



Call for papers

International Conference

CRAFT WORK, DESIGN, CREATIVITY: BETWEEN TRADITION AND CONTEMPORANEITY

18-21 may 2020

Paissii Hilendarski University
Plovdiv (Bulgaria)

With this 5th international conference, set in the cities of Plovdiv and Gabrovo in Bulgaria, crea2S network (<https://crea2s.hypotheses.org>)¹ intends to question creation and creativity when these recall art craft, asking what role is played by design into current mutations. The matter is to go further with the debate that began on that very question in 2014, doing so through the analysis of what is at stake in creativity, beyond economic and cultural challenges. How social and cultural interests from all involved in the current changes of cultural and creative industries, translate in public policies (Schlesinger, 2007; Tremblay, 2008)? What are the new stakes, the balance of power, and their social, organizational and communicational outcome? We offer to continue analysis and discussions about injunctions to creativity in numerical time (Montréal, 2014; Nantes, 2015), about the creative turn (Varna, 2017) and the creative contagion (Athens, 2018), towards a criticism in political economy of creation and creativity (Moeglin, 2015).

“Creative and cultural industries stand out as they’re acting as an important lever of French

growth and create a big economic development stake”, says BPI France². From music to video games, from heritage to gastronomy, through tourism, fashion or marketing, all these activities have a creative part at heart. Service trade or factory items, they’re attributed a symbolic value due to their peculiarity, their quality or their special aesthetic. The production of these symbolic and/or cultural goods is more and more acknowledged, in France or elsewhere, as a lever for economic development and the expression of cultural diversity.

We observe as well a renewed interest for the analysis and the questioning of boundaries, quite porous, of art, design, and craft art (Cozzolino, Golsenne, 2019). Surfing on the *craft* wave, artefacts, matter and material, technics, imagination and representation, designers, artists and craft men’s activities, professionals and amateurs’ practices, all mix together. This demands to scrutinize the general rush for design semantics, included: industrial, craft, cultural, educational, digital, graphic, current, UX, design thinking, etc.; to look also into linked emerging socio-economic models from cultural and creative industries, as well as from other industrial sectors.

¹ For a summary of Crea2S network scientific activities refer to Andonova Y., Kogan A.-F. (2019), “Réseau international Crea2S – Creative Shift Studies. First evaluation and perspectives”, RFSIC, n° 16: <https://journals.openedition.org/rfsic/5818>

² <https://www.bpifrance.fr/A-la-une/Actualites/Les-industries-culturelles-et-creatives-au-service-la-French-Touch-27851>

We're attending the renewal of the "*do it yourself*" technique, of co-creation and experimentation. The search for authenticity expressed by nostalgia and return to craft art forms, by local know-how, and hand-made craft, cannot be understood if you don't question global industrial production. How the integration into business of these activities is strengthened by the creative economy? What room for entrepreneurship? What are the links between traditional craft art cultures and creative industries?

Indeed trades such as art craft and decorative arts request scarce skills, which are derived from local culture and associated to heritage; they call in traditional but also innovative know-how. Moreover, they offer jobs on site which won't be outsourced (Pellegrin-Boucher, Roy, 2019). Public policies support these activities by financial aid and labels.

Intangible cultural heritage stands at an important place. It is: a subject studied which links ancient and modern technics and practices; the bearer of potential creativity; the expression of a common identity; support for social and human interaction. Its definition has constantly broadened during the last half-century. Chiara Bortolotto (2011) maintains that, in Europe, heritage management as a category confirmed by experience, act on the basis of objectivity. It would be difficult to sever the various types of intangible cultural heritage from the existing tools, objects and artefacts. What links tangible to intangible, it's the statement that they are both "public treasure", belonging to *patrimonium populi*, which must be passed on from one generation to another (Poulot, 1998; Jadé, 2006). During the last decennia, new social uses of tangible and intangible heritage have emerged in connection with, especially, sustainable development, the evolution of ties between villages and cities, and the change in nature of social links (Cuvelier et al., 1994; Rautenberg et al., 2000). Thus, resting on the relationship between local participation and European cooperation, they lead to new social dynamics.

Because of their historical background and that they are the symbol of factory and craft work in Bulgaria, the city of Plovdiv received the European Culture Capital city 2019 award

and the city of Gabrovo was granted the "creative city" label by the UNESCO (<https://en.unesco.org/creative-cities/gabrovo>). We will then be surrounded by the perfect environment to question craft art current evolutions, its rich, complex, sometimes ambiguous links with design, heritage and tourism.

Papers proposals should register for one of the following four axes.

Axe 1. Craft work and its representation

Craft work is associated with several representations referring to worshipping of the hand, of the gesture and of the slow pace trainings, which are interesting to question. Richard Sennett (2008) reminds that craft man's art of doing doesn't limit itself to hand work know-how. It implies tight links between practical practices and reflection, between head and hands. He rehabilitates the *métis*, who, in Greek mythology, symbolizes at the same time the clever intelligence and the Greek *praxis* (Détienne et Vernant, 1974), introducing in the "do" a part of thinking, of imagination and sensibility. How, then, take into account at the same time the enabling qualities of a work environment and the "acting creativities" (Joas, 1996) of actors in workplace situations? Where to locate the "creative power", in the reflection or in the gesture? Is separating them still relevant? Stereotypes usually dedicated to craft men are largely reconsidered, now showing that the craft man is not simply a technician with neither creative nor commercial vision. Actually, his set of values is very different: craft work as a "good behavior" and not only as a qualified hand craft activity, is a shared experience proceeding by collective trial and errors. What are contemporary representations of craft work, in its critical, economical, see political, dimensions? Aren't virtues acquired from practice and the worshipping of authenticity, associated to art craft production, now searched for basically different reasons? Moreover, does craft work renewal give an answer to other issues linked to social and mutual economy (Economie Sociale et Solidaire)? It might include, on the one hand,

what is at stake with sustainable development and, on the other hand, what would respond to the criticism of mass consumption, and to the global industry model.

Axe 2. Design and craft work: renewal and changes

Design is often compared by his promoters to a driving belt of creativity, mandatory way for innovation and unavoidable tool for economic development. It would allow “to dust” traditional craft work and give it a new breath. When design invents craft work anew, what are its function, and its methods? Does it interfere with the form or with the use? Innovation brought in by design permit to lower costs, to rationalize production, to manufacture in series, reduce delays and also to master downstream sales. Do we observe an evolution of the status of craft work businesses and of their situation on the network? Philippe Bouquillion (2016) shows that, in India, designers take place upstream, through organizations which order products to craft men but influence the making and the gathering, form the criteria of production and, as a result, the division of labor, and craft men ways of remuneration. This way, the design contributes to lead upwards the economic viability and to deepen the cultural rooting of craft trade, renewing as well its means to make business (Bouquillion, Peghini, Servan-Shreiber, 2017). What is going on in France, in Bulgaria and in other countries in the world? Who are the main actors and what is the existing balance of power - talking of mergers, of diversification or of monopolies (associations, NGO)? What is the role of the Government and of international institutions? We want also to question designer’s profile, his training and his related skills. Who are designers (ex-craft men, artists undergoing a conversion, etc.)? What about training adverts (in Art and Applied Art schools, as well as in design schools, engineers’ schools and the universities)? When you consider design as a competence into creation, how do both designers and craft men’s works join? How does digital contribute to this evolution? What is the role played by web firms like WeCanDoo.fr whose project is to “enlighten

craft men’s talent and free each one’s creativity”?

Axe 3. Creative lands, heritage and public policies

The abundance of labels praising so called “creative” cities, districts and clusters, is part of the “cultural branding” strategy meant to boost the regional economic activity (Vivant, 2013). Official labels and ranking from institutions, like the European Commission Council and the Unesco, can’t be issued without rallying local public actors, upstream as much as downstream. Who are the involved actors (public organizations, small and medium firms, micro-businesses)? How are strains managed when the development of creativity is relevant to land, political, economic and social stakes (Emin, Schieb-Bienfait, 2019)? The towns of Plovdiv and Gabrovo’s cases should project precious light, displaying what concerns local specificities in the process. This should complete works already issued on this theme at the Nantes and Varna conferences (Andonova & Kogan, 2015, 2017). We wish to question more particularly the role played by the craft workers and the way they become –or not, public actors in this visibility of culture. What policies are issued which support craft work: in training; improvement of work conditions, etc.? We can’t avoid looking into the register of intellectual property and the diverse law-strengthening rules: copyright, patents, labels, tax-exemption measures. Could craft work be considered, as the fringes of cultural industry, like a fishpond of innovation benefiting to industrial businesses? Who is the author? There stands fundamentally the question of the rights, and of the inherent economic and legal status. From this standpoint, cultural policies oriented towards heritage, craft work and creative industries offer new opportunities for their preservation and their promotion and make new economic stakes emerge (Grefe, 2003). A recent research on craft work in Bulgaria shows the need to take advantage of these opportunities and to make them work towards regional development (Kabakov, 2016). Heritage and craft work would capture the potential of creative tradition and permit

the revival of economy thanks to the use of local resources and to human capacities development (Mihailescu, 2017; Iosif, 2017). Which analysis is made in strategic terms on these stakes, at the same time social, cultural, economic, and symbolic, and concerning the land?

Axe 4. Experience economy and creativity: risks, opportunities and links with craft work.

The connection between the terms authenticity and experience as well as the substitution of the notion of creation for that of creativity both contribute to increase the symbolic value of ordinary consumption products or those issued from digital industry (Bouquillion, Miège, Moeglin, 2013). Co-creation, participating platforms and experiential marketing, resting on the potential of brands for creating value (Apple store is an example) have the wind right aft. At the heart of innovative ecosystems and of maker culture (Lallement, 2015), they are claimed as sine qua non condition for a creative performance to happen. Thanks to the quest towards sensibility and authenticity, experimental economy thrives, exactly like creative tourism, which promote immersing and participatory experiences (Pagès, 2014). Even though the “make” and experiential

tourism existed previously, the current attraction for ceramics workshops, Brazilian cooking lessons and Japanese floral art (ikebana) and other inclusive practices make wonder. Is really experiential tourism (see Airbnb Experiences site, launched in 2016 and WeCanDoo in 2017), a tourism of authenticity, like so often qualified? Attracting travelers, who are consumers eager for local products, contribute to stimulate the lands, to promote cultural heritage, and local craft work. But because it distorts the inner nature of creation, doesn't it undermine tourism industries? Don't we assist to a standardization of the tourist's experience because of the generalization of platforms? What are the risks and the drifts?

Through these four axes, we intend to decipher the renewal of issues concerning craft work, design and, more broadly, creation activities in creative industries, as well as the associated representations, practices and stakes. This is an invitation to examine the crossing of multiple worlds, in the sense belonging to sociology (Boltanski & Thévenot, 1991): commercial, domestic, industrial, civic, of inspiration, of opinion, and by project, or conflicts about importance which can be fastened to it.

Indicative references:

- ANDONOVA Y. (2019), *Communication, travail et injonctions à la créativité*, mémoire d'HDR en sciences de l'information et de la communication, Université Bordeaux Montaigne, 247p.
- BOLTANSKI L., THÉVENOT L. (1991), *De la justification. Les économies de la grandeur*, Paris, Gallimard.
- BORTOLOTTO Ch. (dir.) (2011), *Le patrimoine culturel immatériel. Enjeux d'une nouvelle catégorie*, Paris, Éditions de la MSH.
- BOUQUILLION Ph. (2016), « Les enjeux des industries créatives en Inde », *Les Enjeux de l'Information et de la Communication*, n°17/2, pp.39-53. <https://lesenjeux.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/2016/dossier/03-enjeux-industries-creatives-inde>
- BOUQUILLION Ph., MIÈGE B., MOEGLIN P. (2013), *L'industrialisation des biens symboliques. Les industries créatives en regard des industries culturelles*, Grenoble, PUG.
- BOUQUILLION Ph., PEGHINI J., SERVAN-SCHREIBER C. (2018), *Artisanat et design. Un dessein indien ?*, Editions Peter Lang.

- COZZOLINO Francesca, GOLSENNE Thomas (2019), « Pour une anthropologie de la création », Images Re-vues, Hors-série 7. <http://journals.openedition.org/imagesrevues/7208>
- CUVELIER, P. ET E. TORRES, J. GADREY (1994), *Modèle de tourisme et développement local*. Paris, Ed. L'Harmattan.
- DÉTIENNE M., VERNANT J.-P. (1974), *Les ruses de l'intelligence. La Métis des Grecs*, Paris, Flammarion.
- EMIN S., SCHIEB-BIENFAIT N. (2019), Scènes locales, clusters culturels et quartiers créatifs : Les ressorts en enjeux territoriaux du développement culturel (PUR). Rennes.
- GREFFE X. (2003), *La valorisation économique du patrimoine*, Paris, La documentation Française.
- IOSIF C. (2017), Creative Traditions Forum: the Project and the Team. *Martor*, 22, pp.183-195
- JADE M. (2006), *Le patrimoine immatériel. Perspectives de l'interprétation du concept du patrimoine*, Série Muséologies, L'Harmattan.
- JOAS H. (1996), *The Creativity of Action*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- KABAKOV I. (2016) (dir.), *Harnessing the Cultural Potential of traditional arts and Crafts*. Gabrovo, Fabric Association.
- KOGAN A.-F., ANDONOVA Y. (coord.) (2019), dossier thématique « De quoi la créativité est-elle le nom ? », *Communication*, n°36/1. <https://journals.openedition.org/communication/9647>
- KRASTANOVA K. (2016), « The Night of Museums and Galleries” as a Cultural and Tourist Destination », in *International Scientific Conference (proceedings) Cultural Corridor Western Transbalkan Road – Cultural Tourism without Boundaries*, Meteora-Lefkada, Greece, 181-187.
- LALLEMENT M. (2015), *L'Âge du Faire. Hacking, travail, anarchie*, Paris, Le Seuil.
- MIHAILESCU V. (2017), Créative Traditions and Ecology of the Heritage. *Martor*, 22, 9-31.
- MOEGLIN P. (2015), « Pour une économie politique de la création. De la trivialité à la créativité », *Communication & langages*, 2015/3, n°185, pp.49-66.
- PAGÈS D. (2014), « Le tourisme créatif à la rencontre des cultures numériques : de la gouvernance des destinations à l'écriture des expériences », *Mondes du Tourisme*, n°10, 75-90.
- POULOT D. (1998), *Patrimoine et modernité*, Ed. L'Harmattan
- RAUTENBERG M., MICOUD A., BERARD L., MARCHENAY Ph. (dir.) (2000), *Campagne de tous nos désirs. Patrimoine et nouveaux usages sociaux*, Paris, Éditions de la MSH.
- SCHLESINGER Ph. (2007), « Creativity: from discourse to doctrine? », *Screen*, Oxford University Press, 48,3, autumn, pp. 377- 387.
- SENNETT R. (2008), *The Craftsman*, Yale University Press.
- TREMBLAY G. (2008), « Industries culturelles, économie créative et société de l'information », *Global Media Journal - Canadian Edition*, 1(1), pp.65-88.
- VIVANT E. (2013), « Creatives in the city: Urban contradictions of the creative city », *City, Culture and Society*, 4 (2), pp.57-63.

Submission process:

Abstracts must be submitted electronically **no later than 1 March 2020** by using the following addresses:

Krassimira KRASTANOVA, Université de Plovdiv : krkrastanova@uni-plovdiv.net

Yanita ANDONOVA, Université Paris 13: yanita.andonova@gmail.com

Anne-France KOGAN, Université Rennes 2 : anne-france.kogan@univ-rennes2.fr

The subject line of the email should be entitled: **"Plovdiv Symposium Proposal 2020"**

All abstracts will be peer reviewed, so the submitted abstract should be prepared for blind review. Abstracts must be written in French or in English and they must include the following elements:

First page :

- Title of the communication
- abstract (15 lines maximum), 12 pt. Times New Roman font, single spaced
- 5 key – words
- surname and first name of the author (s), institutional affiliation, telephone number, e-mail

Following pages (anonymous) :

- The text of the proposal (excluding the references) must range from 6000 to 8000 characters, including spaces, in Times New Roman, character 12, single spacing. It must clearly describe: the subject of the proposal and its adequacy with the main objective of the conference, the problematic, the theoretical and methodological frameworks used, the chosen field and the main results of the research.
- Bibliography -References

Deadlines:

Deadline for abstracts submission	1 March 2020
Notification of decision for papers submitted by conference scientific committee	1 April 2020
Final conference program	20 April 2020
Conference	18-21 May 2020

Steering Committee:

Krassimira KRASTANOVA, Université de Plovdiv (Bulgarie)
Yanita ANDONOVA, LabSIC, Université Paris 13 (France)
Anne-France KOGAN, PREFICs, Université Rennes 2 (France)

Organizing Committee:

Svetla DIMITROVA, Musée ethnographique régional en plein air (Bulgarie)
Vanya DONEVA, Musée ethnographique régional en plein air (Bulgarie)
Maria KISSIKOVA, Université de Plovdiv (Bulgarie)
Oana PERJU, équipe “Traditions créatives” et chercheuse indépendante, Bucarest (Roumanie)
Tomi POPECHKIN, Université de Plovdiv (Bulgarie)
Elitsa STOILOVA, Université de Plovdiv (Bulgarie)
Georgiana VLAHBEI, chercheuse indépendante, Bucarest (Roumanie)
Meglena ZLATKOVA, Université de Plovdiv (Bulgarie)

Scientific Committee :

BAILLARGON Danny, Université de Sherbrooke (Canada)
BAKOUNAKIS Nicolaos, Université Panteion (Grèce)
BELANGER Anouk, Université du Québec à Montréal (Canada)
BERGER Estelle, Strate École de design (France)
BORRELLI Davide, Università “Suor Orsola Benincasa” di Napoli (Italie)
BOUQUILLION Philippe, LabSic, Université Paris 13 (France)
BULLICH Vincent, Gresec, Université Grenoble Alpes (France)
D’ALMEIDA Nicole, Sorbonne Université, Celsa (France)
DABEVA Tania, Université d’économie de Varna (Bulgarie)

GRASSI Carlo, IAUUV, Université de Venise (Italie)
 IOSIF Corina, National Museum of the Romanian Peasant, Bucarest (Roumanie)
 JANOWSKA Anetta, Warsaw School of Economics (Pologne)
 KABAKOV Ivan, Université de Sofia (Bulgarie)
 KRASTOVA Anna, Nouvelle Université Bulgare de Sofia (Bulgarie)
 MAHE Emmanuel, EnsadLab, École nationale supérieure des Arts Décoratifs (France)
 MOEGLIN Pierre, LabSic, Université Paris 13 / Institut Universitaire de France (France)
 MONJARET Anne, IIAC/ équipe LAHIC, CNRS-EHESS (France)
 PATRASCU Marcela, Prefics, Université Rennes 2 (France)
 ROUET Gilles, LAREQUOI, Université de Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines (France)
 SAVIGNAC Emmanuelle, CERLIS, Université Paris 3 (France)
 STAZIO Marialuisa, Université de Naples Frederico II (Italie)
 TREMBLAY Gaëtan, Cricis, Université du Québec à Montréal (Canada)
 VOVOU Ioanna, Ceisme, Université Panteion (Grèce)
 ZACKLAD Manuel, Dicen, CNAM (France)



Plovdiv University
Paissii Hilendarski



ETHNOGRAPHIC OPEN AIR MUSEUM ETAR

