

**Meeting of the North American Sartre Society  
University of Mary Washington, Fredericksburg, VA**

**Minutes of the Business Meeting, April 5, 2008**  
*(Recorded by Beth Butterfield)*

**1. Proposed venue and date of next meeting**

Jonathan Judaken suggested that we meet at that the University of Memphis, in November 2009.

Discussion: Should the conference be held on campus, or at a downtown hotel, or with some mix of the two (for example, sessions on campus, banquet downtown)? Downtown has the advantage of being closer to entertainment, Memphis sites, etc. But concerns were voiced about the possibility of added expense if we met at a hotel.

Jonathan agreed to research costs/budget and come back to the executive committee with a concrete proposal within three months (July, 2008)

**Jonathan Judaken moved that we meet at Memphis in November 2009.  
David Detmer seconded. Passed unanimously.**

\* Bruce Baugh added, can we have the NASS meeting in Canada again soon? Maybe Montreal or Quebec City? Christine will look into it.

**2. Program Committee for the next conference**

Proposed Program Committee for 2009:

- Christine Daigle, as president, will collect submissions and distribute them to the committee

The committee – the three readers of submissions:

- Adrian van den Hoven
- David Detmer stays on
- Bruce Baugh, to replace Ron Santoni

**We voted, passed unanimously.**

### **3. Financial Report**

Financial report submitted by Jeffrey Paris.

**Ken Anderson moved that we accept Jeff Paris's financial report. Peter Gratton seconded, and passed unanimously.**

### **4. Report of SSI Executive Editors, from Bruce Baugh**

a) Steve Hendley is no longer the North American editor. Thank you to Steve for many years of service. The new executive editor is David Detmer. The new Reviews editor is Connie Mui.

b) Bruce: On the UK side of SSI, the journal has the right of first refusal for papers presented at the Sartre conference. Could we begin this practice in the North American Sartre Society as well?

Discussion of this:

Sonia Kruks pointed out that some papers given at the conference are already under contract to be published elsewhere. If this practice were strictly in place, she couldn't have given her present paper at the conference.

Several people asked if it could not be more consensual, just a request.

There were suggestions of ways that SSI could actively solicit papers, perhaps working together with the program committee before the conference.

**Debra Bergoffen moved that NASS "strongly encourage" all those presenting papers at the conference to send their papers to the SSI, in order to give SSI the right of first refusal. Kevin Gray seconded. Passed unanimously.**

### **5. Nominations and Approval of the new Executive Committee of NASS**

a) Yiwei Zheng has resigned as Secretary, and Jeff Paris has resigned as Treasurer. Thank you to Yiwei and Jeff for all of your work.

b) Nominations for the new Executive Committee:

These nominations were given on the meeting agenda:

- Past President, Adrian van den Hoven
- President, Christine Daigle
- Co-President, Jonathan Judaken
- Treasurer, Ken Anderson (replaces Jeffrey Paris)
- Web Master, Farhang Erfani
- Co-Secretaries (and Newsletter): Michelle Darnell and Elizabeth Butterfield (to replace Yiwei Zheng)
- Members-at-large: Ronald Santoni and Yan Hamel

In addition, Jonathan Judaken nominated Dennis Gilbert as Member-at-large.

**Bruce Baugh moved that we approve the new Executive Committee. Kevin Gray seconded, and it passed unanimously.**

c) Jonathan Judaken suggested that NASS should have a Graduate Student Representative on the Executive Committee

Discussion:

- Don't we represent grad student interests already? Yes, but grad students would do it better themselves.
- There are two practical problems to consider, that grad students are only grad students for a few years, and that they may not have attended many NASS meetings.
- Christine Daigle said that it would be helpful to have a grad student's input in the conference planning that takes place throughout the year

Kevin Gray nominated Stephanie Van Hook, but no action was taken.

**Peter Gratton moved that the NASS Executive Committee should seek a Grad Student Representative for now, for one term only, and that before the next meeting in 2009, we should announce that grad students should come to the business meeting and self-nominate for the position. David Detmer seconded, and it passed unanimously.**

d) Ken Anderson raised the question, who will be the next co-president? Will people continue to move up through the offices as before? What do the bylaws say about this?

Adrian expressed a hope that the person who is Treasurer will stay in that position for several years, for some stability.

Otherwise, there was no discussion or answer to Ken's questions.

Adrian handed the meeting over to the new president, Christine.

## **6. Other business**

### **a) Blind Review for Conference Submissions**

Christine proposed that NASS begin to use a process of (double) blind review for conference submissions, meaning that the program committee will review proposals without knowing by whom they are written. It would be the president's job to collect the submissions (via a standard two page form that everyone can send in as an attachment), to render the submissions anonymous, and to pass these along to the program committee.

Christine explained that this would be helpful for presenters, who could then write on their CV's that their papers were blind reviewed / refereed.

Discussion:

Where and when did we decide to go to blind review? We haven't agreed on this yet, have we? Could the executive committee bring a concrete proposal to the next meeting?

Request that if we use blind review, that all papers be read by at least two people. Christine Daigle replied that yes, all members of the program committee will read all submissions, so that there will be input from several people on each one.

Clarification – what about panel proposals? Yes, these can be blind reviewed as well.

Concern: What if a situation arises in which a senior scholar's anonymous submission is rejected by blind review, and then that person does not want to attend or participate? Is there a way that we can open up the process, to avoid this sort of situation?

Could we leave open the possibility that the program committee could invite some senior members, as speakers, or as specialists on panels, book sessions, etc.?

There was discussion regarding the fairness / appropriateness of exempting some people from the blind review process. On one side, it might appear as an unfair disadvantage to less well-known scholars. On the other side, it might be the case that more established scholars and specialists have already shown that they can be relied upon to make a strong presentation, and so submitting an abstract is not always necessary.

**1. Sonia Kruks moved that the executive committee bring a more concrete proposal of blind review to the next conference in 2009, and until then that we continue as we have been.**

**2. Counter to this, Bruce Baugh moved that we begin to use blind review for all submissions now, for the next conference in 2009. For panel proposals, submit an abstract regarding the entire panel itself, plus abstracts for each individual paper. For individual papers, submit a full paper.**

- **Jonathan Judaken proposed we amend this, to only abstracts, for all submissions.**
- **Kevin Gray proposed we amend this, to specify that this blind review will be a trial-run for the next conference, and then at the next business meeting in 2009 we will return to the topic and discuss how we will continue.**

**Bruce accepted the amendments. Yan Hamel seconded. It passed, with 2 opposed and 2 abstentions.**

**3. Jonathan Judaken moved that the program committee in consultation with the executive committee still have the authority to invite speakers.**

- **Debra Bergoffen said that the conference program ought not to indicate that there's a distinction.**

**Debra seconded it. It passed with 14 in favor, 3 against, and 6 abstaining.**

## **B. Subsidies for Conference Participants**

Currently, we are paying for hotel rooms, for a maximum of three nights, for a limited number of persons in need of financial help. We would like to continue to do this.

(Discussion at the executive meeting, Friday night, should we pay for the hotel room, rather than offering participants a lump-sum check? Also, should we ask these participants to share rooms with each other?)

### **C. Scheduling of the Business Meetings**

Kevin Gray moved that these meetings should be scheduled for more than 50 minutes at conferences in the future. Peter Gratton seconded, and it passed.