, Klopstock, Schiller, Goethe, Moritz, Jung-Stilling, Tieck, and Hoffmann.

3. Third, a number of scholars have recently been working on the influence of the concept of conversion, or the distinct but related concept of spiritual exercises, on the development of aesthetics, especially in the work on Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, Karl Philipp Moritz, Johann Georg Hamann, and the Romantics. Can one speak of practices of "aesthetic conversion" or of conversion as a model for aesthetic experience? On the other hand,
one might also reflect on the influence of conversion on the development of the field of psychology and, in particular, of the psychological case study (Fallgeschichte).

Our goal, in short, will be to trace the presence of the phenomenon of conversion across multiple domains of inquiry in the eighteenth century with a view towards better understanding the interrelation of literature, religion, and aesthetics around 1800.

Seminar Format
The proposed seminar would involve three sessions — one dedicated to each of the three categories discussed above (Pietism/Enlightenment; Literature/Theater; Aesthetics/Psychology). Ideally, each session will have 3-5 participants. Participants will be asked to circulate a 6-10 page paper in advance of the conference that presents a central thesis and that is to be submitted 4 weeks prior to the start of the conference. During the seminar, participants would then have the opportunity to give a brief (5-10 min) presentation. This would be followed by general discussion. We also foresee assigning a limited number of additional readings, which will be selected for each session to give additional form to the discussion. These might include a published article written by one of the conveners, a recent theoretical approach to conversion, or a brief primary text. The conveners would each be responsible for moderating one of the three sessions.

Proposed Size
• 12-15

Silent Auditors
• 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 19
Liebe-Sex-Krieg

Conveners
• Drew Bergerson (University of Missouri-Kansas City)
• Elissa Mailänder (Centre d’Histoire de Sciences Po)

Seminar Description
This interdisciplinary seminar seeks to explore the challenges and opportunities for integrative interpretations of
the nexus between intimacy and violence. This problem is appropriate for an interdisciplinary seminar in German
Studies as it lends itself to integrative approaches in terms of interpretation and approach. This seminar topic is
particularly appropriate for the 2014 GSA in Kansas City, marking the 100th anniversary of the start of the Great
War. Yet the sources can and should be wide-ranging in terms of the period, location, and definition of violence
and sexuality. They could include not only total wars but also civil wars, minor wars, genocides, terrorism, state
surveillance, rape, prostitution, and so on.

The seminar seeks to foster an integrative and collaborative dialogue among an interdisciplinary group of scholars
on the topic of Liebe-Sex-Krieg using primary sources taken from a wide range of German contexts.
It will focus on those two issues. The first concerns phenomenology. The problem of apprehending the other—past
or present—is itself a problem of intimacy, with violence looming in the background—and vice versa. Insight into
the nexus of love-sex-war is made more difficult by the fact that these phenomena are at once so personal and so
collective. At the same time, the “historic” nature of these events makes some of them noteworthy, leading to the
self-conscious authoring of texts for posterity. Recent scholarship has drawn particular attention to the kinds of
sources available to study these issues. We are interested in exploring the range and interpretative possibilities of
our sources. What can we know and say about Liebe-Sex-Krieg through what kinds of sources? What are our limits?

The second concerns experience. A wave of recent scholarship has drawn attention to the experience of ordinary
people during wartime on both the home and war fronts with particular attention to intimacy. [2] We are interest-
ed in exploring the many relationships between individual intimacy and collective violence as well as between
individual acts of violence and collective forms of intimacy and belonging. Love and sex are often tied to domination
and power through categories of race, class, gender, and so on; but it can also provide authentic experiences of
lust and arousal, affirmation of the self, and connections that transcend the social boundaries and tragic circum-
stances of the human condition. How does intimacy and arousal play out in the context of war, civil war, terrorism,
surveillance, or genocide? How does violence and arousal play out in the context of love and sex? What options
exist for non-normative interpretations of these phenomena?
On the basis of these conversations, we will engage in a far more wide-ranging conversation about how we should
think about intimacy-violence and what new kinds of questions we could be asking.

Seminar Format
In advance of the seminar, participants will be asked to do four things:

1. They will read: Dorothea Wierling, Eine Familie im Krieg: Leben, Sterben und Schreiben 1914-1918, Göttingen:
Wallstein Verlag, 2013.

2. They will submit, via Dropbox.com by Sept 1, 2014, a scan or transcription of one primary source that opens
interesting opportunities for or challenges to integrative interpretation on the subject of intimacy-violence.
3. They will include a short contextualization of the document in one page or less: provenance, authorship, audience, how you came upon it, and so on.

4. Finally, participants will read all of the primary sources and contextualizations in advance of the GSA.

During the seminar, participants will not make individual presentations on “their” primary sources. Rather, we will organize our discussions around key questions in order to direct our efforts at integrative and collaborative analysis of those sources. Our agenda follows from the two main questions of the seminar.

• The agenda for the First Session is both a critical discussion of Wierling’s book and a critical discussion of the problem of phenomenology of Liebe-Sex-Krieg in terms of the sources provided by the participants. We will ask: What windows do these sources open or close for interpretation?

• The agenda for the Second Session is a critical discussion of the experience of Liebe-Sex-Krieg in terms of the sources provided by the participants. We will ask: What is the experience of intimacy-violence? What stories can and should we tell about intimacy-violence?

• The agenda for the Third Session is a far more open-ended conversation about Liebe-Sex-Krieg in terms of theory. We will ask: How can we theorize intimacy-violence? What are the big questions here? What other agenda items or ideas do the participants bring to the table?

Proposed Size

• 16-20

Silent Auditors *

• 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 20
Staging Globalization: Theory and Application

Conveners
- Kristin Kopp, University of Missouri
- Siegfried Mattl, Boltzmann Institute, Vienna
- Carsten Strathausen, University of Missouri

Seminar Description
“Globalization” has become the ubiquitous catch-phrase employed to characterize all recent social, cultural, and political developments. Even academic discourse is generally assumed to be undergoing a globalization process leading to greater dissemination and circulation of shared knowledge and ideas. In German studies, however, any sense that this process is homogenizing intellectual inquiry is belied by the very treatment of the topic of globalization itself, given the divergent patterns of reception found on both sides of the Atlantic. While, for example, Ulrich Beck’s Weltrisikogesellschaft (2008, with simultaneous English translation) has elicited a wave of academic discussion (as well as criticisms and refinements) in Europe to the extent that the term “risk” itself risks achieving passé status there, the term, and the theoretical negotiations it now connotes, has been largely absent from the North American German-studies landscape.

One thus finds that, while assumptions of a “global” reality are commonly encountered in North American German studies (as evinced by the now frequent references to German literature, culture, immigration, science, or cuisine “in the global era”), critical applications of globalization theory itself are engaged much less frequently. Our seminar on “globalization” will fill this lacuna. We aim to bring together an interdisciplinary group of scholars engaging with globalization theory in their current research in order to strengthen collaboration and to assess disciplinary contours emerging on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition to outlining the strategies employed in the staging of globalization in their case, potential seminar participants should highlight the theoretical tools they are bringing to their projects.

While the conveners are particularly welcoming of new and unexpected projects, we include these topic suggestions to indicate various points of entry:
- Following Ulrich Beck’s model of “world risk society,” how are global risk communities being brought into existence around specific risks? Is there evidence of what he calls “the clash of risk cultures”?
- Again following Beck, but now drawing on his model of “cosmopolitanism from below,” where do we see signs of social diversity purposefully engaged rather than rejected?
- In narratives projecting theoretical models of globalization into the future (perhaps in the form of literary utopias/dystopias, or science fiction from both past and present), which models are being staged?
- If, as Thomas Friedman argues, “living green instead of fighting reds will become the new glue of the Atlantic alliance,” through what mechanisms and in which forms is this “green society” constituting itself?

Seminar Format
The seminar will take the form of a workshop organized to maximize and facilitate sustained discussion between participants. While conventional conference panels involve the frontal presentation of completed ideas in the form of statements, presentations at this workshop will instead function as questions designed to launch discussions. Intellectually, in other words, we seek an open-ended, discussion-generating, collaborative approach.
With this format in mind, the conveners have developed the following set of structures and procedures:

At the workshop, participants will each have between 20-30 minutes (depending on the final number of participants) allotted to their question. In this time, they will take 5-7 minutes to introduce a conceptual problem or theoretical question they have encountered in their research. This presentation should be designed to elicit collaborative responses from the workshop participants.

In order to prepare for these discussions, participants will pre-circulate a research document (of no more than 2,000 words). This document can take any form: it might be a narrative description of your research project, a set of bullet points highlighting central concerns, a collection of annotated excerpts from theoretical sources, etc. The goal in each case should be to provide seminar participants with that material which would be most profitable for them to prepare in advance of the discussion. What do they need to know or have considered in advance in order to best engage the problem or question presented?

The final 15 minutes of each session will be moderated by one of the three conveners, who will seek to articulate the session’s findings by synthesizing moments of theoretical overlap, and highlighting questions that remain open.

Organizational Timeline:

- **March 2014:** Once the final list of seminar participants has been determined, conveners will create a conversation platform, including an e-mail list, and a shared dropbox.
- **April 2014:** Based on feedback received from participants, conveners will draft a prioritized list of suggested theoretical readings. It will include Ulrich Beck’s *Weltrisikogesellschaft: auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Sicherheit* (Suhrkamp, 2008), translated as *World at Risk* (Polity, 2008) and those works most commonly cited by participants in their project descriptions. Participants will be encouraged to familiarize themselves with the entries on this list.
- **August 15:** Deadline for submitting research documents to dropbox (pre-circulated papers).

**Proposed Size**

- 12-15

**Silent Auditors**

1-5

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.
Seminar 21
Shift: Culture, Society, and Change

Conveners:
- Christina Kraenzle (York University)
- James M. Skidmore (University of Waterloo)

Seminar Description
Environmental degradation, security and privacy concerns, perceived democratic deficits, growing right-wing populism, economic instability and social inequality, youth unemployment, the future of the EU, migration and minority rights, lack of enthusiasm for the Grand Coalition – these are just some of the challenges presently facing German-speaking Europe. In this seminar we wish to explore German society as it is right now, in the middle of these many concerns, in order to understand how that society is responding and will respond to the pressures of the day. We want to focus on the now: not how Germany and German-speaking Europe have met challenges, but how they are meeting challenges by means of artistic expression, economic development, political adaptations, and social change.

We seek papers that treat a wide variety of media and cultural arenas (e.g. film and visual arts, literature, music, theatre and performance, fashion, craft and design); political, social, and religious discourses (e.g. the NSA affair, innovative or grass roots responses to a changing world such as local food and movements, social justice initiatives, debates regarding the place of religion in society, intellectualism in the public sphere); economic studies (the role of the Euro in unifying Europe, future prospects for the German economy in the global age). In short, we are hoping to attract scholars from various fields who are willing to discuss, from their particular disciplinary perspective, what they see happening in German-speaking society and culture today and what that might mean for tomorrow. All participants would be using their papers to ask how the activities, texts, ideas, movements, or debates reflect on our contemporary cultural moment and/or open up new spaces for activism and engagement. Papers might seek to address one or more of the following questions (though the organizers welcome questions/topics that deal with any aspect of the German society’s present moment – these questions are meant as aids to help prod the creative juices):

- How have responses to contemporary sociopolitical issues necessitated new experiments in form or practice?
- How do responses to sociopolitical change communicate local or regional understandings of global concerns? Conversely, how might artists, cultural agents, and political actors engage with more transnational dimensions of local problems?
- Will the recent German federal elections change the social or cultural landscape of Germany?
- The Grand Coalition has made little effort to change Germany’s dual citizenship laws. Does this mark a pause in Germany’s growing awareness of the intercultural component to its identity?
- Is Germany’s role as the central economic power of the Eurozone having an effect on the arts?
- What role will the politics of memory play in 21st century Germany?
- What distinguishes German youth culture from other western youth cultures?
- How do the contemporary narrative arts - film, theatre, literature – address the issues of the day?
- Are responses to sociopolitical change opening up new spaces of activism?

Seminar Format
Those selected to participate in the seminar would be required to write 6,000-7,500 word papers that would be
circulated beforehand to all seminar participants. The deadline for handing in the papers would be 1 August 2014 (in order to allow participants enough time to read the papers at a time of year that is busy with summer vacations and fall term preparations). The organizers will seek out publication/dissemination opportunities for the papers and keep participants informed of these developments. The seminar would provide time for participants to make brief 5-10 minute statements that could be summaries of the main points of their papers and/or responses to other papers in the seminar. The remaining time will be devoted to general discussion and debate. At the present time no additional readings are envisioned for the seminar; since we are focusing on contemporary Germany we wish to leave as open as possible the impulses to which participants may wish to respond.

The role of the convenors would be to collect and make accessible the papers for the seminar, to moderate the discussions at the GSA, to seek out further opportunities for publication or dissemination of the papers, to liaise with the GSA, and to provide any other assistance required by the participants. The convenors will communicate regularly via e-mail with participants in order to encourage participants to meet the deadline for the papers, to provide any additional information as may be necessary, to keep participants informed about the development of publication and dissemination plans, and to provide from time to time some additional resources (e.g. important Feuilleton discussions or other contemporary news) that may be relevant to the seminar contributions.

**Proposed Size**
- 12-15

**Silent Auditors**
- 1-5
Seminar Description
The Baltic region has been influenced by German culture since the 12th century. Merchants of the Hanseatic League as well as crusading knights of the Teutonic Order shaped the history of the region from the medieval to the modern period. While there was clearly no conception of a German “nation” at this point, the merchants in Baltic cities such as Reval or Riga, and the land-owning nobility, descendants of the Teutonic Knights, had a distinct perception of their German-ness as opposed to the “Non-German” (Undeutsch) peasants or craftsmen in the region. The German-speaking elites in the Baltics were the first ones calling themselves Balts, only later adopting the term German Balts (Deutschbalten). The English term Baltic Germans is, therefore, a misleading translation; in their own perception Deutschbalten felt “Baltic” first and “German” only second. In fact, the question needs to be posed whether Baltic Germans actually felt as German nationals, in particular in the 19th-century era of nationalism. Baltic Germans were loyal citizens of the Russian Empire, they contributed at large to the Russian industrialization of the late 19th century and fought in the Imperial Russian Army, even as late as World War I, thereby opposing their fellow Germans.

Did Baltic Germans feel “German”? The German language and German cultural traditions were absolutely central for the Baltic German communities in the region, distinguishing them from the “other”, the non-Germans. However, there seems to be a clear distinction between the feeling of belonging to the (Baltic) German community and the attachment to the German nation. As Tara Zahra has argued with regard to Sudeten Germans and Silesian Germans in her essay on Imagined Non-Communities. National Indifference as a Category, the notion of being indifferent to one's nationality was common in 19th and early 20th-century East Central Europe. Examining the religious, ethnic, national and social interaction of German-speaking and “other” groups in the Baltic Sea Region, this seminar seeks to explore the different perceptions of belonging during the 19th and 20th centuries, with retrospective considerations of earlier patterns of identity during the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period. With the arrival of Estonian and Latvian nationalism in the late 19th century, the question of self-perception and otherness gained additional importance since the Estonian and Latvian nations were shaped at large by distinguishing and defining themselves as opposed to the Germans.

While the perspectives on German-ness in the region starting with the late medieval period are crucial to understand the notions of belonging, the focus of the seminar will be on the 19th and 20th centuries. One of the key aims of this seminar is to analyze how the German-speaking community in the region was influenced by the rise German nationalism, following the Napoleonic wars as well as the emerging Latvian and Estonian nationalisms in the mid-19th century, which led to the establishment of Estonia and Latvia as independent states in 1918. In the light of this new research on national indifference, the questions will be posed to what extent Baltic Germans felt “German.” This also draws a new light onto Adolf Hitler’s “Heim ins Reich” policy leading to the resettlement of Baltic Germans in occupied Poland during World War II and their subsequent flight and expulsion in 1945.

Seminar Format
The aim of this seminar is to bring together scholars of history, literature, film studies and sociology in
order to examine historical patterns of belonging and self-perception among Baltic Germans. In order to facilitate a common understanding of the conception of this seminar, participants will be asked to read Tara Zahra’s essay on National Indifference in advance. In addition, the participants, including the organizers, will be asked to write 10-12 page essays placing their research in the framework of the seminar's guiding questions. These essays will be circulated among the participants four weeks prior to the GSA, so that everybody can read all contributions in advance. Two lead-discussants for each paper will be assigned to each essay. Since all participants will be expected to read all essays in advance, each participant will be given only 5 min to present her/his key arguments. It will be the lead-discussants' task to provide initial comments on the papers and thus facilitate a discussion.

The three-day seminar will start with perceptions of German-ness in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Period and move to the 19th and early 20th century on the second morning. The third day should be devoted to the 20th century and a final discussion about the seminar's key questions raised by the participants' papers.

The conveners will actively participate in this seminar with their own essays. Furthermore, in the months leading up to the conference we will engage in an active email dialogue with the participants to ensure that everyone fully understands the concept of this seminar. We will ask the participants to send us their essays no later than August 8, 2014 to allow the conveners to read and discuss the essays before circulating them.

**Proposed Size**
- 12-15

**Silent Auditors**
- 6-10
Seminar 23
Teaching Fascist Culture

Conveners
- David Pugh (Queen’s University, Kingston, Canada)
- Florentine Strzelczyk, (University of Calgary, Canada)
- Stefan Höppner (University of Calgary, Canada)

Seminar Description
The purpose of the seminar is to take stock of the “cultural turn” in fascist studies and to assess how this new(ish) trend in scholarship can most effectively harnessed to change the way we teach undergraduate classes on fascism. The cultural turn in the study of fascism includes the move away from social and political histories of fascism, and away from versions based on the history of ideas, and towards cultural approaches. The latter can take various forms, such as the study of fascist intellectuals, fascist aesthetics, fascist spectacle, and the role of visual and everyday culture such as fashion, consumption and leisure. Connected with the works of such different scholars as Eley, Griffin, Antliff, Kaplan and Ben-Ghiat, fascism is today understood less in terms of political and social crises but instead in terms of a cultural crisis of modernity. While the seminar’s primary focus will be on Germany and Austria during the years 1919-45, we will welcome contributions that draw on scholarship on other countries in order to throw light on the German experience.

While students continue to show a strong interest in the topic of fascism and are attracted by the idea of a culture-based approach that holds out the promise of showing what fascism “was really like,” the question persists how to capitalize on these new approaches without losing the insights gained through traditional approaches. Developing a sound method of teaching fascism as culture is a strong desideratum of German Studies. The threefold aim of this seminar is first to attempt take stock of and clarify the recent theories of fascism in the context of the “cultural turn,” as well as to consider some of the reservations that have been expressed; secondly, to assess theories and approaches with undergraduate needs in mind; and thirdly to share and discuss in concrete terms the kinds of curricula and course materials that have been found fruitful in the classroom.

Since we have three events to plan, we would suggest organizing the seminar around the concepts clarification, assessment, and application. Under clarification we would take stock of recent theories of fascism and would attempt to isolate specific issues including: the semantic peculiarities of the term fascism as both national and international, and both as a slogan (both positive and negative) and as a concept meriting scholarly definition; the attempt to break down the notion of a cultural approach into discrete types of enquiry, proceeding from the central ambiguity of “culture” as the fine arts but also as a general way of life; and the definition of separate questions such as the role of the pre-existing German culture in the emergence of Nazism, the characterization of German everyday experience under Nazism, and the cultural policies of the Nazi government. Under assessment, we would wish to look at the emergence of the cultural approach, with discussion of some specific recent texts, as well as the criticisms they have attracted. Under application, we would seek to generate a discussion, based on classroom experience, of how cultural approaches can enable students to understand fascism beyond its political structures, and to consider its relevance in the present day.

Seminar Format
1. Participants will be asked to provide a “think piece” of about 5 pages each for either 2 or 3 of the sessions. These will be circulated no later than 6 weeks before the conference. Participants will also be asked to bring a short version (1 page) of their submissions which can be read at the session in order to refresh people’s memories. The conveners may choose a number of the think pieces to be read in their entirety during the session.
They may also, based on the topics covered by the submissions received, compile an agenda that divides the session into a sequence of discussions of cognate topics.

2. We will produce a list of around 10 books and articles with which all participants should be conversant. If the timetable permits, we will wait till we know who the participants are before this list is finalized, so that all may make proposals.

3. We would hope there will be frequent email contact among the participants before the conference.

4. A convener will i. open each session with a summary of the submitted think pieces, and will attempt to lay down some guidelines for the discussion to follow; ii. moderate the discussion; and iii. give a round-up in the last 10 minutes. The conveners will also submit think pieces of their own.

**Proposed Size**

- 16-20

**Silent Auditors**

- 6-10

* Please note that the auditor application and enrollment process will not begin before the entire GSA conference program has been scheduled.