

Reflections

1. I consider the seminar a success first and foremost due to the format that is applied in the academic sharing of ideas (conferences, workshops, etc.) too scarcely. In place of a common theme, the common play object seems to spawn discussions that rarely come to exist. To me, this was a proof of concept.
2. A central question for the seminar and its future is, in my opinion, what does a “method” mean (and how broadly are we ready to interpret the concept). Many of the presenters didn’t seem to have a method in the strict sense of the term. I don’t consider that an issue, however. I’d recommend opening up the seminar for non-method based analysis too; for instance, people interested in studying specific concepts (e.g. time, characters, mechanics) may not have a clear method but should still be able to contribute fittingly.
3. If you need a hand in organizing this in the future, let me know.

Matti