

HERA Joint Research Programme (HERA JRP) CALL FOR OUTLINE PROPOSALS

For two themes:

“Cultural dynamics: Inheritance and identity” and “Humanities as a Source of Creativity and Innovation”

The HERA Joint Research Programme (HERA JRP) partners have launched a joint call for trans-national Collaborative Research Projects (CRPs) in two humanities research areas: “Cultural Dynamics” and “Creativity and Innovation”. By launching the first HERA JRP call for proposals, 13 national funding partners want to create collaborative, trans-national research opportunities that will derive new insights from humanities research in order to address major social, cultural, and political challenges facing Europe. In consultation with their national researcher communities, they have jointly defined and developed common research priorities, and created a new trans-national funding mechanism.

The beneficiaries of this Call are eligible scholars located in **Austria, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden and United Kingdom**, irrespective of their nationality. Successful proposals will require the building of consortia of three or more partners based in **three** or more different HERA JRP countries. The total amount of funding available for both HERA JRP themes is 12,4 – 16,4 M€.

The Programme will cover research funding in the amount of max. 1M€ per CRP which must focus on original excellent trans-national research in either of the two themes, must have European-added value and include networking and knowledge transfer activities. The maximum duration of each CRP is 36 months.

Outline Proposals are to be submitted electronically via the HERA website by **7 April, 14:00 CET**. It is expected that Full Proposals will be invited in May 2009 with 1 September 2009, 14:00 CET as expected deadline for submission.

A Programme-specific website can be consulted for the latest updates at <http://www.heranet.info>

HERA JRP Objectives & Themes

Humanities in the European Research Area (HERA) is a partnership of a growing number of (inter)national Humanities funding agencies across Europe. The main objective of HERA is to firmly establish the Humanities in the European Research Area and to seriously engage the Humanities in the Framework Programmes of the European Commission. HERA has been designed to deliver new levels of co-operative research policy and practice in the Humanities by embarking on an ambitious programme of communication, enquiry and sharing of expertise. All HERA partners are dedicated to the establishment of best practice in funding mechanisms, the establishment of quality and impact assessment methods for Humanities research, the coordination of national research programmes, the joint planning and lobbying for important Humanities infrastructure initiatives and the joint selection of important humanities research priorities. HERA’s final and most ambitious goal is the development of a new type of trans-national joint research funding programmes. More information about these HERA activities can be found on the HERA website www.heranet.info.

The HERA network has set up a Joint Research Programme (JRP) for researchers in the Humanities and is launching a first call for proposals for two thematic research areas. Thirteen HERA JRP Consortium members fund the HERA JRP through a real common pot funding mechanism and the expected top-up from the European Commission’s Era-net Plus call. The total budget for the two thematic calls is 12,4 – 16,4 M€ (pending financial contribution from the EC).

Before applying, please read carefully the theme specifications and guidelines for applicants provided below. The contact details of HERA JRP handling agency (ESF) and the national funding agencies that are participating in the HERA Joint Research Programme and the national contact points are provided on page 15. **Before submitting a proposal, all applicants should contact their national contact persons to verify the eligibility of their proposal.**

I. Theme "Cultural Dynamics: Inheritance and Identity"

1. General Objectives

The programme *Cultural Dynamics* aims to look at culture as a process rather than as a product, as a praxis rather than a pragma. These cultural processes and practices are to be addressed as *complex dynamic systems*, the focus being specifically on the way in which cultural exchanges and dynamics cross between social strata, between countries, and between media. Culture is to be studied, not as the output of a given society, community, or generation, but as a form of traffic between societies, communities and generations.

2. Academic state of the art

The last quarter-century has seen important changes in the study of culture and identity. Culture is now no longer seen as a *condition* of social life, but as a *part* of it. Scholars have increasingly stressed the fact that culture ('high' as well as 'low') is subject to continuous socially-determined shifts and changes. The artistic or literary canon is now studied as a multiplicity of different canons, each of them valid for different countries, different sub-cultures or social groups, all of them overlapping and interlocking, with *exchanges* between them. Cultural canonicity has come to be studied, not just as the power of a given text (or painting, or musical composition) to maintain its prestige over time, but rather as its capacity to translate itself to new audiences, new media, new meanings. In the process, the distinction between 'high' culture and popular culture has largely vanished, also as a result of the rise of new media with a great potential for social dissemination and reproduction. Cultural history flows across the rapids of media revolutions: the original Gutenberg revolution; the emergence of cheap bulk printing in the nineteenth century; the rise of photography, of sound recording, of film and video recording; the availability of digital storage and instantaneous mass accessibility. As a result, the study of culture now takes account, not only of the conditions of cultural production, but also of cultural dissemination and appropriation. Culture obtains its meaning, indeed its various meanings, in the *function* it has for its audiences and participants.

Culture-oriented studies over the past twenty years have accordingly undertaken a huge process of inventorizing the identitarian function of culture, and (certainly among European scholars) specifically its national-identitarian function. All branches of the humanities, from archaeology and folklore to linguistics and literary study, from the areas of historical research to art history and music history, have been engaged on an enormous reassessment of the way in which various aspects of the cultural field have been implicated in the articulation, construction and 'invention' of collective (primarily national) identities. This functionalist revolution, linked to the trend towards 'deconstruction' (i.e. the demonstration that identities and meanings are in many instances *constructs* disguised as *givens*) has by now run its course. The task for researchers is now to collate insights from various parts of Europe, and from various disciplines, and to move from specialist analysis towards interdisciplinary and trans-national synthesis.

Some signs indicate that the first examples and outlines of such syntheses are being developed even as this proposal is being put forward.

- The formula of the *Lieux de mémoire* or 'sites of memory' has found broad repercussion in various European countries. The commemorative function of culture, e.g. in historical painting, has been the topic of numerous exhibitions in leading European museums. The interaction between cultural memory and tourism, and what is now known as "the heritage industry" has been put on the scholarly agenda.
- The study of nationalism and national thought has shown an increasing trend towards international comparison. Whereas national movements were traditionally studied piecemeal, on a country-by-country basis, a noticeable trend is emerging to see nationalism as an exchange of ideas and inspirations, and to study the way national movements in one country were influenced by examples from abroad.
- Generally, trans-nationally comparative studies (history of literature, of linguistics, of the European libraries and universities etc.) are beginning to be conducted on a new basis. No longer juxtaposing a modular array of individual countries, studies now chart exchanges and patterns that are on the whole regardless of borders as they exist nowadays, and that occur regionally in and between metropolitan centres, their catchment areas, and the traffic and dissemination corridors linking them.
- Linking the two above-mentioned fields of study is the question of national neighbourhood. The study of national identities, representations and stereotypes, and of the rhetoric of national character thematizes the situatedness of nations amidst their neighbours as a formative experience. Studying the constant interaction between the nation's self-image and its view of others, i.e. the way in which national identity takes shape in contradistinction to an Outside, offers a promising working ground, particularly in Europe. Concepts like cultural transfer or *histoires croisées* are gained in popularity. Patterns of cultural exchange are now being analysed on the basis of system theory, network theory and "innovation/diffusion" models.

3. European context and added value

Europe's modernity project is now at a new juncture. The rise of the nation-state in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries led to a conceptualization of culture in predominantly national terms; there is still a strong tendency to see culture primarily as a modular array of national cultures and to study historical and cultural developments on a national basis. This paradigm is now being overtaken, not only by academic developments (as outlined above) but also cultural patterns themselves. Globalization and global mobility are creating multicultural and multi-ethnic societies everywhere; religious loyalties are cutting across, and competing with, national loyalties; recent communication patterns (mass media, internet) are triggering the development of a 'network society' and causing increasing individualization. Europe is moving towards a 'liquid modernity' (Zygmunt Bauman, 2000) or 'second modernity' (Ulrich Beck, 1992).

The cultural cohesion of the 'nation-state' is, in these circumstances, no longer a given. The state is still the main sponsor of cultural traditions and heritage: by means of education, by providing an infrastructure (academic research, museal and archival conservation and display), and by virtue of its guardianship of public space with its heirlooms, buildings, city-scapes and landscapes. But the state is nowadays buffeted by a tumultuous and contentious debate on what 'culture' means, to whom it belongs, and whom it includes or excludes. To properly study the dynamics of culture in this context, its mobility across national boundaries will have to be foregrounded and thematized.

4. Research Topics

a. Collective identities before and after the nation-state: Types and rhetoric

This topic covers a long historical period, from the feudal-dynastic beginnings of state centralization up to and including contemporary debates around the evaporation of national sovereignty and the rise of post-national identities. European state formation begins with the centralization policies and consolidation strategies of medieval kings coping with the cultural differentiation and fragmentation of their realms. Such policies were legitimized and rationalized by common myths of origin, tightly linked with dynastic legends. From these tentative beginnings we can trace later and even contemporary entities known as England, France, Norway, Poland, Hungary or Rus'. The medieval, dynastic roots of nation-formation involved myths and self-images and a differentiating discourse of collective characters and identities ascribed to these emerging states and nations. That discourse stratified in the early-modern period and still forms the basis of all current stereotypes concerning a nation's character, soul or psychological identity.

Although processes of othering and exoticism are to some extent a long-term anthropological constant, they are also shaped by changing historical contingencies by and discursive and rhetorical convention. They can be encountered at the macro-level (in the historically ingrained, stereotypical distinctions between civility and barbarism, Christian Europe and its infidel/pagan/heathen counterparts), as well as at the national and regional level. Similar processes also take place between genders, religious denominations, social classes etc. These processes have traditionally been studied as the discursive reperCUSSION of underlying social realities; they can and should also be contextualized as part of a traffic of cultural dynamics, migrating from context to context, from genre to genre, shifting in shape, function and valorization, leaving contested reception trajectories in their wake (e.g. Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*), and implicated in literary and representational trends and fashions.

b. Culture as self-reflection: The dynamics and institutions of remembrance and canonicity

Societies remember their past, not just in the form of 'official' academic history-writing, but through a whole variety of practices. While collective memory may feed into formalized historical narratives, it is also kept alive in more or less informal commemorative practices, landmarks, ritual re-enactments, the historical accuracy of which is often at odds with the insights of academic historians. This leads to remarkable social debates on subaltern histories, recalcitrant versions of the past, and a popular historical consciousness that is often heedlessly or deliberately counterfactual. At the same time, the historical commemoration of the past is manifesting itself in public space by way of monuments and the monumentalization of landmarks, this in turn generating either 'secular pilgrimages' or an entire tourism industry. Analysis has demonstrated that this process is often a reductive one: landmarks tend to attract and conflate different commemorative functions, and the complex and contradictory nature of the past is collapsed into a limited number of easily understandable symbols and material fragments. Thus, the popularization of the past leads to its trivialization. Educational objectives are increasingly overshadowed by commercialization.

As cultural practices are beginning to slip from the grasp of the nation-state, and are themselves affected by patterns of globalization and localization, these processes alert us to the fact that in fact culture never was 'national' by default, but became nationalized as it was contextualized in the frame of the emerging nation-state, i.e. from the late eighteenth century onwards. The emergence and subsequent erosion of

national cultures in the last two centuries now begins to present itself as one of the more exciting challenges for large-scale interdisciplinary history. The process of cultural canonization or the 'cultivation of culture' involved the developing infrastructure of the modern state, with the centralization of libraries and archives, the reorganization of universities and academies, the professionalization of the humanities and philologies, and the rising sociability of an educated middle class; it involved the ideological emergence of romantic nationalism and national thought, with its interest in cultural identity rooted in language, folklore, and ancient and medieval history. The process was all-encompassing (affecting all aspects of public life and all cultural fields, from architecture and music to language politics and education, from literature and painting to commemorations and festivals). It was also hugely successful in two respects: it aided the process of state formation in Europe (consolidated by the end of the First World War); and it became so ingrained in the public perception that throughout most of the twentieth century, culture was widely perceived to consist naturally, spontaneously, of separate national canons, and the national cultivation process that had led to this canonization model had been lost sight of.

The proper understanding of this process of national culture canonization (or cultivation of culture) presents a vast and highly promising topic with an obvious civic dimension, in that it is directly linked to the way people have been taught to view their traditions and cultural identity.

c. Cultural practices between 'high' and 'low', local and global, performance and ownership

There has been a scholarly interest in popular culture from the days of Herder and Romanticism onwards; oral epic and folktales were collected, influencing literary production, and folk music has exercised a steady influence on 'classical' music from Weber, Chopin and Glinka to Bartók and Theodorakis. This exchange between 'high' and 'low' culture at first took the shape of a cosmopolitan 'high' culture taking inspiration from the demotic bedrock of the nation. This canonization of popular culture in national terms involved fixing its fluid, shifting practices into a static unchanging canon; as a result, what we know today as 'traditional' folk culture is often a projection of its state as it was recorded in the nineteenth century.

Meanwhile, the rise of mass media and mass dissemination has inverted the terms of the high-low relationship. Popular culture is now less traditional and more cosmopolitan, from soap operas to rap music, challenging the national organization of 'high' culture. At the same time, local traditions persist, interacting with the global rather than with the national level. The public valorization and 'canonicity' of culture has likewise undergone great changes and has resulted in a blurring of the 'high'/low' distinction, with commercialism adding a new factor. Problems of canon formation in modern culture must therefore address the blurring divisions between separate national canons, between high and low culture, and between genres (given the increasing tendency towards intermediality with the rise of new genres and media: film, television, the graphic novel, historical re-enactment societies, online gaming etc.). In this of all areas, commercialism and commodification pose an unprecedented challenge. In the smallest villages, the TV set's remote control gives access to a global culture.

The relationship between culture and participants is often felt to be one of 'ownership' – a two-way ownership where it is possible to say "this belongs to me" as well as "I belong to this". Who owns culture? For most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the moral rights of cultural producers (artists, writers) were in the ascendant, leading, not only to the cult of the individual artist as creative genius, but also to copyright conventions and the notion of intellectual property. Nowadays, the easy reproducibility of information and culture is putting this idea under pressure. Culture can be 'sampled' and shared by all its users, through photocopying, downloading, scanning and otherwise. However, while culture is more accessible than ever before, it is also, to an unprecedented degree, owned by private and corporate proprietors. What does this mean for cultural practices, for the status of the artist? A long-term historical analysis of notions of authoring and 'belonging' may offer valuable perspectives on a thorny political issue.

Such an analysis may also offer insights on the question of how culture is financed. The financing of culture, once a question of private sponsoring, has become increasingly a state affair funded by tax payers; recently, however, a trend has become noticeable for a retrenchment of the state's financing role, a return to private funding, but with commercial enterprises increasingly acting as corporate sponsors. Should culture be left wholly to the invisible hand of the market place? Are there cultural forms or fields in which a national or European dimension ought to be maintained against commercial pressures, and if so, which (e.g., cinema) are these? What insights does history have to offer us concerning the various ways in which cultural practices have been, and can be, financed?

The idea of collective ownership also affects the use we make of public spaces: as landmarks, as memory sites, and places of congregation and social intercourse. Modern urban and rural planning often faces the contradictory imperatives of innovation and conservation. Space itself is a valuable resource in modern Europe: as natural landscape, as historical landmark, as living ambience. The cultural investment of public spaces, particularly of urban spaces, is a complex process of appropriation and adaptation. Buildings can be restored, replaced or refurbished; churches or palaces can be made commercially viable by being turned into office or apartment buildings, museums or shopping malls. Alternatively, other landmarks may

be considered exempt from interference because of their high symbolical prestige in the public's cultural or national consciousness. Decisions take place in a direct confrontation between logistic planning, commercial-economic initiative, and citizens' identitarian need for cultural continuity.

Indicative examples of research questions

This theme is structured around three topics which raise a range of research questions. Some of these indicative questions are listed below, so researchers are not required to answer one on the particular questions below or to work on a single topic. It is expected that some applicants may wish to address issues in more than one topic and may pose other questions. The scope of the programme is expected to be transnational in nature.

- What was the organizing power of cultural factors (language, historical memory, secular ritual, myth) in the various periods of European state formation?
- What drives the propagating power and mobility of culture? How does the self-propagating dissemination of culture relate to the geographic specificity of its social frameworks?
- What role is played by cultural self-reflection in the dynamics of culture? What role do notions (self-images, stereotypes) of national identity or specificity play in the conceptualization and international spread of culture? How do such notions relate to other forms of cultural identification (religion, gender, race, class, age-group)?
- How does cultural canonicity perpetuate itself over time, in changing circumstances and amidst changing available media?
- How does the rise of new media, from the stained-glass window, polyphonic music and the printing press to television, the internet and computer games, affect cultural themes, forms and tastes?
- Given that culture is influenced by social setting, how does it in turn influence its social ambience, e.g. in the form of public manifestations of cultural or historical remembrance, tourism, museum policy, public policy concerning museums and landmarks, city planning, school curricula etc.?
- How do different versions or interpretations of the past compete? How do they underpin opposing ideological evaluations? How does academic investigation relate to popular remembrance and myth? What demarcations can be made between factual and fictional, speculative, counterfactual and counterfeit versions of the past, ranging from academic history-writing to The Da Vinci Code and Holocaust negationism?
- What is the civic and cultural position of popular (everyday) culture and migration culture? How does it negotiate its functions of identity-affirmation or, alternatively, exclusion? How does the adoption of popular culture in high culture negotiate the registers of traditionalism and avant-garde? What cultural self-reflection processes are operative in popular culture? How does popular culture take account of high culture (imitation, carnivalesque subversion, etc.)? What forms of hybridizations occur in the triangle high culture - autochthonous popular culture - immigrant culture?
- What was/is the status of popular culture in processes of nation-building and globalization?
- How has the notion of cultural ownership and the financial value attribution of culture shifted over time, and how do these shifts relate to the rise and fall of different media and reproduction technologies? What is the future of cultural ownership in a digital world? What is the past development and the future of the respective roles of cultural creators, sponsors, participants and consumers?
- What is the history and future of the performativity of culture? Is this performativity located in individualist creation, small-scale conviviality, large-scale sociability or commercial performance and mediatization, and how do these scale-sizes relate given the rise of the internet (e.g. blogospheres)?

HERA JRP collaborative research projects are humanities-driven, but do not exclude participation from other disciplines that are relevant to addressing the theme of the call.

5. Networking and knowledge transfer

The complex dynamics of cultural processes, as outlined in the above topics, will need to be addressed internationally and by experts working in different languages and different cultural media/fields. The results of such collaboration can bring patterns, values and attitudes into focus that are of urgent relevance to European and national policy-makers in the areas of education, community relations, international affairs and public opinion. In all these areas, cultural dynamics is intimately bound up with, but rarely adequately apprehended as part of, "identity politics". Europe's cultural infrastructure at national and transnational level (museums, monument and conservation policy, cultural and historical literacy programmes, community relations) would also benefit from the insights of such research. An important field of dissemination could lie, not just in the form of academic publications, but also in the media of education (school books and educational packages) museological planning and television production/programming.

II. Theme “Humanities As A Source of Creativity and Innovation”

1. General Objectives

Historically, critically and practically, creativity is a central term in the vocabulary of the arts and humanities. Implicitly or explicitly, it informs our value systems and our critical discourse; historically, it contributes to our sense of the periodization of culture; and practically, it defines the aims and aspirations not only of the creative and performing arts but of new thinking in almost any area of intellectual endeavour: science, medicine, engineering and technology would all lay legitimate claim to creativity as a central term of their research and development. And yet, despite its centrality, the nature of creativity – its defining conditions, its workings in different arenas, and its values – seem often to be assumed rather than critically understood.

In recent years, creativity has come to be linked almost formulaically in a new conjunction, ‘creativity and innovation’, which is proposed as a key driver of the economy. Not only in the ‘creative industries’, but also in business and industry more generally, creativity and innovation are seen as forces to be harnessed in the service of economic growth. Policy reports and publications such as the Lisbon Declaration (2000) argue that *creativity* and *innovation* are central to progress and development, and the goal for Europe to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based community in the world by 2010 has put *innovation* at the top of the European research agenda.

This conjunction of creativity and innovation can be perceived both as a threat and as an opportunity. On the one hand, there is legitimate concern that the values of creativity – the imaginative leap, the risks of the genuinely new, the iconoclasm in the face of established conventions of thought – are tamed and instrumentalized when they are placed at the service of the economy. On the other hand, the very centrality of the conjunction offers arts and humanities research the opportunity for real interdisciplinarity, engaging with the ways in which the terms of creativity are being revalued by science, technology and the wider economy and bringing our own research to a better understanding of what it means to link creativity to innovation – culturally, socially and economically. It is the aim of this programme to seize this opportunity.

We welcome proposals that address creativity in all its aspects in the expectation that new research, whether it be disciplinary or interdisciplinary, into the processes and conditions of human creativity will add new understandings of the value systems of the humanities and the practices and conditions of the creative, performing and visual arts, and a much better understanding of how these values and processes might contribute to cultural, social and economic innovation. In particular, the programme will draw value from the collaboration between researchers in a range of European countries with different experiences of the creative industries, different models of the creative community or the ‘creative city’, and different histories of engagement in the agenda which links creativity and innovation. HERA JRP collaborative research projects are humanities-driven, but do not exclude participation from other disciplines that are relevant to addressing the theme of the call.

Through this programme we will bring together researchers from arts and humanities disciplines across Europe in order to understand the issue of creativity and innovation and how humanities might contribute to creativity and innovation in society at large. It is expected that the programme will stimulate high quality research across the arts and humanities and encourage interdisciplinary collaboration in and beyond academia.

In achieving these objectives, the programme will:

- Provide new opportunity to European researchers to collaborate across countries and across disciplines and facilitate exchange of knowledge and expertise
- Generate new knowledge and develop new perspectives on creativity and innovation research
- Make a significant international impact in the field

2. State of the art

At one end of the spectrum, the question of creativity focuses on the relationship between the creative artist or creative ensemble and a creative output. It is a question of expressivity and agency which has preoccupied academics within various fields of arts and humanities research throughout the twentieth-century and into the twenty-first, and has been re-invented and re-articulated through the study of successive periods and aesthetic movements: renaissance, romanticism, modernism, structuralism, poststructuralism and postmodernism. With the erosion of the boundaries between high art and popular culture, and the growing significance of craft, applied arts, and new technologies the relationship between

creativity, commerce and industrial production raises new theoretical and aesthetic questions. Added to this, of course, questions about creativity, expressivity and the role of the artist have not only preoccupied academic research but have been at the heart of many of the art movements of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

At the other end of the spectrum, creativity, now coupled with innovation, has become a question on which the wealth of nations is seen to depend. In the UK, a report by the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA), *Creating Growth: How the UK Can Create World Class Creative Businesses* (2006), estimated that the Creative Industries accounted for eight per cent of the UK economy – a total of £56.5 billion – with exports contributing £11.6 billion to the UK balance of trade in 2003. Globally, NESTA estimates that the global market value of the creative industries increased from \$831 billion in 2000 to \$1.3 trillion in 2005, with global revenues from cinema admissions alone amounting to \$25 billion http://www.nesta.org.uk/assets/pdf/creating_growth_full_report.pdf. This is clearly very big business, and economic, social and policy research has become a matter of national or regional priority in a number of territories as the economy shifts from production to consumption, and from manufacturing to services.

For arts and humanities research, the interesting questions may lie in the links which stretch from one end of the spectrum to the other, and which might tie together – perhaps in critical tension - familiar questions of creativity and expressiveness with new questions of creativity and innovation. In a 2001 paper, 'Cultural policy: rejuvenate or wither' <http://www.griffith.edu.au/ins/collections/proflects/oregan01.PDF>, Tom O'Regan, Director of the Australian Key Centre for Cultural and Media Policy, follows David Throsby (*Economics and Culture*, Cambridge University Press, 2001) by posing a model comprising three concentric circles: the first circle consisting of traditional creative arts such as dance, theatre, literature, visual arts as well as new arts like video art, performance art, multimedia; the second consisting of industries such as television, publishing, film whose output is cultural but whose structure is industrial; and the third consisting of industries like advertising and tourism which exist outside the cultural sphere but whose outputs may have cultural dimensions. Such a model, as O'Regan recognizes, has informed cultural policy and state intervention, dividing the field into different business models – from subsidy to free market competition. The danger of such a division into compartments is two-way: it may miss *both* the questions of creativity and culture which flow from the inner circle to the outer *and* the questions of innovation and entrepreneurship which may flow from the outer to the inner.

Some of these issues are addressed in work on the 'creative city' and the 'rise of the creative class' which Richard Florida addressed in his influential US 'national bestseller', *The Rise of the Creative Class* (Basic Books, 2002). While Florida's book has come under criticism, both for its data and its categories, it is suggestive in its identification of both the material and the intangible components which provide the environment within which a creative community flourishes: not only employment opportunities and technology, but also life style, social interaction and openness to diversity. In Europe such modeling had already been influential in regional policies since the 1980s, with studies such as John Myerscough's work on the economic importance of the arts in the regeneration of cities (see for example, Myerscough [1988], 'Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts: a review' <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/documents/publications/340.pdf>). In policy initiatives there has been a growing recognition of the significance of cultural amenities in attracting mobile middle- and upper-management to cities which had traditionally depended on a 'captive' industrial labour force. There is continuing scope for such work, tracing the workings of creativity through the various communities which make up an innovative and risk-taking regional or national culture. More particularly, there is scope for bringing the questions which arts and humanities researchers are most adept at addressing into a new alignment with the questions which are the specialist province of economists and policy researchers. In particular for humanistic research, some focus on the demand-side of culture and creativity might profitably adjust a balance which has been weighted heavily towards the supply-side.

A question which may have been lost in the research focus on economics and cultural policy formation concerns the *critical* function of creativity. However much we may regret its cultural pessimism, the accusation which Adorno and Horkheimer leveled against the cultural industries in 1944 still haunts us. The function of 'genuine art', they claimed, was to negate and challenge the alienation of advanced capitalism; the 'culture industry' merely extends the 'administrative rationality' of industrial production into the sphere of art and culture. The culture industries, in their analysis, deprive art of its critical function. Much of the thinking about cultural policy and creativity and innovation seems to confirm their suspicion: the value of creativity and innovation are defined as incremental and instrumental, adding value which enables social and economic benefits such as economic growth and social well-being rather than inherently valuable as challenges and provocations. Arts and humanities research tends to be most comfortable with an approach in which art, culture and creativity is valuable – and valued - for itself. It may be time for arts and humanities research to break free from this comfortable dichotomy, and to consider, for example, the complex relationship between an incremental paradigm in which creativity is placed at the service of innovation, and the critical paradigm associated with the great iconoclastic, experimental and avant garde

movements of twentieth-century modernism which rebelled against orthodoxies, challenged social convention, and, arguably, changed the ways in which we saw the world. Are such historic movements purely historic or do they have something to tell us about change and innovation?

In the 2005 European Commission Working Document, 'The future of creative industries: implications for research policy' ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/foresight/docs/a4_eur21471_web2_final.pdf, the Commission identifies a set of twelve 'possible research needs'. Many of these are concerned with issues such as the impact of technologies, the promotion of the cultural industries, statistical indicators, etc., to which arts and humanities research (particularly humanities-based cultural policy research) might (and should) contribute, but which do not pose core questions or invite methodologies familiar to traditional humanistic research. There are, however, questions of cultural diversity, of definition and of education and training which are central to the arts and humanities research community, and, in particular, Question, no. 7, 'Understanding better the idea of creativity as a factor conducive to innovation', may be seen as the inspiration for this programme for Humanities in the European Research Area. It affords the possibility of a new perspective which complicates a purely incremental and instrumental relationship between creativity and innovation, traces the terms of creativity from individual expressivity to public good (and back again), and brings to bear insights and research concerns which are at the heart of arts and humanities research.

3. European context and added values

Bringing an European dimension to this programme will provide added value to national research efforts in the area of creativity and innovation. The collaboration of researchers from across Europe will also build new expertise and produce new knowledge, which will strengthen European competitiveness in this area.

4. Research Topics

This theme is structured around three topics which raise a range of research questions. These are indicative questions and researchers are not required to answer a particular question or to work on a single topic. It is expected that some applicants may wish to address issues in more than one topic and may pose other questions.

The topics have been identified following a consultative workshop in June 2007. Many of these topics are already being addressed in practice not only in the arts and humanities but in business, science and technology. The aim is to draw them together more systematically; to ground them in research; and to add value to the research by collaboration between researchers across Europe, developing fresh perspectives by bringing together different national experiences and research traditions.

a. Creative Values

Discussions about creativity and innovation are informed by a range of values - imaginative, spiritual, aesthetic, for example. Some may have particular national inflections while others are supra-national; some may be specific to the humanities, while many others will be shared by science, technology, industry, marketing. This topic examines our perceptions, understandings and views about creativity; how they have been formed; and how they are being re-formed. They might be addressed through a range of research questions, of which the following are abstract and indicative examples. To have research value these questions would have to be rooted in historical and/or contemporary case studies.

- What do we mean by 'creativity', and how are its meanings shaped by different models of the creative process? Is a creative technologist creative in the same way as a creative artist? Are the terms of invention and experiment shared or different?
- What are the social attitudes to creativity and how are they formed historically and nationally? Is there anything to be learned about contemporary creativity and innovation from the workshops of the Renaissance or the historical conjunction of, purely for example, Einstein and Picasso?
- How is creativity distributed in terms of region (rural/urban), class, ethnicity, gender and sexuality?
- What happens to the values of creativity when they are adopted by business, the economy and society?

b. Creating Value

This topic examines the value which creativity brings to the individual and/or society and/or the economy. In particular, it offers the opportunity to interrogate the assumption that art and creativity are good in themselves, requiring no further justification. On the one hand, these assumptions underpin public subsidy and patronage for the arts; on the other hand, the absence of evidence makes it difficult to find a secure place for the arts on a scale of public policy priorities which also includes health, education, security and economic development. Many claims are made for the instrumental benefits which participation in the creative arts may bring to many socially desirable outcomes (benefits to health, for example, or to social cohesion), or for the importance of artistic creativity in affirming identities, whether communal or national.

The evidence, however, is slender. This topic is intended to encourage rigorous research both on the value which human creativity might add to the individual, public and economic good through innovation. Importantly, it also offers the opportunity for innovative and interdisciplinary models of how research on the value of creativity and innovation might be conducted.

- What is the relationship between market values and creative values? What forms of resistance do creative values and creative practices pose to traditional economic models?
- What is the relationship between creative values and systems of intellectual property?
- Under what conditions does creativity lead to innovation and what are the barriers?
- What are the implications of the argument that art is a public good, and what is the evidence base for claims that art is good for the individual, and/or for communities and/or for society at large?
- What are the benefits of participation in creativity through the visual, literary and performing arts; how might these benefits be researched, and what evidence might be developed?
- What is the role of creativity and innovation in urban or rural regeneration? What is a 'creative community' or a 'creative city', and what robust evidence is there for their contribution to a 'creative economy'?
- In what ways are the creative industries either creative or industrial?

c. Creativity and Innovation in Practice

This topic examines creativity and innovation in practice in various environments, inviting research into appropriate comparative, interdisciplinary and practical models of how it comes into being and how it operates. In effect, research might pursue many of the same questions about value and values as those exemplified above, but with a specifically practical and empirical focus. Particular emphasis might be placed on national comparisons with a view to offering models of successful practice. In particular, the research might examine models of creative practice which lead to innovation either as an explicit aim or according to the law of unintended consequences, and consider the conditions which make them possible, or which make them difficult. For example:

- In what ways do new social formations, new technologies or new economic pressures and opportunities enable – or hinder - new links between creativity and innovation?
- Can creativity be taught and/or learned? What models of good practice are there for developing and supporting creativity and encouraging innovation?
- What are the European models of a creative community or a creative city? What are the conditions which define and enable them?
- How can communities who make creative works and those who study them come together to work effectively and innovatively?
- What are the political and social conditions under which some forms of creativity are encouraged and preserved while others are suppressed, ignored or destroyed? What are the ethical considerations, stated or tacit, that lie behind these decisions?

5. Networking and knowledge transfer

By providing networking opportunities, we will promote effective engagement and transfer of knowledge and understanding between stakeholders in the creative and cultural sectors, in the public sector, in business and into society in general.

Researchers are also encouraged to work with colleagues from beyond academia to develop practical solutions for increasing creativity and innovation. We expect that the resulting research and other outputs will be relevant beyond the immediate academic sphere, to the creative communities and wider non-academic audiences. Applicants should therefore be addressing issues of collaborations and knowledge exchange, especially focusing on the particular contribution that arts and humanities can make. It is important that the applicant demonstrate the potential use of the research beyond academia and the potential impact of the research, in social, cultural or economic terms.

Some concrete examples of potential use of research beyond academia include:

- Contributing to public awareness of a specific issues in the field of arts and humanities
- Making research useful in a commercial and cultural project or in regional, national or international initiative
- Informing regional, national or international future policies
- Improving the quality of tourism.

GUIDELINES FOR APPLICANTS

Outline and Full Proposals must be submitted by Project Leaders online. The online application form for Outline Proposals will be available on the Programme website as from **5 February 2009**. Applicants should follow the proposal structure as indicated in the application template for Outline Proposals available on the Programme website at: <http://www.heranet.info>. Project Leaders submit the application on the part of all partners (Principal Investigators) of the Collaborative Research Project (CRP).

On the Programme website, general information on **National Eligibility Requirements** as well as to a **HERA JRP Glossary** and **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)** are available.

Eligibility

The Outline Proposals will be subjected to an eligibility check according to commonly agreed HERA JRP criteria and national eligibility criteria (applicable in the country where the applicants intend to receive their grants). Proposals are only eligible, if they fulfil the following **common HERA JRP criteria**:

- Outline Proposals must be submitted in time. i.e. via the online submission system accessible via the HERA website before the deadline: **7 April, 14:00 CET.**
- Outline Proposals must be submitted by an eligible research team.
- Outline proposals must be complete and follow the prescribed format.

Prior to submitting Outline Proposals, all applicants must contact the contact persons of their respective national funding organisations in order to verify eligibility and to ensure compliance with their relevant organisations' granting rules and regulations defining national eligibility with regards to such matters as qualifications of applicants or accuracy of budget items (see contact persons listed on page 15). General information on national eligibility requirements is also available via the Programme website.

At the time of online submission of the Outline Proposals, the Project Leader is asked to confirm that all respective national funding agencies have been contacted on behalf of all Principal Investigators in the CRP.

Eligibility of the research teams and research proposal

Each HERA CRP consortium must be composed of research teams consisting of at least one Principal Investigator based at universities or research institutes **in three or more** different **HERA JRP countries**. Each participating researcher must be considered eligible for funding by the funding organisations of the HERA JRP country he/she works.

Each project team should strive to include researchers at different stages in their careers, including postdoctoral and PhD students, as participants in the project. To stimulate knowledge transfer outside the academic community the inclusion of non-academic partners is also encouraged.

All HERA JRP CRP consortia must be balanced in terms of contributions from the three or more partners based in three or more different countries but distribution of funding over countries may be uneven.

Non-academic partners (e.g. applicants from industry) can be associated with a CRP where their added value is demonstrated. Their participation as **Associated Partners (AP)** in a CRP will not be financially supported by the HERA JRP. Non-academic APs are considered part of a CRP and will be assessed as such at both the Outline and Full Proposal stage. A formal letter of commitment on the part of non-academic APs should be appended to the application explaining their interest and role in the CRP and making explicit the way in which they are committed to the CRP activities (financially and/or in kind).

Researchers from countries NOT participating in the HERA JRP are **NOT eligible** to be part of HERA JRP applications. If they wish to collaborate in CRPs they can only do so at their own cost and with the agreement of the CRP consortium. Their projects/contributions to CRPs will NOT be taken into consideration during the evaluation, and proposals should NOT include any information (project descriptions, CVs) of ineligible researchers. However, researchers from non-HERA JRP countries will be allowed to participate in ways as yet to be determined in the future HERA JRP networking activities.

Project Leader (PL)

The Project Leader (PL) must be a senior researcher responsible for carrying out the CRP. S/he will be the contact point for the HERA JRP Handling Agency and is responsible for communication with the other Principal Investigators of his/her CRP. In addition, the PL is responsible for leading project activities of

his/her Individual Project at his/her own institute and for representing the Collaborative Research Project as a whole.

The PL is also responsible for the administrative and financial management of the complete CRP, i.e. if a CRP is granted, the HERA JRP Handling Agency will transfer the full CRP budget to the PL, who will be responsible for distributing funding to the CRP consortium partners.

Finally, the PL is responsible for the intellectual agenda and coherence as well all reporting duties pertaining to the CRP funded within the context of the HERA JRP.

The PL can participate as a PL in one proposal only.

Principal Investigator (PI)

Each Principal Investigator (PI) is responsible for leading project activities of his/her Individual Project at his/her institute. PI status is not limited to researchers at any specific career stage after completing PhD. There may be more than one PI from any one eligible country in one proposal, but only one per university/institute.

PIs are responsible for providing the PL with the required information and financial data in order for the PL to be able to fulfil his/her reporting obligations.

A PI is only allowed to be involved in more than one HERA JRP proposal provided the following conditions for multiple participation are met:

- the PI needs to inform his/her PLs about which CRP proposals (s)he is involved in;
- the total number of hours the PI participates in the submitted CRP proposal(s) must be lower than the number of hours (s)he is employed by his/her university/institute.

Maximum duration, maximum budget and starting date of CRPs

The maximum duration of CRPs is **36 months**, and the maximum level of funding is **1M€**. Taking into account the selection and approval processes, the successful projects are expected to begin their activities in **February-March 2010**.

Application format

An Outline Proposal must be written in English, must follow the proposal structure as indicated in the application template for Outline Proposals available on the Programme website and comprises:

- √ A short description of the CRP (max. 2000 words) that explains:
 - * What research question does the CRP seek to answer
 - * Why is this research question significant? How will it contribute to one of the HERA JRP themes?
 - * By what methods will the research question be tackled?
 - * In what way is the project original and/or innovative?
 - * What added value will be gained by undertaking this CRP with the proposed partners?
 - * What is the trans-national (European) added value of the CRP?
 - * How will findings be shared with interested parties?
- √ Short CVs of PL, all PIs and non-academic APs (max. one page each, including five most relevant publications); A formal letter of commitment on the part of non-academic APs should be appended to the application explaining their interest and role in the CRP and making explicit the way in which they are committed to the CRP activities (financially and/or in kind).
- √ Estimated budget over the funding period of max. 36 months (consistent with the rules of relevant national funding organisation) tabulated according to a provided template. *NB! At the Full Proposal stage applicants must provide proof for the fact that the budget data they provide are in accordance with national eligibility rules.*

A project summary of no more than 1500 characters (no spaces) should be entered directly in the online application form that will be available on the Programme website from 5 February 2009. The project summary should include the following information:

- * relevance of the research topic to the Call
- * Objectives/expected outcome of the CRP
- * Explanation on how the CRP will be implemented.

The title of the CRP, including the acronym of the project, the abstract and names of the Principal Investigators involved, will be made public if the CRP is funded by the HERA JRP.

Assessment procedure and criteria – Outline Proposal phase

Proposal evaluation under the two HERA JRP themes is prepared by two international, independent HERA JRP Review Panels (RPs). The members of the RPs are leading scientists, appointed by the HERA JRP Board. The composition of the HERA JRP Review Panels will be available on the HERA website.

Applications will be evaluated according to a set of criteria in a two-stage procedure. In the Outline Proposal phase, the Review Panels will select proposals with potential for research excellence, by applying the following **criteria**:

- Research excellence
- Relevance to the Call for Proposals
- Novelty and originality
- European added value [=value added to the research conducted from the novel multilateral European research collaboration. European added value is not about "European" (vs. local or global) topics, but about the expected better research that emerges from European research collaboration]
- Qualification of the applicants

Open Access

The HERA JRP Board endorses, for the output of these HERA Joint Research Programme, the recommendations on Open Access made by the European Research Advisory Board (EURAB) http://ec.europa.eu/research/eurab/pdf/eurab_scipub_report_recomm_dec06_en.pdf and the Scientific Council of the European Research Council http://erc.europa.eu/pdf/ScC_Guidelines_Open_Access_revised_Dec07_FINAL.pdf.

The HERA JRP will develop dissemination and knowledge transfer strategies, in which Open Access will play a role. Recipients of HERA JRP funding are therefore strongly encouraged to use Open Access publishing wherever possible. If they foresee, at the application stage, publishing under "author pays" regimes they are invited to include the related costs (justified) into their budgets. HERA JRP beneficiaries are expected to explain, in their application, which Open Access strategy they intend to follow.

Assessment procedure and criteria – Full Proposal phase

Full Proposals for the two HERA JRP themes will be invited following the recommendations of the Review Panels. The deadline for Full Proposals will be announced later, but is expected to be around 1 September 2009, 14:00 CET. Please note that only applicants who submitted an Outline Proposal can submit a Full Proposal.

The Full Proposals under each theme will be assessed by at least three independent external expert referees who are selected from a pool of scientists suggested by the participating funding organisations. A list of all referee names unassigned to proposals used for the international peer review will be published on the Programme website once the selection process is complete.

Referee reports will be made available (anonymously) to the applicants for their information and for commenting (optional). The HERA JRP Review Panels will rank all Full Proposals based on the assessment of the Full Proposal, the referee reports and the applicant's responses to these.

The proposals under both themes will be financed from one common pot, where the highest ranked proposals under both themes are funded. The Review Panels will create a joint ranked list consisting of the best Full Proposals under the two HERA JRP themes and will subsequently make recommendations to the HERA JRP Board for the funding of these proposals.

Full Proposals will be evaluated according to the following selection **criteria** (in accordance with FP7 requirements):

Research excellence - Quality of the trans-national project (Threshold 3/5):

- sound concept and quality of objectives
- progress beyond the state-of-the-art
- quality and effectiveness of the research methodology and associated workplan

Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management (Threshold 3/5) :

- appropriateness of the management structure and procedures
- quality and individual experience of the individual participants
- quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance, level of integration and collaboration)
- appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff equipment)

Potential Impact (Threshold 3/5):

- relevance to the EU and FP7 objectives
- appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of trans-national CRP results, and management of intellectual property”

Detailed requirements and instructions on how to complete the application forms will be made available once Full Proposals are being invited.

Intellectual Property Rights (IRP)

The arrangements for the handling of IPR must be in place within projects. In the Full Proposal phase, successful applicants will be required to submit a consortium agreement with IPR issues clarified. It is expected that the results obtained by the CRPs supported under this Programme will be placed in the public domain. HERA JRP conditions with respect to IPR are to be considered equal to those for all collaborative projects funded by the European Commission under FP7 (ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/ipr_en.pdf). Successful applicants are advised to familiarize themselves thoroughly with these guidelines, and to include them, in a modified or specified form, into their consortium agreements with their partners. A model consortium agreement will be made available once Full Proposals are being invited.

HERA Joint Research Programme Structure and Management

The overall responsibility for the governance of the HERA JRP lies with the *HERA JRP Board*, whose membership is formed by one representative from each participating funding organisation. *Quality Assurance Committee* and *Knowledge Transfer Advisory Committee* composed of the members of the HERA JRP Board will monitor the project selection process and knowledge transfer activities, respectively.

Proposal assessment and selection are the responsibility of the two international, independent *Review Panels*. The members of the Review Panels are leading scientists, appointed following suggestions from participating funding organisations. The membership of the Review Panels will be available on the Programme website for information. The Review Panels are also expected to monitor the overall research progress of the Programme.

Two theme-specific *Research Steering Committees*, which are formed by the Project Leaders of all funded CRPs, will be responsible for proposing networking activities for research synergy in the HERA JRP Programme.

ESF will act as the *Handling Agency* for the HERA JRP, managing the project selection process, dealing with the financial administration and managing research networking activities.

HERA Joint Research Programme Networking

Networking activities are designed to strengthen the research objectives of HERA JRP by promoting coherence in the activities of the research community involved. This will stimulate the European added-value which is one of the central objectives of this Programme.

Networking and collaboration within HERA JRP takes place at two levels:

1. between the various Individual Projects within each Collaborative Research Project (CRP) and
2. between the funded CRPs within the programme as a whole.

The intra-CRP networking activities must be paid from the HERA JRP research grants and can be included in the budgets of the Individual Projects in the CRP. In addition, all IP budgets should include travel and accommodation costs for participation in the HERA JRP Kick-Off and Final Conferences, where Principal Investigators (obligatory) and other Project Members (optional) take part. A standard estimate of 850 EUR per person per trip may be used. Other cross-CRP activities are funded additionally through the HERA JRP.

The intra-CRP collaboration is motivated by the nature of the CRP’s research objectives, i.e., by the scope and the complexity of the questions it deals with. In a CRP, the participating groups have the opportunity to gather the required critical mass to successfully address the objectives and challenges of their project. The cross-CRP networking and collaboration is stirred by the aims and the nature of the HERA JRP. The two themes which were the basis of this Programme have been selected for their clear need of collaboration in the proposed field. The funded CRPs will collectively set up and further streamline this new collaboration. To this end, the CRPs will engage the programme participants and, when of clear benefit, colleagues from outside the programme in joint activities such as conferences, workshops or seminars.

Through active participation of scientists in the above-mentioned activities, not only existing collaborations are enhanced but new and strategic partnership opportunities are also identified. Furthermore, these

activities may provide opportunities to explore aspects of the programme, which are not covered by the funded research projects. The integrative activities between the CRPs will help to strengthen the field by building coherence within this emerging research community and will serve as a platform for the research work, which is done in the programme.

HERA Joint Research Programme Evaluation

The first evaluation, conducted by the Review Panel after the first year of research, will evaluate the overall progress of the Programme, based on the progress of the funded CRPs. Here, the Review Panels have a steering function and can comment on the workplan of each CRP in relation to the objectives of the overall Programme. A final evaluation will assess the achievements of the CRPs and the whole HERA Joint Research Programme.

HERA Joint Research Programme

National contact points:

Country, Funding Agency	Contact details (as regards national eligibility questions) For administrative and procedural question, contact ESF.
Austria FWF	Fonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften Dr. M. (Monika) Maruska Sensengasse 1, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA E-mail address: monika.maruska@wfu.ac.at
Croatia HAZU	The Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences. Mrs J. (Jelena) Đukić Zrinski trg 11, 10000 ZAGREB, CROATIA E-mail address: jdukic@hazu.hr
Denmark DASTI	The Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation Research Council for the Humanities Ms I. (Inger) Schow Bredgade 40, DK-1260 KOPENHAGEN, DENMARK E-mail address: inso@fi.dk
Estonia EstSF	Estonian Science Foundation Ms. K. (Kati) Kio Endla 4, 10142 TALLINN, ESTONIA E-mail address: kati@etf.ee
Finland AKA	Academy of Finland Research Council for Culture and Society Dr. K. (Kustaa) Multamäki Vilhonvuorenkatu 6, 00500 HELSINKI, FINLAND E-mail address: kustaa.multamaki@aka.fi
Iceland RANNIS	Icelandic Centre for Research Mr. M. (Magnús) Lyngdal Magnússon Laugavegi 13, IS-101 REYKJAVIK, ICELAND E-mail address: magnus@rannis.is
Ireland IRCHSS	Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences Mrs. S. (Sorcha) Carthy Shelbourne Road, Ballsbridge, DUBLIN 4, IRELAND E-mail address: scarthy@irchss.ie
Luxembourg FRR	Fonds National de la Recherche, Luxembourg Mrs. S. (Susanne) Rick 6, rue Antoine de Saint-Exupéry B.P. 1777, L-1017 Luxembourg, LUXEMBOURG E-mail address: susanne.rick@fnr.lu
Netherlands NWO	Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research Mrs A. (Alice) Dijkstra P.O. Box 93425, 2509 AK THE HAGUE, THE NETHERLANDS E-mail address: hera@nwo.nl
Norway RCN	The Research Council of Norway Department for the Humanities Division of Science Mrs S. (Solbjørg) Rauset P.O.Box 2700 St.Hanshaugen, N-0131 OSLO, NORWAY E-mail address: sol@forskningsradet.no

Slovenia MHEST	Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology Mr D. (Davor) Kozmus Kotnikova 38, 1000 LJUBLJANA, SLOVENIA E-mail address: davor.kozmus@gov.si
Sweden VR	The Swedish Research Council Humanities and Social Sciences Dr. L (Lena) Johansson de Château 103 78 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN E-mail address: lena.johansson.dechateau@vr.se
UK AHRC	Arts and Humanities Research Council Ms. C. (Christelle) Pellecier Lewins Mead, BRISTOL BS1 2AE, UNITED KINGDOM E-mail address: c.pellecier@ahrc.ac.uk

**Handling Agency for the HERA Joint Research Programmes
(as regards administrative and procedural questions)**

European Science Foundation Humanities Unit	Ms. J. (Julia) Boman 1, quai Lezay-Marnesia 67080 STRASBOURG, FRANCE E-mail address: hera@esf.org
---	--