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The professors you are about to meet in this issue of Arts Insights all came to McGill during the past academic year. Once again, the Faculty of Arts has attracted exciting and dynamic new researchers in the humanities and social sciences. Our newest colleagues represent an emerging generation of young scholars who emphasize interdisciplinarity in their research. By reaching across traditional boundaries, the professors profiled here bring fresh and vibrant perspectives to their work on topics such as eco-criticism, biomedical perspectives on health and illness, reimagining social and political theory, and understanding “the good life”.

I also want to introduce you to our latest Andrew W. Mellon Postdoctoral Fellows. The Faculty is once again privileged to welcome three new recipients of this prestigious fellowship to McGill. Fellows spend two full years in our Faculty refining their doctoral work and expanding it in new directions. Fellows teach in the Faculty as well, sharing their intellectual expertise with our undergraduate and graduate students and giving them an opportunity to develop their own courses before embarking on their tenure-track careers.

Fundamentally, all of these researchers are exploring the human condition, whether it be how we lived in the past, how we live today, or how we might live tomorrow.

Welcome to this issue.

JULIET JOHNSON
Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies
Faculty of Arts
How does social life get “under the skin”? My research interests center in the pathways through which toxic social conditions can affect physiological states – in particular, stress-metabolic processes, and epigenetics. Traditional biomedical perspectives on health and illness emphasize internal physiological processes that lead up to the outcome. It’s a crisis-oriented approach that works well for acute conditions – things that drive you to the doctor’s office, and/or need urgent medical care. However, especially in developed countries, recent decades have seen dramatic enhancements in longevity, and a shift from acute illness followed by death to survival with (costly) chronic conditions. This has prompted a need to reorient healthcare from treatment to prevention, with increased attention to constraining negative behaviors and maintaining functionality despite disease.

However, much of the new “preventive care” agenda is focused on individual-level factors – especially changing lifestyles and health behaviors to prevent disease. We have known for a long time that social context also has a strong impact on health – and perhaps a more fundamental one. To take an obvious example, lack of exercise and a proper diet lead to a host of health issues – particularly the “Metabolic Syndrome” cluster of obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease, which has become perhaps the most prevalent and serious set of health problems in developed countries. But in turn, these individual-level factors are driven to a large extent by one’s social ecology. Socioeconomic “stratification” (race, class, gender) affects resources and the availability of particular lifestyle choices. At the “micro” level, we have the family. A spouse’s health-related choices and behaviors have perhaps the strongest influence on one’s own. Between the two, we have a range of social processes – from one’s larger network of friends and relatives influencing one’s decisions, to neighborhood environments constraining mobility and social life. Perhaps most importantly, socioeconomic deprivation and racial discrimination can lead to chronic stress, as can living in a high-crime neighborhood, or negative family interactions. In turn, we know that such socially-induced stress is a major cause of unhealthy behaviors. One set of pathways from social context to physiological states, then, is mediated by negative behaviors – whether triggered by stress, lack of resources, or network influence.

There is, however, a second pathway, also mediated by stress. And this is where my primary interests lie. In addition to inducing unhealthy behaviors, long-term stress may also affect physiology directly – through systemic inflammation. It is increasingly apparent that there is a strong linkage between inflammation and chronic stress. Downstream, inflammation has an established role in the pathogenesis of a range of disease states – including cardiovascular and diabetic problems. I just finished a project on race and the Metabolic Syndrome among older U.S. adults. It turns out that older black men’s diabetes and CVD are not caused by obesity – they’re thinner than white men. Nor is it caused by their poor behaviors – smoking, drinking, inactivity – which are generally no higher than among white men. They seem, in fact, to be (at least partly) caused by the direct physiological effects of long term structural stress, working through inflammation. And yet, the media is still focused on a blame-the-victim “culture of irresponsibility” narrative that blames black men’s health conditions on obesity and poor behaviors. Perhaps most interestingly, recent biomedical literature suggests that chronic inflammation may play a causal role in biological aging itself – potentially through shortening telomere-length. In short, many diseases may be more like “symptoms” of an underlying aging process – partly induced, through inflammation, by psychosocial stress. If so, then social differentials in this stress-inflammation process may arguably mediate concomitant differentials in longevity itself. This is where my work is now going.

Aniruddha (Bobby) Das
Assistant Professor,
Department of Sociology
WHICH CHINA WILL PREVAIL, THE AWAKENED DRAGON OR THE PAPER TIGER?

In September 2010, the Chinese media exposed the local government practice of using illegal security services to detain individuals who had come to Beijing to petition the central government for redressing the local government mishandling. This served to heighten international awareness of the growing problem of state-society conflict in China. At the same time, the Western world continues to study the so-called “China Model”, the idea that China can combine rapid economic growth with political stability. Which one of these two Chinas will dominate the country’s future of political economic development?

China observers are often split over this question. Those emphasizing the endurance of China’s authoritarian regime highlight its “authoritarian resilience,” characterized by administrative improvement of public representation, the promotion of a meritocratic evaluation system, and conventional divide-and-rule tactics that balance differing interests. In contrast, some predict that the regime will collapse and focus on the lack of government accountability, weak administrative institutions, and widespread corruption and repression. The collective resistance in the form of demonstrations and violent protests has intensified since the 1990s, so much so that Slavoj Žižek (2010) would later warn that China “threatens to explode.” Are there limits to the Chinese regime’s ability to deal with rising social protest? Is it inevitable that it will self-destruct or can it seek solutions through reforms? It would be futile to examine these inquiries by assessing the above two separate groups of causes and attempt to measure which group overwhelms the other.

Rather, whether China will continue to be an awakened dragon or turn out to be a paper tiger largely depends on the availability of an effective state apparatus that resolves, controls, contains, and prevents social revolts. An administration with effective social control does not necessarily mean a coercive government. The state may co-opt social groups, such as labor unions and business groups, as well as apply coercive power and suppress social demands. An important prerequisite for effective social control is the existence of institutions that promote intergovernmental collaboration to act efficiently and collectively. Despite the political importance of collaborative intergovernmental relationships for the state’s capacity for social control, however, this is not necessarily an outcome of formal institutional design.

Intergovernmental collaboration among different sub-provincial levels of government in China is, to a significant extent, an unintended consequence of political turbulence during the Mao Zedong era and economic liberalization during the Deng Xiaoping era. Common experiences of the three-decade turbulence of land reform, four clean-up campaigns, and the Cultural Revolution, helped elites in the 1950s-1970s develop shared expectations of each other and the political system, and shaped the interests and preferences of local state agents that both constrained and enabled their later activities. In the 1980s and 1990s, practices of institutionalized intergovernmental collaboration in developing private enterprises and extracting revenue from peasants illegally moved China along a dual track of economic growth and social grievances.

In the twenty-first century, the collaborative intergovernmental relationship is set to change as the central government has adopted a series of fiscal and administrative reforms to redress predatory local governments by recentralizing authorities of revenue extraction. While successfully reducing the fiscal burdens on peasants, these reforms have paradoxically disrupted local state cohesion and weakened the state’s capacity to resolve, control, contain, and prevent social revolts. China may soon face the critical juncture of its regime’s resilience.

JUAN WANG
Assistant Professor, 
Department of Political Science
WHAT DOES MEANING COMPOSITION TELL US ABOUT THE LOGIC OF OUR MINDS?

Language makes us human. To study language is to get face to face with a fundamental cognitive skill of our species. Meaning composition is at the very core of this skill. Human languages allow us to produce and understand very complex meanings with a computational efficiency unmatched by artificial systems. Formal semanticists, like myself, aim at developing formally explicit models of the algorithms that underlie this process.

Quite remarkably, it is the simplest words that offer the best window into the secrets of meaning composition. Take or. Unlike dog or plane, or does not seem to refer to anything out there. Like and, not, or if, this word simply provides the glue to combine meanings. Consider what you do when you search for a book in the library catalog. You use words like or and to create complex search terms. You can search for books by Abbie, or by Abbie or Babbie. or connects two phrases and creates a new complex phrase whose meaning is related to the meaning of the original phrases in a predictable way: books by Abbie or Babbie searches for those books by at least one of these two authors. Here we see the process of meaning composition in action. So-called ‘functional words’, like or and, are to semanticists what fruit flies are to geneticists.

Formal semanticists are not the first to wonder about meaning composition. In their search for patterns of valid reasoning, logicians provided very explicit models for the meaning of functional words. When you search for books by Abbie or Babbie, for instance, the search algorithm blindly applies the meaning of or that you find in introductory logic textbooks. Since we understand what or does in that case, we can ask ourselves whether that is in fact what speakers do across languages when they interpret this word. The picture is far from clear. When I tell Abbie that she may register in Stats or in Biology, for instance, I am not conveying that she may register in at least one of these courses, I am in fact conveying something stronger: that she may register in Stats and that she may register in Biology too. The interpretation of or in cases like these has puzzled generations of judges, logicians, and linguists. In work that stems from my dissertation, I have pointed out several inadequacies with the logic textbook meaning of or. Following pioneering work on the interpretation of questions by the computer scientist Charles Leonard Hamblin, I have proposed to treat or phrases as devices that introduce lists of alternative meanings into the process of meaning composition.

Research in Formal Semantics usually proceeds by discovering generalizations about particular languages that can reveal something about universal linguistic patterns. My research is no different in this respect, and has frequently drawn theoretical conclusions from the analysis of subtle facts about Spanish, a language that is still badly underrepresented in the literature.

The process of coming up with, testing, and refining explicit hypotheses about how a certain language works (and how it differs from others) is of particular interest to those learning or teaching languages. They routinely come up with grammar questions for which descriptive grammars and textbooks give no answer. I have a strong interest in teaching audiences like this about what we linguists do, and I hold a joint appointment in the Department of Linguistics and in the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, where I am developing courses dealing with a variety of topics that introduce language students to the fundamentals of linguistic analysis.

Luis Alonso-Ovalle
Assistant Professor, Departments of Linguistics and Languages, Literatures, and Cultures
Our current environmental crisis is very much a crisis of the imagination in the sense that we have reduced the more-than-human world to a material resource in a commodity-based global economy. To move beyond our current unsustainable lifestyle, we must imagine mountains, fields, oil, minerals, animals, as something other than what we can use, abuse, exhaust, and discard. As windows into the past, present, and future, literary texts offer ways of imagining new relationships with the non-human world.

Literary analysis has tended to focus on human interests and values in texts, while ignoring the ways in which the human is inextricably linked to the non-human. In response, ecocriticism works to bridge environment and literature, and now includes diverse branches in environmental justice, film studies, feminist studies, queer theory, and postcolonial studies, to name but a few. The main objective of my research in this area is to develop an ecocritical approach to contemporary French literature. Although the environmental crisis is unfolding on a global scale, I work from the premise that bridging environment and literature cannot be done universally, that is, ecocriticism must take into account specific cultural and linguistic differences when examining environmental imaginations. This is particularly true in the case of French literary studies where ecocriticism has been associated with (and at times, dismissed as merely dealing with) American nature writing. My efforts in this area have been to identify the characteristics of a contemporary French environmental imagination based on the specificities of l’écologie politique as it has evolved in France over the last thirty years. My current position in the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures has given me the opportunity to widen my geographical focus and to begin situating French ecocriticism within the larger context of European ecocriticisms in order to better understand the role of the local, the national, and the transnational in a globalized world.

From philosophy to sociology, from literary criticism to ethics, the question of the animal has garnered much critical attention in France. Yet animal studies have not traditionally been aligned with environmental literary studies; in fact, the two have followed very different trajectories, the one arguing for bios understood as the planet and the other arguing for bios understood as animal life. Yet these areas intersect in their deconstruction of the humanist subject and their concern for the more-than-human world. Using as a lens the philosophical and ethical questions raised by a host of other disciplines, I have been examining the literary animal in contemporary French literature. Novels such as Marie Darrieussecq’s Truismes and Éric Chevillard’s Palafox depict extreme violence done to humans and animals while they also clearly insist on the role of language and writing in our understanding of animals. From this difficult position, the reader can begin to understand both language’s limits and its role in imagining animals’ irreducible otherness. This is also the position at which ecocriticism and animal studies can come together in productive ways as they explore the problems of current anthropocentric practices and the possibilities of adopting more sustainable and symbiotic relationships with the non-human world.

My research is grounded in the desire to bring the literary and the political together, not as they promote some overarching environmental message or animal rights agenda, but rather as they question, subvert, and deconstruct dominant social discourses in specific, cultural contexts. Reading ethically means reading carefully in light of concerns that touch both the human and the non-human in place-specific and culturally-informed ways.

Stéphanie Posthumus
Assistant Professor, Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures
HOW MANY ANGELS CAN DANCE ON THE HEAD OF A PIN?

This question is not the focus of my research. In fact, we should probably think that it could not be the focus of any research. It is the exemplary pointless question. Every possible answer to such a question seems equally arbitrary; no matter how lengthy and detailed the reasoning that leads to it, we have no more reason to affirm this answer than another. Reference to this question is supposed to call to mind the bad old days of scholasticism, when theologians and philosophers, cut off from vivifying contact with common sense and everyday life, multiplied problems for themselves without any purpose. The point of mentioning the question, as opposed to asking it, is to congratulate oneself for having one’s feet on the ground, and to accuse someone else of the opposite.

And, yet, the encounter with a pointless question might just as well be the encounter with a frame of reference and way of thinking that, while alien, is actually quite fruitful. A close cousin of the question above concerns the principle of individuation of angels. Amongst medieval Aristotelians, some held that only material beings could be distinct from others of the same kind. My three cats are three different cats, each individual, because they have three different bodies, not because they are three different species or kinds of beings. What, then, of angels, who are supposed to be immaterial? Without bodies, are all angels identical iterations of the kind, lacking all individuality? Or is each of them its own species, such that the word “angel,” like the word “thing,” does not refer to a specific type of being at all? In response to this problem, Duns Scotus argued that the singularity of an individual could not be attributed simply either to its material existence or to its specific type, both of which are, in a way, common to the various individuals. Rather, each individual is a singularization of both material and species – this body and this cat. Hence, the fact that angels do not have bodies does not prevent them from being individuals, but neither does this destroy their specific commonality.

The multitude of angels is the only and the complete actualization of the species of angels. They are one because they are many, and many because they are one.

This question, seemingly as pointless as the one with which I began, has important implications for a host of issues in social and political theory, which frequently turn on the status of either the individual or the common, if not both. For example, do the differences amongst our beliefs and desires arise from our different material situations, such that we are so many identically functioning minds that just happen to be located in different bodies with different histories and locations? If so, then one ought to be able to abstract away from these differences in order to isolate the form of rational thought that is common to all of us. But, if we are like Scotus’ angels, then this project of abstraction – which runs through modern economics and the rational choice methodologies that have spread throughout social and political theory – is misconceived.

The common form of thought is nothing but the multitude of singular discursive thought processes, and the communication amongst them.

My research gravitates to cases like these, where an obsolete or superseded question – What is the substance of the value of commodities? What is the natural motion of a being? – seems to open up a vantage point for rethinking the way we do social and political theory. Sometimes a little more scholasticism is just what is needed.

WILLIAM ROBERTS
Assistant Professor,
Department of Political Science
For decades, psychologists and survey designers have been asking people: “Taking all things into account, how satisfied are you with your life these days, on a scale of zero to ten.” Within economics, this measure of subjective well-being (sometimes referred to as “happiness”) has grown from obscurity to a position of prominence, and it is now changing the way governments and societies think about progress.

It would be right to start with healthy skepticism for aggregating such reports, since, in principle, individuals could vary substantially in their emotional norms, could be influenced by short-term events and circumstances, and might even have different conceptions of “the good life” in different places and cultures around the world.

However, short-term influences on an individual’s response reflect the long-term realities of their life. Individual differences in intrinsic optimism are washed out in aggregate measures of happiness, or are removed when the data come from tracking happiness of the same individuals over time. One of our most remarkable findings to date is that the pattern of social, economic, political, and individual factors that account for variation in individual life satisfaction look more or less the same in 150 countries around the world, suggesting a significant universality to the meaning of the “good life”.

Thus, by measuring such “happiness” and helping to unpack its relationship to the conditions and events of people’s lives, our research is offering new insights into what may be the ultimate social objective, for which economists have previously been more dependent on poor proxies such as the Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Indeed, as economists, we have measured well-being by the scope of choices (but especially market-oriented, or observable, choices) available to people. This makes a lot of sense as long as people can be deeply trusted to make decisions in their own interest. However, extensive evidence says that we cannot always. Given the choice and without prodding, people will take up smoking, eat unhealthy food, and undertake for retirement. Now, the happiness research provides a way to identify hard-to-measure mistakes and has shown that we mispredict our own happiness and overvalue material benefits as compared with social benefits and sharing.

The maturation of techniques to measure and analyse subjective well-being, and the modern confidence in its reproducibility and salience as an overall assessment of life quality, are reflected in a rapidly burgeoning interest from academics, high-level policy makers, national statistical agencies, and civil society. For instance, national governments in the U.K., France, Korea, Bhutan, as well as the European Union and OECD are making efforts to develop and target new measures of well-being.

Canada is also somewhat of a leader in the measurement of subjective well-being, but has taken a more cautious approach in making the link to policy.

Meanwhile, my research has shown that in Canada, the wealthiest cities are the least happy, and that Quebec has undergone a large and hard-to-explain rise in life satisfaction over the past 25 years. These mysteries are still to be fully unravelled.

The new science of happiness is already affecting policy, from shifting the balance between unemployment (bad, and worse than previously thought) and inflation (bad, but less than previously thought) in macroeconomic policy, to the design of urban form at the civic and local scale. Some of my research supports a cautious approach to using this new tool in formulating policy. However, I suspect that as our understanding of the relative well-being benefits of material gain and social cohesion continues to mature, we will have more to say, and with large implications. For instance, while the current paradigm tells us that climate mitigation policy is a threat to material consumption growth, the economics of happiness may show us a path in which true well-being can rise at the same time as we curb our harmful emissions. Indeed, it currently appears that our policy options are insufficient to meet the crisis without redirecting our progress towards some more meaningful measure of well-being.

Chris Barrington-Leigh
Assistant Professor, McGill School of Environment and the Institute for Health and Social Policy
DO PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENTS REALLY CARE ABOUT CORRUPTION?

Few if any issues have generated as much attention from societies, policy makers, and international organizations as corruption has in the last few decades. Despite the many definitional (what is corruption?) and measurement discrepancies (how do we assess levels of corruption?), there is widespread agreement that corruption is ethically reprehensible and that it undermines development, as it generates transactional costs that hinder state capacity. The notion of corruption as greasing the wheels of otherwise ineffective institutions is now démodé. Yet, for all the talk about corruption and all the resources employed to attempt to curb it, we still witness lots of corrupt acts taking place throughout the world. Is it that corruption is a moving target? Are established anti-corruption policies simply misguided? At this point, after more than 20 years of mostly unsuccessful attempts to fight corruption, it is time to ask the difficult underlying question: Do people and governments really care about corruption and about reducing it?

Empirical evidence shows that there is widespread high perception of corruption among the population – and experts – of many if not most developing countries in some developed countries as well. Yet, when people are asked about their actual experiences with corruption, most countries score significantly lower (Venezuela, Argentina, Italy, Belarus, Somalia are but a few examples). In other words, there is a noticeable gap between the perception people have of corruption in a given country and their personal experience with corruption. Why is there such a disparity? Part of the explanation rests on the understandable underreporting of experiences with corruption for fear of consequences. Moreover, petty and grand corruption are usually thrown in the same bag, and people may weight different instances of corruption in conflicting ways. Also, while people may not witness or suffer corruption themselves, they may see instances of corruption being regularly reported in the media, which eventually lead them to think that the level of corruption must be quite high. However, all these explanations – although valid – only get at marginal differences according to controlled experiments. It seems that what is actually going on is that people are using corruption as a proxy for something else, namely whether the state is providing them with what they believe they are entitled to receive. Respondents who are dissatisfied with government performance may choose the term “corruption” to vent a general negative feeling, which suggests that people’s concern is mostly about government performance, and not so much about corruption per se.

On the government side, the multiple internal responses to corruption (lobby regulation, freedom of information acts, the creation of anti-corruption agencies), together with the many international treaties treaties on the subject (UN, OAS, EU and other Conventions Against Corruption, the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Officials) suggest a prevalent commitment to addressing the issue. However, a closer look at local policies shows that anti-corruption agencies are usually either politicized – used to investigate the opposition – or lacking institutional power or capacity. On the external front, international conventions usually have very weak enforcement mechanisms, with the exception of the OECD Convention, which is narrow in focus and signed by far fewer countries. In short, state responses are usually geared towards showing that something is being done about corruption, when in fact the policies enacted have little if any potential impact. In other words, most reforms have no teeth and are meant mostly as window-dressing.

So do people and governments really care about corruption? Or do they only care when and if it becomes public? Both societies and governments are shocked and affected by corruption scandals. In the absence of exposés, or conversely when news on corruption is so common that people and governments are desensitized to it, people care about receiving from government what they think they should. And governments care about portraying themselves as if they actually cared – and were doing something – about corruption. Therefore, it is unsurprising that corruption continues to define democratic politics, even amidst widespread rhetoric against it. Corruption may in fact be a difficult issue to address, but true concern and commitment that goes beyond a government PR strategy seems like a starting point that in many cases is yet to be reached.

MANUEL BÁLAN,
Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science
and the Institute for the Study of International Development
Mellon Postdoctoral Fellows establish a formal relationship with a senior scholar in a field allied to that of their dissertation. This enables them to broaden their perspective and develop and enhance their earlier research. The Fellows also develop and teach two undergraduate courses: a lecture course and a cross-disciplinary seminar focusing on problems, questions, methodologies, and models of research.

PETER RUDIAK-GOULD comes to McGill from Oxford University, where he completed both his MPhil and DPhil in Anthropology. He also holds undergraduate degrees in Cognitive Science and Linguistics from the University of California, San Diego. Dr. Rudiak-Gould conducts research on climate change focusing on the role of scientific expertise in influencing climate change beliefs in indigenous communities. His work has guided climate change educational policy in the Australian Prime Minister’s Office, and he has received significant media attention for his extensive fieldwork and numerous publications on the Micronesian Marshall Islands. Dr. Rudiak-Gould has broadened the scope of his research to include the study of climate change issues in the indigenous Sami communities of Norway, where he has already conducted preliminary fieldwork on reindeer herders. His Mellon Fellowship at McGill is under the supervision of Professor Colin Scott in the Department of Anthropology. Dr. Rudiak-Gould also works closely with McGill’s Centre for Technology, Society and Development (STANDD), and with researchers at the McGill School of Environment.

LESLIE TOMORY obtained his MA and PhD in the History of Technology from the University of Toronto. He also holds a MEng from McGill in Aerospace Engineering. Dr. Tomory examines the development of early industrial networks – canal, gas, water, and sewage systems – in Industrial Revolution Britain. He investigates these systems from the points of view of construction, governance and stabilization, and examines how they borrowed legal, financial and business models from each other. He also studies questions of how British companies built and operated subsidiaries throughout Europe. His Mellon Fellowship is supervised by Professor Brian Lewis from the Department of History and Classical Studies. Dr. Tomory is actively involved in the History and Philosophy of Sciences seminar and lecture series at McGill. His monograph on the origins of the gaslight industry is being published by MIT Press in 2012 as part of its Transformations series.

TIMOTHY WALIGORE holds an MA, MPhil and PhD in Political Science from Columbia University, and a BA in Government from Dartmouth College. He comes to McGill after completing postdoctoral fellowships at the Goethe-Universität in Frankfurt, Germany and Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. Dr. Waligore’s expertise is in the history of modern political thought and contemporary political theory. He examines the links between cosmopolitanism and imperialism using the writings of Kant, Fichte and Hegel, and draws on contemporary discussions of the relationship between justice and context. His work contributes to contemporary debates on how to resolve tensions between claims based on historical injustices, global distributive justice, and multicultural citizenship. Dr. Waligore’s research is supervised by Professor Jacob Levy and other theorists in the Department of Political Science and in the Department of Philosophy.
Arts Insights, a new series from McGill-Queens University Press, showcases current research in the social sciences, humanities, and social work.

Arts Insights, an initiative of McGill’s Faculty of Arts, brings together research in the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Social Work. Reflective of the range of expertise and interests represented by the Faculty of Arts at McGill, Arts Insights seeks manuscripts that bring an interdisciplinary perspective to the discussion of ideas, issues, and debates that deepen and expand our understanding of human interaction, such as works dealing with society and change, or languages, literatures, and cultures and the relationships among them. Of particular interest are manuscripts that reflect the work of research collaborations involving McGill faculty and their colleagues in universities that are part of McGill’s international affiliation network.

Arts Insights will publish two titles a year in English. The editors prefer original manuscripts but may consider the English language translations of works that have already appeared in another language.