

Heritage Dynamics: Politics of Authentication and Aesthetics of Persuasion in Brazil, Ghana, South Africa and the Netherlands

Fact sheet IRIS

1. Project information

This multidisciplinary, international, comparative program focuses on (a) the framing of cultural heritage in multicultural arenas, (b) its intersection with citizenship and identity, (c) attempts to design cultural heritage in such a way that it appear as 'authentic' and 'real' (politics of authentication) and (d) the extent to which cultural heritage is – or is not - subjectively experienced as objectively real (aesthetics of persuasion) in Brazil, Ghana, South Africa and the Netherlands. Combining (1) a thorough analysis of the processes by which canons-in-the-making are re-mediated with (2) an in-depth empirical study of how cultural heritage becomes inscribed into understandings of self through embodied performances, this project seeks (3) to develop a comparative framework, and (4) to move cultural analysis beyond the trodden paths of constructivist and essentializing approaches.

2. Main applicant

Mw. Prof. Dr. Birgit Meyer (VU, Faculty of Social Sciences, Social and Cultural Anthropology).

3. Co-applicants

Dr. Mattijs van de Port (UvA, ASSR, Department of Sociology and Anthropology).
Prof. Dr. Herman Roodenburg (Department of Dutch Ethnology, Meertens-institute).

Prof. Dr. David Chidester, Institute for the Comparative Study of Religion in Southern Africa, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Prof. Dr. Luis Nicolau Parés, Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Brazil.

Prof. Dr. Kodjo Senah, Department of Sociology, University of Ghana.

4. Previous and future submissions

None

5. Institutional setting

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU), Faculty of Social Sciences (Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology) and VU Institute for the Study of Religion, Culture and Society (VISOR); Universiteit van Amsterdam (UvA), Amsterdam School of Social Science Research (ASSR); Meertens-institute, KNAW, Amsterdam.

6. Period of funding

5 years (4/2008-3/2013)

7. Composition of the research team

a) Principal applicant

Mw. Prof. Dr. Birgit Meyer (VU, Faculty of Social Sciences, Social and Cultural Anthropology) Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Vrije Universiteit, De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, + 31.20.5986710 (phone), + 31.20.5986722 (fax), e-mail: b.meyer@fsw.vu.nl

b) Co-applicants

Dr. Mattijs van de Port (UvA, ASSR, Department of Sociology and Anthropology), anthropology.
Address: Oudezijds Achterburgwal 185. 1012 DK Amsterdam, M.P.J.vandeport@uva.nl

Prof. Dr. Herman Roodenburg (Department of Dutch Ethnology, Meertens-institute), European ethnology, history.

Address: Joan Muyskenweg 25. 1096 CJ Amsterdam, herman.roodenburg@meertens.knaw.nl

Prof. Dr. David Chidester (Institute for the Comparative Study of Religion in Southern Africa University of Cape Town, South Africa) religious studies.

Address: Institute for Comparative Religion in Southern Africa (ICRSA), Department of Religious Studies, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa, Davidc@iafrica.com

Prof. Dr. Luis Nicolau Parés (Departamento de Antropologia, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, Brazil) anthropology.

Address: CEAO, Prç. Inocêncio Galvão, 42, Largo Dois de Julho - CEP 40025-010. Salvador - Bahia – Brasil, todogomi@yahoo.com.br

Prof. Dr. Kodjo Senah (Department of Sociology, University of Ghana) sociology.

Address: Department of Sociology, University of Ghana, Legon, Ghana; kamesenah@yahoo.co.uk

c) Researchers

Postdoc: Dr. Marleen de Witte (acceptance dissertation ms expected in December 2008), to be located at VU University Amsterdam

PhD: NN, supervisor Prof. Dr. Herman Roodenburg, takes part in Graduate School of the CCSS (FSW-VU)

PhD-student (South Africa): Dwame Jethro (MA); supervisors Prof Dr. Birgit Meyer & Prof Dr. David Chidester, takes part in Graduate School of the CCSS (FSW-VU)

PhD-student (Brazil): NN; supervisors Dr. Mattijs van de Port & Prof Dr. Luis Nicolau Pares; takes part in Graduate Program of ASSR (UvA)

d) Contribution of universities and institutes

This multidisciplinary program, combining cultural anthropology, religious studies, sociology, history and media studies, is based on a long-standing co-operation between the PA and co-applicants.

Institutionally, the program will be located at the VU (FSW-CCSS and the new VU Institute for the Study of Religion, Culture and Society [VISOR], of which the PA is a founding co-director), the ASSR (Cluster Religion and Identity, co-chaired by Prof. Dr. T. Blom Hansen and the PA), and the Meertens institute.

The three Dutch-based applicants are co-organizing a three-weekly seminar titled *Religion, Media and the Body* in the framework of which the issues suggested by the program are being discussed by a broad group of junior and senior scholars affiliated with the UvA, the VU, and the Meertens Institute. In addition, as part of its research accents as formulated in its research plan 2006-2010, the Meertens Institute will organize two international conferences, on both cultural heritage and on performance/embodiment perspectives.

The Dutch based applicants are also involved in national networks, that could already be mobilized for the preparatory workshop. If the program is granted, the following scholars will act as advisors: Dr. Marjo de Theije (anthropology, coordinator Paolo Freire Network, Board member CEDLA, VU), Dr. Hester Dibbits (history, identity and multiculturalism, Meertens-institute); Dr. Michel Doortmont (history, cultural heritage Ghana, RUG), Prof Dr. Gert Oostindie (Caribbean history, KITLV, UL); Dr. Marja Spierenburg (organization anthropology, heritage studies, SAVUSA network, VU); Dr. Hilje van der Horst (anthropology, Meertens-institute); Prof Dr. Alex van Stipriaan (history, memory of slavery, KITLV/KIT).

The three international departments, at which the international co-applicants are located, will each host one of the annual conferences that take place in 2009, 2010, and 2011.

8. Thematic classification

Investigating the coming about of new cultural canons in multicultural settings, the program is particularly relevant to the sub-foci canonization and citizenship. The attention paid to questions of aesthetics and mediations also implies a strong affinity with the focus on form and design, and intermediality.

9. Brief description of the proposed research

Cultural heritage is not given, but constantly in the *making*: a construction subject to dynamic processes of (re)inventing culture within particular social formations and bound to particular forms of mediation. And yet, the appeal of cultural heritage rests on its denial of being a fabrication, on its promise to provide an essential ground to social-cultural identities. Taking this paradoxical feature as a point of departure, our program evolves on four interrelated foci:

- (a) the multicultural arenas in which the state and ethnic and/or religious players frame, fix, and form cultural heritage in different media, yielding the performance of partly competing and partly overlapping canons of cultural ‘truth’,
- (b) the intersection of such canons with citizenship and alternative identities,
- (c) the processes through which the players, in a conflicting dynamics of power, deal with the fact that making a canon does not imply its acceptance as truthful, and thus seek to make such canons of cultural ‘truth’ appear as ‘authentic’ and ‘real’ by invoking particular aesthetics, and
- (d) the extent to which the addressees can at all be persuaded to endorse forms of cultural heritage as truthful, embodied resources for citizenship and identity in our rapidly changing world of cultural diversity where citizenship and identity – and the question of collectivity – have become increasingly problematic.

We have selected four multicultural, religiously plural societies, in which state-driven articulations of national cultural heritage are accompanied by alternative articulations of cultural identity. The ‘Africanizing’ of Bahian culture politics in Brazil, the ‘Sankofaism’ of the Ghanaian state, the integrative ‘Rainbow-nation’ in South Africa and Dutch multiculturalism all struggle, each in their own way, with the authentication of national cultural heritage as a vital basis for citizenship in a situation of increasing competition from alternative, religious or ethnic identities. As focus (a) shows, our program builds upon recent scholarly work in the study of cultural heritage that moves beyond state-centred approaches and critically investigates processes of framing heritage on the part of agents such as UNESCO, states and local agents (Hoek 1988; Niec 1998; Harrison & Hitchcock 2005). We also take as a point of departure approaches of citizenship as constituted in broader political-cultural processes of forming identities and social imaginaries (Bridges 2001; Taylor 2004; Volpp 2007), the theme of focus (b).

The distinctive and innovative feature of this program is the attention paid to authentication and aesthetics in the paradoxical process through which cultural fabrications are (to be) experienced as ‘real’ (foci c and d). In so doing, our program synthesizes debates about the politics of framing cultural heritage with debates about the limits of both cultural essentialism and cultural constructivism (Baumann 1999; Latour 2005). This synthesis is to account for the persuasive reality-effects of cultural constructions (de Certeau 1984; Lowenthal 1996). We argue that the success and/or demise of different canons of cultural truth, as they are articulated and performed by competing players, cannot be explained by ‘unmasking’ them as ever so many ‘invented traditions’ (Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983) or ‘staged authenticities’ (McCannell 1999), let alone by recurring to essentializing approaches. The question to be asked is how some canons come to be experienced as persuasive and binding while others fail to do so. How, in other words, can we ‘account for the intersection of human subjectivity with social collectivity’ (Chidester 2005: 72) in arenas in which social collectivity itself is in a process of erosion and reconstruction?

In answering this question, we deem a focus on what we call the *politics of authentication* (focus c) and the *aesthetics of persuasion* (focus d) of crucial importance. In addition to its international comparative scope, the innovative dimension of this program thus lies in the fact that it calls attention to the question how constructions, even though admittedly ‘in the making’, are fashioned in such a way that they can be *experienced* as persuasively ‘authentic’ and ‘real’, that is, how mediated cultural forms operate through processes of authentication.

The notion *politics of authentication* highlights that authenticity is not an essence to be discovered, but a quality produced in cultural forms (Bendix 1997; Bruner 1994; Chidester 2005; Handler 1996, 2001; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Van de Port 2004; Taylor 1991). This is an eminently political process. In the societies studied, cultural heritage is constantly re-mediated and commoditized by competing players. The fact that an awareness of its constructed nature is ever more difficult to avoid (Bolter & Grusin 1991; Mazzarella 2004), yielding characterizations such as ‘folklorization’ or ‘banalization’, calls forth even more frantic attempts to produce persuasive heritage forms. Indeed, notions of authenticity have permeated both scholarly and vernacular discussions on cultural heritage. The point is to acknowledge the frequent appeal made to authenticity (be it by invoking this very term, or by other aesthetic strategies through which cultural heritage is framed as ‘true’ and beyond questioning), and yet to resist an essentialist understanding of authenticity as a cultural given. Therefore, the questions guiding our investigations (under focus c) are: how are forms of cultural heritage mediated, and how are these mediations designed and styled as authentic? How do relations of power impinge on the ability to assume a position of authority from which cultural heritage can be authenticated effectively? Who are the authoritative voices – the *authenticators* – in these processes and who are the objects of authentication (*authenticees*)? Which conflicts arise over competing authorizations and how do these conflicts relate to the politics of citizenship and identity in the four settings?

While we thus consider a constructivist approach indispensable to grasp how canons of cultural truth and sacrosanct performances come into being, we argue that – in order to get at the strong sense of identity which forms of cultural heritage seek *and* oftentimes manage to invoke – our analysis should not be confined to mediation practices alone. It needs to investigate how (re)-mediations of cultural heritage appeal to the body, the senses, and the lived experiences of the groups in question by offering ‘sensational forms’ (Meyer 2006a) that appeal. It is here that we deem the notion ‘*aesthetics of persuasion*’ (Meyer fc) important. Our understanding of aesthetics goes beyond a narrow understanding in terms of arts and the beautiful, but refers to the Aristotelian notion of aisthesis, that is, people’s sensorial, embodied relation to the world (Csordas 1994; Hirschkind 2006; Pinney 2004; Verrips 2006). Theories about the transmission and appropriation of culture pinpoint the importance of viewing persons as sentient beings (Brenneis 1987; Howes 2005). We propose that the successful authentication of cultural heritage depends on its capacity to resonate with a particular habitus (Bourdieu 1977; Connerton 1989; Roodenburg 2004a,b). It is thus that a form of cultural heritage ceases to be merely an object at display out there in the world, but becomes part of a lived experience that conveys – like a ‘second nature’ – a strong notion of authenticity (Meyer 2006a; Van de Port 2004). As this process of embodiment is far from taken-for-granted, but requires specific modes of address, and specific forms and designs that are appreciated as persuasive and binding, in our exploration of focus (d), the following questions stand central: which divergent aesthetic modes of address are articulated by key players in the four settings? What makes that a particular aesthetics of persuasion that is associated with specific forms of cultural heritage becomes effective, or not? In how far does the success of modes of address depend on the incorporation of sensorial and bodily dispositions of the addressees? What on the contrary contributes to experiencing cultural heritage forms as a cultural ‘style’, mere ‘folklore’, or even banal?

In order to appreciate cultural particularities and yet to yield generalisable analyses, one must use a comparative perspective. The four selected settings espouse a common problematic that evolves around the state’s striving to both further cultural heritage *and* convey to its citizens the ‘essence’ of the nation in a culturally diverse context that is characterized by (a) the presence of alternative religious and ethnic identities, (b) the commoditization and folklorisation of culture, (c) the (mass) mediatisation of cultural forms, and (d) the mobilization of notions of Blackness and Africanness. In these societies, attempts to make cultural heritage appear ‘real’ are challenged in different ways, ranging from an inflation of cultural heritage through overinvestment (Bahia) to criticisms from a Pentecostal position (Ghana), from the difficulty to encompass cultural diversity without reiterating apartheid identity politics or turning heritage into a sheer tourist

attraction (South-Africa) to the problem how to articulate a cultural heritage that encompasses not only autochthons but also black immigrants from former colonies (Netherlands).

These four settings have been selected so as to enable us to distinguish, and compare, different modalities of dealing with cultural heritage in multicultural settings. The red thread connecting all the four cases is the emphasis placed on Blackness or Africanness in articulating cultural heritage; this connection obviously is due to historical relations between Africa, Europe and the New World ('Black Atlantic'), and the circulation of people and ideas between Africa, Brazil and the Netherlands in our age of globalization. While the state of Bahia (Brazil) and Ghana have both long acknowledged and sought to encompass citizens' multi-ethnic (and multi-religious) affiliations, in South-Africa and the Netherlands the awareness of the necessity and difficulty to synthesize a new cultural diversity into a new national identity is fairly recent. At the same time, intriguing differences exist between Bahia and Ghana, and between South-Africa and the Netherlands.

In Bahia, the state's policy to embrace the Afro-Brazilian possession cult Candomblé as central to the federal state's cultural heritage meets with major consent by politicians and a great deal of the population (van de Port 2005). By contrast, in Ghana the state policy of 'Sankofaism', that postulates the importance of the various local cultural and religious traditions for national heritage and identity, is heavily contested by the Pentecostal-Charismatic movement, that has become a major voice in the public sphere and questions the authority of the state in framing national cultural heritage (Meyer 2004). In these two settings, the public's appreciation of the state's valuation of cultural heritage differs remarkably, while in both cases the re-mediation of these heritage forms and their marketing for purposes of tourism also entails the spectre of folklorization and banalization.

Also regarding South-Africa and the Netherlands, intriguing differences exist. While in post-apartheid South-Africa the state seeks to create new spaces for cultural diversity, in the post-pillarized Netherlands there is a manifest striving for a binding canon, from which distinct groups – such as Caribbean-Dutch people that stand central in this research – feel potentially excluded. In all these settings, we find attempts on the part of the state and alternative players to articulate cultural heritage forms and seek to persuade addressees, albeit with varying success, of the reality and truthfulness of cultural heritage constructions, especially in relation to citizenship.

The following model shows overall similarities and differences between the four cases:

		<i>State's appreciation of cultural diversity as relevant to encompassing national identity</i>	
		<i>Longstanding</i>	<i>Recent</i>
<i>Dominant attitudes towards cultural diversity in public arena</i>	<i>Consent</i>	Brazil	South-Africa
	<i>Contestation</i>	Ghana	Netherlands

Working on the basis of the four foci, it is the aim of our program to

- (1) offer in-depth studies of each of the four settings,
- (2) develop a comparative framework that allows to (a) make visible similarities and differences between the settings and (b) develop a generalizable model that takes into account varieties on the level of state policies and appreciations of cultural diversity in the public arena,
- (3) theorize cultural heritage dynamics in multicultural arenas by highlighting the importance of politics of authentication and aesthetics of persuasion, and
- (4) present our findings to policy makers and social partners in the four settings (see list of social partners, point 12)

While the four settings are explored by 3 Phd students and 1 postdoc, the international team will meet at least once a year in the respective settings. Since this program is based on an already existing international, interdisciplinary cooperation, we envision an ongoing reflection and exchange of views about the research progress, that will yield collective publications of high quality.

Subprojects:

Subproject 1: The cultural politics of *tombamento* and Afro-Brazilian religion

The focus will be on the *tombamento* (register or inventory) of temples of Candomblé: a state policy that declares certain temples of this Afro-Brazilian religion to be part of the national (regional or municipal) cultural heritage. *Tombamento* politics not only reframe a deeply contested ‘living’ religious practice (associated with such controversial practices as animal sacrifice, spirit possession and witchcraft) as the prestigious cultural heritage of the Bahian state; they also imply the introduction of a new aesthetics – and new bodily and sensorial regimes – through which cult adepts must articulate the newly acquired prestige in the public sphere. The aim of this research is to unearth the extent to which the new regimes of embodiment that come with *tombamento* politics affect a ‘living’ religious practice, transforming both the ideational and experiential content of the cult.

During the 20th century, the Brazilian national project shifted from the endorsement of an ideal of racial and cultural blending in the 1930s, to the embracing of a multicultural model from the 1970s onwards. In both models there has been a recognition of Brazil’s African legacy and, albeit to a different degree, a valorisation of black cultural forms. The fact that the institutionalisation of a discourse on preservation, maintenance and memory of black culture has been increasingly promoted from within the state’s apparatus (particularly through the Palmares Cultural Foundation, a department of the Ministry of Culture) signals the success of the Black Movement’s strategy of ‘capturing the state’ (Matory 2005; Santos 2005; Parés 2006).

In the last decade, the National Historical and Artistic Heritage Institute (IPHAN) has endorsed the *tombamento* of a variety of black cultural forms, both as material and intangible heritage, like the *samba de roda* (lately recognised by UNESCO), the *acarajé* (West African fried bean cake) and last but not least Candomblé temples, emblems of a religious institution historically discriminated against. This federal policy was shortly afterwards replicated by the state of Bahia’s own Cultural and Artistic Heritage Institute (IPAC) and similar initiatives have been undertaken at the municipal level.

Although only a few temples are *tombado*, the symbolic rhetoric of *tombamento* evokes a sense of historical reparation and restitution of public dignity to the black subaltern population which is not deprived of emotional and political potential. For those who compete for the *tombamento* it is also perceived as a way to achieve social and religious prestige and some material advantage. Overlapping with the cultural politics of *tombamento*, Candomblé has continued to be explicitly marketed as the ultimate authentic site for tourists (lately ‘roots’ tourism), and its signs of African heritage are absorbed and ‘re-mediated’ for consumerism purposes. Hence the state’s tutelage of Candomblé intersects with development and market dynamics, engaging government agencies and increasingly NGOs and other civil society organizations.

The fact that, in the present day situation, Candomblé is key to the production of all sorts of identities, from regional *baianidade* to ethnic *negritude*, implies that it should speak to the sense and sensibilities of publics not born into its life world. Its aesthetics of persuasion must, on the one hand, manage its association with controversial and potentially deterring practices as animal sacrifice and spirit possession; on the other hand, it must avoid the alienation that might follow an all out folklorisation of the cult (Van de Port 2005).

The fact that many of the people involved in *tombamento* politics have multiple affiliations and transits, both as Candomblé insiders and external actors (black activists, politicians, academics, artists etc. who may be initiated or not) makes the issue how inevitable transformations due to heritage dynamics are authenticated all the more relevant.

In this research, we will ask what criteria are used by state agencies to select particular temples and how the current *tombamento* legislation applies to the specificities of a religious practice in continuous transformation. How do the *tombamento* politics reframe an African legacy already in place, reifying cultural hegemonies and hierarchies of prestige, and reinforcing notions of ritual purity, tradition and Africaness? How, from the state’s perspective, are the *tombamento* politics linked to development and the roots tourism market? How do the *tombamento* processes transform the inner politics and ritual dynamics of the selected

religious congregations and affect the subjectivities of their members? And how does the state's positive authentication of Candomblé modify its public image and how is this perceived by concurrent religious institutions like Christian churches?

Subproject 2: Tracing *Sankofa*. The aesthetics of Africanness in Ghana

This project analyses the historical and contemporary re-encodings of 'Sankofaism', the heritage model through which the Ghanaian post-colonial state sought to build the newborn nation. In the multi-ethnic and multi-religious setting of Ghana this project is inherently problematic.

Since independence Ghanaian governments have sought to revive and propagate Ghana's diverse cultural heritage and recognise cultural diversity within a national identity that transcends ethnic boundaries. This nationalizing project took shape around the Akan symbol of *Sankofa*, a bird looking back and walking forward, expressing the need for cultural heritage in moving ahead as a people. Under the ideology of 'Sankofaism', state cultural policies tried to facilitate the formation of a national cultural heritage, and people's identification with it through school curricula and books (Coe 2006), mass media (De Witte 2004, 2005; Meyer 1999), support of the chieftaincy system and cultural festivals (Schramm 2004a,b), preservation of heritage sites, and adoption of national cultural symbols.

From the onset of its implementation, 'Sankofaism' had to develop an aesthetics of persuasion able to overcome the evidently 'invented' nature of an assemblage of cultural forms that were selected, polished and framed to serve the project of nation building. The transformation of the hitherto state-controlled public sphere into a liberalised and commercialised arena in the 1990s put the credibility of *Sankofa* under even more pressure as its premises became openly contested by non-Akan ethnic groups (fearing the 'Akanisation' of Ghana), religious, especially Pentecostal communities (rejecting traditional culture on spiritual grounds) and republicans (arguing that chieftaincy has no place in a modern nation state). The fact that, pressures notwithstanding, *Sankofa*'s forms continue to attract a wide range of groups and actors, who appropriate and redesign them for various ideological, cultural, religious, or commercial purposes, calls for an investigation of the re-authentication of this 'invented tradition' in ever changing settings.

Tracing *Sankofa* leads us into three intersecting domains of the state, religion, and popular culture, each showing different tendencies with regard to the framing of heritage. As far as the state is concerned, the mounting public influence of Pentecostalism has weakened 'Sankofaism' as a national identity project (Meyer 2004). The state has shifted focus to marketing *Sankofa* in the context of black heritage tourism (Schramm 2004a) and diasporic investment in Ghana, thus moving, at least partially, from national identity politics to transnational economics. This shift has effects on the design of *Sankofa* and its authentication in the face of criticisms of 'folklorization'.

In the field of religion, Pentecostalist moral practices of 'breaking with the past' directly oppose *Sankofa* ideology of retrieving from the past. Highly suspicious of the demonic power implied in state cultural policies, Pentecostal-charismatic churches promote alternative identifications and forms of belonging grounded in being born-again and aim at Christianising the nation. Neo-traditional religions, on the other hand, advocate a radicalisation of *Sankofa*. Since 1982 the neo-traditional Afrikania Mission promotes African Traditional Religion as 'the *Sankofa* Faith,' implying a radical rejection of Christianity and a claim to the 'real power' of tradition. Although emerging from the same intellectual and political tradition as (earlier) state 'Sankofaism', the movement now rejects it as superficial and hypocritical. Critical also of the folklorization of heritage in tourism, Afrikania at the same time taps from this economic resource.

In popular culture we witness a 'stylization' of *Sankofa*: while cultural heritage and Africanness have long been valued in the elite art scene, there is a recent trend and a new aesthetics of Africanness among young urbanites (names, fashion, haircut) and in popular culture at large (music, drama, visual arts, video). Cultural heritage becomes an urban style, partly mediated through global media and globalised imaginations of Africanness, but it is as such that it dovetails into people's everyday experiences and creates an embodied sense of belonging and authenticity.

This project will examine these tendencies of transnationalization (by the state), demonization (by Pentecostalism), radicalization (by neo-traditional religion), and stylization of 'Sankofaism' (in popular culture), their intersections and their contradictions by asking questions such as: How is *Sankofa* designed and redesigned, signified and resignified in different projects, by different cultural producers, through different media, and for different audiences? How do different versions of *Sankofa* intersect, or contradict each other? How are particular versions of *Sankofa* authenticated? Which designs are persuasive, to whom and in what

context? What makes them persuasive? Which ones are not and why? How do different versions of *Sankofa* relate to the body, the senses, and the embodiment of spirits?

Subproject 3: Unity in diversity: nationalizing heritage in South Africa

The South African research will focus on two national heritage initiatives, the state-driven *Freedom Park*, and the market-driven *Sunday Times Heritage Project*. As projects-in-the-making both projects take us into the realm of the ‘heritage industry’ and into the heart of contemporary heritage debates.

‘Heritage’ has served as the overarching term for the initiatives of the post-apartheid state to renegotiate relations with the past transactions (Coombes 2003; Rassool 2006; Sheperd 2006). It has been the subject of extensive research and has been managed by government institutions, including the Department of Arts and Culture, the National Monuments Council, and the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). As elsewhere, heritage is mobilized by tourism, advertising, and other entrepreneurial ventures. In ongoing deliberations about national policy, heritage is pointed out as ‘the country’s strategic resource for national identity, nation building, with a high potential for economic development.’

Freedom Park is dedicated to all who have died in the struggle for freedom and humanity. Dramatically centralized, with a time depth of mythic proportions going back 3.6 billion years and a spatial extension embracing South Africa, Africa, as well as the African diaspora, it is global in scope. Explicitly designed as a sacred centre, Freedom Park is intended to exercise a centripetal force, drawing people into its central shrine, *Isivivane*, while extending a centrifugal force out into the world through multi-faith rituals of healing, cleansing, and reconciliation. The project is not uncontested: it has been criticized for creating an artificial uniformity and for burying difference, disagreement, and debate under prescribed narratives and imageries. It has also been criticized for focusing on extraordinary events of heroism, sacrifice, and loss. Extraordinary sites, such as national memorials, might inspire, but they also can overshadow or even erase the meaning of everyday, ordinary places.

By contrast, the forty memorial sites selected by *The Sunday Times* are decentralized and dispersed, spread out throughout the country, but with a time depth that only goes back to the founding of the newspaper in 1906. Although the project commemorates national heritage, the sites include sports, music, the arts, and a wider range of cultural resources than are being drawn into *Freedom Park*’s focus on sacrificial death. While *Freedom Park* seeks to enshrine a single narrative of the struggle for humanity and freedom, the *Sunday Times Heritage Project* commemorates multiple narratives, embedded in local histories, which could be variously interpreted by the artists commissioned to create the memorials for each site.

Both projects recast historical narratives about the nation, and are committed to advancing a public pedagogy aligned with the post-apartheid national motto ‘Unity in Diversity’ and draw on powerful images of non-racial rainbowism or African renaissance. A comparative analysis of *Freedom Park* and the *Sunday Times Heritage Project* promises both theoretical and practical insights into strategies of state-driven and market-driven heritage initiatives.

Moreover, what makes these heritage sites particularly relevant for this project is the fact that both are explicitly conceptualized as ‘sensational forms’ which seek to cast their message about a new South Africa in tangible, interactive, and multisensory form. Their public pedagogy is not so much geared towards conveying information as towards shaping sentiments and sensibilities. The project will also draw on theory and method in the history of religions for analyzing productions of the sacred as that which is ‘set apart’ (Durkheim), but set apart at the centre of social cohesion, exchanges, and contestations (Chidester 2005: 119-20). Focusing on the particular aesthetics of persuasion employed in Freedom Park and the Sunday Times Heritage Project, we will ask: how do heritage sites deal with the tensions between the potentially contradictory national imagery evoked by ‘rainbow nation’ and ‘African Renaissance’? How do they recast historical narratives, redesign spatial relations, and establish links between extraordinary events and ordinary life in South Africa? What are the experiences they seek to provoke? What are the sensorial regimes on which these particular aesthetics are grounded? How should their success and failure in addressing the nation-as-a-whole be assessed? What is ‘the nation’ to become when its essence is articulated in new experiential formats of mediation?

The fact that the framing of cultural heritage in terms of *experience* is part of a world wide trend (in fact, the design company that was awarded the contract for creating exhibitions in the World Trade Center Memorial in New York City invoked its experience in working on South Africa’s Freedom Park as a transferable model for creating spaces of social healing) justifies the expectation that the South African

research will advance a more general understanding of the dynamics of nation building, global exchanges, and embodied engagement with cultural heritage.

Subproject 4: The trauma of slavery: the aesthetics of blackness in the Netherlands

The project will analyse how, in the 1990s, ‘carrier groups’ acting on behalf of Caribbean (Surinamese and Antillean) immigrants in the Netherlands began to address debates on cultural heritage from a specific Caribbean angle, striving to have the ‘traumatic’ history of slavery recognized as part of the country’s national and colonial heritage. Within the framework of this project, the Dutch-Caribbean case is of particular relevance to see how a new reading of Dutch history becomes entangled with notions of slavery as ‘cultural trauma’ (Eyerman 2001), sometimes even of a ‘black Holocaust’. The research seeks to show how these particular articulations of cultural heritage are authenticated by the emotions and sentiments evoked in an aesthetics of persuasion that highlights suffering, thus inviting the Caribbean Dutch (numbering a modest two percent of the Dutch population) to signify and explain happenings in their everyday lives in terms of the trauma’s suffered under slavery.

The debate about the trauma of slavery takes place in a society where issues of national identity and heritage are deeply contested. Having adopted in the late twentieth century a policy of ‘difference multiculturalism’ (Turner 1993), of ‘integration while retaining one’s identity’ (in many ways a continuation of the former politics of pillarization), the Dutch government used to situate issues of cultural or ethnic identity in the immigrant communities, not in the dominant group of autochthons. Tellingly, the former role of the Dutch state in slavery and the slave trade was not an issue of debate (both among scholars and the public at large) until the 1990s. Things only changed when the state started looking for a new, more inclusive notion of national identity, aiming to reconcile the immigrant groups’ claims of heritage and reparation for colonial wrongdoings suffered with a new, more open notion of national heritage.

Today, we find a Dutch state that is willing to testify its remorse but not its responsibility, thus seeking to accommodate and socially include the Caribbean Dutch without having to meet their claims for financial reparation (Oostindie 2005). The government actively supports research (historians have produced an impressive number of studies on Dutch slavery and the transatlantic slave trade) and the erection of monuments commemorating this dark side of Dutch national history. In 2002, on July 1 (Emancipation Day), a national slavery memorial, the *Nationaal Monument Slavernijverleden*, was unveiled in Amsterdam, in the presence of the Dutch queen, the Dutch prime minister and the ambassador of Ghana. A year later, facing the memorial, the NiNsee was established, a national expertise centre on the history and heritage of Dutch slavery. In 2005, another monument was unveiled, in Middelburg, from which town much of the slave trade was coordinated. Finally, in 2006, in the Amsterdam borough of the Bijlmermeer, harbouring many Caribbean and Ghanaian immigrants and their offspring, a monument was raised to commemorate the Surinam born Anton de Kom (1898-1945), a victim of the Nazi regime and one of the first outspoken critics of Dutch slavery. Already earlier, the fortress of Elmina in Ghana was restored with funding from the Dutch government, USAID and UNESCO, transforming this former slave castle not only into a *lieu de memoire* for the Dutch slave trade but also, like Brazilian Bahia, into a folklorized, trans-atlantic heritage site, favoured by the black consciousness tour operators capitalizing on the ‘black diaspora’ (Kardux 2003; cf. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998). With their history taken up by historians, the various monuments erected and the expressions of remorse by the Dutch state, the Caribbean Dutch seem to have succeeded in having their past finally recognized as a part of Dutch national history and, more generally, as a part of the African diaspora. Indeed, one of the central questions to be answered in the project regards the ‘incontestables’ invoked by the carrier groups: the appeal to a shared physical appearance, a shared African ancestry and a shared ‘cultural trauma’ of slavery. What was the role of these incontestables in providing an aesthetics of persuasion grafted onto generational memory and victimhood, and how are they remediated in popular music and theatre, Anansi stories and art, as well as the practices of the everyday? How, finally, did such new articulations tap into Afro-American black culture with its transnational and strongly mediatized notions, both of blackness and black suffering?

Methods in subprojects 1-4

Focusing on concrete heritage discourses and heritage sites, all researches will be predominantly qualitative and based on anthropological methods of participant observation, with semi-structured and open interviews

and informal conversations (with producers, consumers, and critics of cultural heritage). As all projects have a historical dimension, archival work on earlier heritage politics may be necessary (where the existing literature does not yield satisfactory data). All projects will engage in (audio)visual and discourse analysis (of heritage sites, media representations, public debates, opening rituals and inaugurations, and other cultural performances relevant to the particular cases).

Addressing the 'experiential side' of heritage is a methodological challenge, but can build forth on recent debates about the anthropology of the body and the senses that have stressed the importance of prolonged fieldwork: 'immersion' in the everyday of heritage producers and consumers is crucial, not only because researchers will thus have access to the ongoing debates (in their various levels of 'officiality') and discussions of heritage; but will also gradually become 'fine-tuned' to the tacit knowledge underlying the appreciation of certain forms of cultural heritage. This will allow them to analyse and discuss the relation between the preference for certain 'sensational forms' and the broader make-up of the cultural sensorium.

- Baumann, G 1999 *The Multicultural Riddle. Rethinking National, Ethnic and Religious Identities*. London: Routledge.
- Bendix, R 1997 *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bolter, J D & R Grusin 1999 *Remediation. Understanding New Media* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bourdieu, P 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Brenneis, D 1987 Performing Passions: Aesthetics and Politics in an Occasionally Egalitarian Community. *American Ethnologist* 14: 236-250.
- Bridges, T 2001 *The Culture of Citizenship: Inventing Postmodern Civic Culture*. Albany: State University of NYP.
- Bruner, E 1994 Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction: A Critique of Postmodernism. *American Anthropologist* 96(2):397-415.
- Certeau, M de 1984 *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chidester, D 2005a *Authentic Fakes. Religion and American Popular Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coe, C 2006 *Dilemmas of Culture in African Schools. Youth, Nationalism, and the Transformation of Knowledge*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Coombes, A E 2003. *History After Apartheid: Visual Culture and Public Memory in a Democratic South Africa*. Durham: Duke UP.
- Connerton, P 1989 *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Csordas, T J 1994 *Embodiment and Experience. The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- De Witte, M 2004 Afrikaania's Dilemma. Reframing African Authenticity in a Christian Public sphere. *Etnofoor* 17 (1,2): 133-156.
- 2005 The Spectacular and the Spirits: Charismatics and Neo-Traditionalists on Ghanaian Television. *Material Religion* 1 (3): 314-333.
- Eyerman, R 2001 *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Handler, R 1996 After Authenticity at an American Heritage Site. *American Anthropologist* 98: 568-78.
- 2001 Anthropology of Authenticity. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*., 963-67.
- Harrison, D & M Hitchcock (eds.), 2005 *The Politics of World Heritage. Negotiating Tourism and Conservation*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Hirschkind, Ch 2006 *The Ethical Soundscape. Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Hobsbawm, E & T Ranger 1983 (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hoek, A W v.d. 1988 *Cultural Diversity and the Ideology of Development. UNESCO's Role in the International Debate on the Cultural Dimension of Development* Leiden: Lidesco.
- Howes, D 2005 *Empire of the Senses. The Sensual Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg.
- Kardux, J C 2004 Monuments of the Black Atlantic: Slavery Memorials in the United States and the Netherlands. In: H. Raphael-Hernandez (ed.), *Blackening Europe: The African American Presence*. New York: Routledge, 87-105.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1993, *Destination Culture. Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Latour, B 2005 *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Lowenthal, D 1996. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cambridge: C.U.P.).
- Matory, L 2005 *Black Atlantic Religion. Tradition, Transnationalism and Matriarchy in the Afro-Brazilian Candomblé*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Mazzarella, W 2004 Culture, Globalization, Mediation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33:345-367.
- McCannell, D 1999 Staged Authenticity. In: *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Meyer, B 1999 Popular Ghanaian Cinema and 'African Heritage'. *Africa Today* 46 (2): 93-114.
- 2005 Mediating Tradition: Pentecostal Pastors, African Priests, and Chiefs in Ghanaian Popular Films. In: T Falola (ed.), *Christianity and Social Change in Africa. Essays in Honor of J.D.Y. Peel*. Durham Carolina Academic Press, 275-306.
- 2006a *Religious Sensations. Why Media, Aesthetics and Power Matter in the Study of Contemporary Religion*, Inaugural Lecture VU.
- 2006b *Religious Revelation, Secrecy and the Limits of Visual Representation. Anthropological Theory* 6 (3): 431-453.
- fc Modern Mass Media, Religion, and the Dynamics of Distraction and Concentration. In B. Meyer (ed.), *Religion, Media and the Question of Community*. New York: Palgrave.
- Niec, H ed 1998 *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*, Paris: Institute of Art and Law, Unesco Publishing.
- Oostindie, G 2005 The Slippery Paths of Commemoration and Heritage Tourism: The Netherlands, Ghana, and the Rediscovery of Atlantic Slavery. *New West Indian Guide* 79 (1/2): 55-77.
- Parés, L N 2006 *A Formação do Candomblé. História e ritual da nação jeje na Bahia*. Campinas: Editora Unicamp.
- Pinney, Ch 2004 *'Photos of the Gods.' The Printed Image and Political Struggle in India*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Port, Mv d 2004 Registers of Incontestability. The Quest for Authenticity in Academia and Beyond. *Etnofoor* 17 (1,2): 7-23.
- 2005a Candomblé in Pink, Green and Black. Re-scripting the Afro-Brazilian Religious Heritage in the Public sphere of Salvador, Bahia. *Social Anthropology* 13 (1):1-24.
- Rassool, C 2006 Community Museums, Memory Politics and Social Transformation: Histories, Possibilities and Limits. In Karp, I et al., (eds.), *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*. Durham, NC: Duke UP. 286-321.
- Roodenburg, H 2004a *The Eloquence of the Body: Studies on Gesture in the Dutch Republic* Zwolle: Waanders.
- 2004b Pierre Bourdieu: Issues of Embodiment and Authenticity. *Etnofoor* 17 (1/2): 215-226.
- Santos, J Teles dos 2005 *O Poder da Cultura e a Cultura no Poder. A Disputa Simbólica da Herança Cultural Negra no Brasil*. Salvador: Edufba.
- Schramm, K 2004a *Struggling over the Past. The Politics of Heritage and Homecoming on Ghana*. Free University Berlin: Diss.
- 2004b Senses of Authenticity. Chieftaincy and the Politics of Heritage in Ghana. *Etnofoor* 17 (1/2): 156-177.
- Shepherd, N 2006 Roots and Wings: Heritage Studies in the Humanities. In A. Hofmaenner and T. Marcus, (eds.), *Shifting Boundaries of Knowledge: A View of Social Sciences, Law, and Humanities in South Africa*. Durban: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press. 125-40.
- Taylor, Ch 1991 *Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
2004. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke UP.
- Turner, T 1993. Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology that Multiculturalists should be mindful of it? *Cultural Anthropology* 8 (4): 411-429.
- Verrips, J 2006 Aisthesis and An-aesthesia. *Ethnologia Europea* 35 (1/2): 27-33.
- Volpp, L 2007 The Culture of Citizenship. *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 8(2): 570-602.

10. Word Count

8: 45

9

main text: 1999 (max 2000)

subproposal 1: 735

subproposal 2: 745

subproposal 3: 775

subproposal 4: 721

shared methodology: 207

Total: 3192 (max 3200)

11. Workshop

The workshop with social partners was held on 28 September 2007 at the *Amsterdam School for Social Science Research*. After an introduction explaining the general aim and outline of the project, issues regarding heritage politics and citizenship in the diverse research settings were presented by Luis Nicolau Parés, Kodjo Senah and David Chidester. Comments and feed-back came from representatives of major players in the field of cultural heritage: Michel Doortmont (history of Africa, consultant UNESCO, RUG); Paul Faber (curator Africa, Royal Tropical Museum, Amsterdam); Renate van de Weijer (Nederlands Openluchtmuseum, Arnhem); Jeroen-Louis Martens (senior policy officer, DCO, mutual cultural heritage); Hester Dibbits and Hilje van der Horst (P.J. Meertens-institute); Valika Smeulders (NWO-project *Globalization and Cultural Heritage*); Francio Guadeloupe (Cultural heritage project *The Atlantic World and the Dutch*); and a number of interested academics.

There was overall enthusiasm about the project and a general agreement that the questions asked and issues addressed resonate with current developments in the field, and push debates about heritage further by not remaining confined to processes of framing. The emphasis on the aesthetic/sensorial dimension of cultural heritage was found to be innovative. All Dutch presenters recognised the increasingly contested nature of cultural heritage due to the changing make-up of Dutch society. Our foreign guests confirmed that in their respective countries too, notions as to what constitutes cultural heritage do not go unchallenged. The contested nature of cultural heritage takes the question of authentication beyond theory, and makes it immediately relevant for the implementation of cultural policies and exhibition practices. Questions that were brought to the fore by our social partners were: how to come up with a ‘public pedagogy’ that really speaks to the people addressed? How to avoid a ‘top-down’ implementation of canonised culture? How to create the consent necessary for the maintenance of cultural heritage? How to involve audiences in such a way that cultural heritage becomes a ‘living thing’ to be nurtured and cared for? There was an overall agreement that such policies need to be informed by – and based on – sound scientific explanations as to why some cultural forms capture the popular imagination, whereas others fail to do so. A study of the aesthetics of persuasion, with a keen eye for the experiential underpinnings through which cultural heritage becomes ‘animated’, was deemed a promising alley to come to such knowledge.

The comparative approach to heritage dynamics was appreciated by all. Gaining knowledge as to how different settings produce different understandings of what constitutes cultural heritage is crucial in a globalizing world where multivocality characterises understandings of past, present and future. Policies regarding so called ‘shared heritage’ or ‘mutual heritage’ cannot do without an understanding of the ways in which local heritage dynamics function. Moreover, several speakers voiced their expectation that the comparative character of the research might engender new clues as to how to involve new groups in heritage politics.

It has been agreed that during the course of the project, two public seminars will be organised to present and discuss our findings here in the Netherlands, so as to continue what already turned out to be a stimulating discussion.

Next to this public session, our research team convened on 29 and 30 September. Through an intense discussion of the general proposal and the four sub-projects we laid the basis for the final version of our program. We agreed that, next to involving junior researchers in the research, we will also be in touch via e-mail and meet every year in one of the respective settings.

12. International perspective

The program is inspired by four issues that are central in current international debates: (1) the question of identity politics and multiculturalism in the context of globalization; (2) the question of the framing of cultural heritage in political arenas which next to nation-states also host competing players; (3) the debate about people's quest for authenticity and truth in a (post)modern world where long-standing securities are eroding; and (4) theoretical discussions about the relevance of the body, senses, and materiality in transcending the limits of a narrow constructivism. The applicants all work in international settings, in which these questions are being discussed. With this program, it is our ambition to join forces, and synthesize these debates.

The PA Birgit Meyer gained expertise in analysing the mediation and authentication of cultural forms in the context of her NWO/MAG-sponsored PIONIER research programme *Modern Mass Media, Religion and the Imagination of Communities in Non-Western Postcolonial Societies. Different Postcolonial Trajectories in West-Africa, East Asia, Brazil and the Caribbean* (2000-2006) (www.pscw.uva.nl/media-religion). These activities yielded a multidisciplinary (inter)national network that is relevant to the research proposed, and that involves scholars working in the fields of media, religion and visual culture (Patricia Birman, Faye Ginsburg, David Morgan, Stewart Hoover, Brian Larkin, Christopher Pinney, S. Brent Plate, Jeremy Stolow, Patricia Spyer, Hent de Vries); questions of identity and the politics of belonging (Arjun Appadurai, Jean-François Bayart, Jean and John Comaroff, Peter Geschiere, Achille Mbembe, Peter van der Veer), and questions concerning the body and the senses (Talal Asad, Elizabeth Castelli, David Chidester, Charles Hirschkind, Michael Lambek, Angela Zito).

Mattijs van de Port has addressed the authentication of a re-awakened Serbian nationalism in his research in the former Yugoslavia (*Gypsies, Wars & Other Instances of the Wild*, 1998, Amsterdam University Press); and explored the 'authenticating potential' of violence in the Netherlands (*Geliquideerd*, 2000, Meulenhoff). He has been teaching on the subject of authenticity at the University of Amsterdam. Since 2000, he has been studying authentication processes in the mediation of Bahian Candomblé within the framework of Birgit Meyer's program *Modern Mass Media, Religion and the Imagination of Communities in Non-Western Postcolonial Societies*. His network (beyond the contacts acquired in Meyer's program, see above, and the *Amsterdam School for Social Science Research*) includes a great number of Brazilian scholars involved in the study of Black Brazil, more in particular candomblé (Jocélio Teles dos Santos, Livio Sansone, Patricia Birman, Vagner Gonçalves da Silva, Roger Sanci-Roca, Luis Nicolau Pares and others). Due to his involvement with the organisation of annual summer schools with the WISER institute of the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, regular contacts exist with Deborah Posel, Achille Mbembe, Sarah Nuttall, Graeme Reid and others.

Herman Roodenburg gained expertise in analyzing European issues of cultural heritage, identity and authenticity in co-organizing the Sixth Congress of the *Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore* (SIEF), held in Amsterdam, 20-25 April 1998. With Regina Bendix he edited the eleven keynote addresses (by amongst others Konrad Köstlin, Judith Okely, Gisela Welz, Bendix, Anthony D. Smith, Willem Frijhoff, Roodenburg, Tamás Hofer and Thomas Hylland Eriksen). As teamleader in the ESF-project *Cultural Exchange in Europe 1400-1700* (1998-2003) he organized various international workshops on issues of Bourdieuan habitus, bodily memory, performativity and material culture (papers by amongst others Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett and Daniel Miller). The results have been published by Cambridge UP. Both networks constitute a relevant source and background for the proposed program.

The program builds upon already existing, intellectually stimulating international networks. With our partner in Brazil, we have been involved, via the ASSR, in a network that has been organizing annual

summer schools and other events. The proposed program is part of this co-operation. In addition, Dr. Mattijs van de Port is engaged in a long term research in Salvador. With our partner in Ghana, we have also been involved in a long-standing co-operation with Prof. Senah (PhD via an earlier WOTRO grant, defended in Amsterdam). The PA's and postdoc's earlier work is focusing religion, heritage and identity in Ghana. With our partner in South Africa, we have been involved in a stimulating exchange of ideas in a number of conferences (in South Africa and Amsterdam), if the project is granted, this cooperation will also be incorporated in the SAVUSA network at the VU.

David Chidester is Professor of Religious Studies, Head of the Department of Religious Studies, and Director of the Institute for Comparative Religion in Southern Africa (ICRSA) at the University of Cape Town in South Africa. He has also served as Special Advisor to the Minister of Education, Visiting Fellow with the Human Sciences Research Council, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Africa Genome Education Institute. He is an internationally highly respected scholar, and received the American Academy of Religion's Award for Excellence in Religious Studies in 1990 and 1997 and the Alan J. Pifer Award for social research in 2005.

Luís Nicolau Parés holds a PhD from the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) of the University of London (1997). He has lived in Salvador of Bahia in Brazil since 1998 and he is a tenured professor of the Department of Anthropology and the Postgraduate Program in Ethnic and African Studies of the Federal University of Bahia. He is co-editor of the journal *Afro-Ásia* of the Center of Afro-Oriental Studies (CEAO-UFBA). A specialist in the history and anthropology of African and Afro-Brazilian religions, he has conducted field work in Bahia, Maranhão and the Republic of Benin. He is author of numerous papers and book chapters published both nationally and internationally.

Kodjo Senah holds a PhD from the University of Amsterdam, and is the chair of the Department of Spociology in the University of Ghana Legon where he has been teaching for the past 23 years. His areas of academic interest are Medical Anthropology, Juvenile Justice Systems and Rural Development. He has published extensively in these areas and conducted research for WHO and other global institutions.

The program is interesting for our international partners, because it allows them to engage in broader international debates about heritage politics that involve other settings in the South. The PhD-projects involving MA students from South Africa and Brazil will contribute to capacity building. Equally import, however, is the prospect for the international research team to visit all four locations. This will generate new insights, based on comparison. It is our aim, to also involve local policy makers and heritage builders in this program by organizing public sessions and expert meetings as part of our annual conferences. Our international partners are already involved in exchanges with a great number of persons/institutions over limits and potential of existing 'public pedagogies.'

For the respective settings, the following lists of interested parties in the world of policy making, have been drawn. The partners with respect to the three settings are:

Brazil: Zulu Araújo, CEO, Fundação Cultural Palmares, Ministry of Culture; José do Nascimento Júnior, CEO, Instituto do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional (IPHAN); Frederico Augusto Rodrigues da Costa de Mendonça, CEO, Instituto do Patrimônio Artístico e Cultural (IPAC, Bahia); Ordep Serra, Pro-Reitor de Extensão, Universidade Federal da Bahia; Marcelo Nascimento Bernardo da Cunha, Museu Afro-Brasileiro, Universidade Federal da Bahia; Taata Konmannjy, CEO, Associação Cultural de Preservação do Patrimônio Bantu (ACBANTU).

Ghana: Institute of African Studies, Univ of Ghana; National Commission on Culture; Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports; National House of Chiefs; Ghana Museums and Monument Board; Ministry of Information and Diasporan Relations.

South Africa: Minister Pallo Jordan, Department of Arts and Culture; Sonwabile Mancotywa, CEO, National Heritage Council; Phakamani Buthelezi, CEO, South African Heritage Resources Agency; Mangena Wally Serote, CEO, Freedom Park Trust; Charlotte Bauer, Director, Sunday Times Heritage Project.

Netherlands: See the list of persons/institutions mentioned in the section on the workshop.

13. Work programme

PhDs: The two foreign PhD students are selected in consonance with David Chidester (SA) and Luis Nicolau Parés (BR), the AIO post will be advertised once the program is granted and be selected by the Dutch team.

Postdoc: The postdoc will be Marleen de Witte, selected because of her great expertise on religion, media and identity in Ghana; the program proposed will be an excellent follow-up research on her dissertation research (ms is expected to be accepted in 12/2007), which she conducted in the framework of Meyer's Pionier program. She is willing to work part-time (2 fte over 4 years), and next to conducting her research she will coordinate the overall research program, and prepare the conferences and events in the program.

Applicants: Throughout the program, all applicants will work with the PhDs, AIO and postdoc, attend the annual meetings, and prepare presentations/articles. The Dutch-based applicants will also continue the *Religion, Media and the Body Seminar* (see question 5), and involve the other researchers.

Scheme: research activities of PhD-students, AIO, Postdoc, and applicants

04/2008

Beginning of project

04-09/2008

PhDs & AIO: read relevant literature, elaborate research plan (due after 9 months)

Postdoc: reads relevant literature, prepares 1 meeting for the whole team in Amsterdam

10/2008

PhDs, postdoc and co-applicants hold a small preparatory workshop in Amsterdam

10/2008-03/2009

PhDs: stay in NL, read, discuss progress on 9 month paper (due 12/2008) with each other and applicants

AIO: further reading, preparation 9 month paper (due 12/2008), further refine proposal and methodology

Postdoc: further reading of relevant literature, preparing annual conference in Ghana (9/2009)

04/2009-03/2010

PhDs and AIO: research in respective settings

Postdoc: further reading, research in Ghana (06-08/2009), writing article, working on book

04/2010-09/2010

PhDs: stay in NL, work on material, writing article

AIO: work on material, writing article

Postdoc: writing article, working on book, research in Ghana (06-08/2010) preparing annual conference in Brazil (10/2010)

09/2010-02/2011:

PhDs: stay in home countries, further analysis and writing chapters, writing article

AIO: further analysis and writing chapters, writing article

Postdoc: writing article

03/2011-03/2012:

PhDs: stay in NL, writing chapters, first version of thesis due 11/2011

AIO: writing chapters, first version of thesis due 11/2011

Postdoc: writing article, working on book, preparing annual conference in South Africa (10/2011)

04/2012:

PhDs and AIO submit manuscript of dissertation

Postdoc: submits book ms

04/2012-03/2013:

Applicants B. Meyer and M. van de Port will co-author a book that synthesizes the findings
All applicants will work on an edited volume that presents the main findings

14. Planned deliverables and knowledge dissemination

Scientific output: three dissertations, a set of articles and a book by the postdoc, sets of articles, an edited volume, and a synthesizing book by the applicants. We plan to submit articles to journals as the following: *Africa*, *Africa Today*, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, *American Ethnologist*, *Public Culture*, *Identities*, *Comparative Studies in History and Society*, *Body and Society*, *Material Religion*, *Development and Change*, *Religião & Sociedade*, *Popular Culture*, *Journal of Folklore Research*, *Cultural and Social History*. We plan to organise four international conferences (see scheme), including workshops for policy makers and a broad, interested public.

The Dutch based applicants also seek to participate in public debates via the newspapers and roundtables. We will also explore possibilities for the organisation of an exhibition centred on, and informed by, the program, preferably in collaboration with the Royal Tropical Institute, The *Nederlands Openluchtmuseum Arnhem* and *Stichting Vista*, as well as with museums in Ghana, Brazil and South Africa.

Scheme: events

10/2008: meeting of the research team (Amsterdam)

10/2009: conference in Ghana, including a meeting with/for the social partners and public

10/2010: conference in Brazil, including a meeting with/for the social partners and public

10/2011: conference in South Africa, including a meeting with/for the social partners and public

10/2012: conference in Amsterdam, including a meeting with/for the social partners and public

Scheme: publications

Postdoc: 4 articles (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012) and book (2012)

PhDs and Aio: each 2 articles after fieldwork, dissertation (04/2012)

Applicants: a number of articles, as well as editing special issues on the basis of the annual conferences, an edited volume (ms due 12/2011), and a book that highlights conceptual issues (due 3/2012).

15. Brief curriculum of the main applicant

BIRGIT MEYER CURRICULUM VITAE

Born

21 March 1960 in Emden (Germany)

Education

Gymnasium (*Abitur* 1978), study pedagogy and comparative religion, *Universität Bremen* (1979-1985, finished cum laude with *Erstes Staatsexamen für Sekundarstufe I*); study Cultural Anthropology, *Universiteit van Amsterdam* (1985-1990, finished cum laude); PhD, *Universiteit van Amsterdam* (1995, finished cum laude)

Current status

Professor of Cultural Anthropology at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Main areas of interest

Anthropology of religion, anthropology of modernity, colonial history, globalization, media/visual culture, material culture, popular culture

Grants/honours

- 1991-1995 Research Grant by the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO) for dissertation research in Ghana
- 1995-1999 Research Grant by WOTRO for postdoc research Ghana, in the framework of the research program 'Globalization and the Construction of Communal Identities'
- 2000-2006 'PIONIER' research grant by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) for the research program 'Modern Mass Media, Religion and the Imagination of Communities
- Different Postcolonial Trajectories in West Africa, Brazil, India and the Caribbean',
www.pscw.uva.nl/media-religion
- Member of the International African Institute (IAI), London (since 2004)
- Vice-Chairperson of the IAI, London (since 2005)
- Member KNAW (since 2007)

Editorial positions

- Co-editor of *Etnofoor* (1987-2005)
- Co-editor of *Material Religion* (since 2006)
- Member of the editorial advisory board of *The Journal of Religion in Africa* (since 1999), and *Postscripts* (since 2005)
- Co-editor of the electronic journal *Pentecostudies* (since 2007)
- Peer reviewer of articles submitted to *American Ethnologist*, *Cultural Anthropology*, *Current Anthropology*, *Africa*, *African Studies Review*, *Journal of Religion*

Positions in Dutch-based networks

- Co-chair of the cluster Religion and Politics in the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research (ASSR)
- Coordinates the thematic focus religion in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the VU, founding co-director of VU institute for the Study of Religion, Culture and Society.
- Director Faculty Research Institute (FSW-VU)
- Member of the program board of the NWO-sponsored multidisciplinary national research program *The Future of the Religious Past*
- Member of the PAVEM 'Curatorium' (Máxima-leerstoel, held by Prof. Halleh Ghorashi)

International cooperation

- Member of the International Advisory Board of the Religion and Media Centre, New York University (since 2004)
- Collaborator on the South-African Research Program Radio and the Making of Communities, University of Natal (in 2004)
- Involved in network with WISER (Univ. of Witwatersrand) and the University of Bahia (Brazil), setting up conferences and summer schools with the ASSR
- Board member of the Culture, Religion, Media-project (together with Peter Horsfield, David Morgan, Stewart Hoover) (since 2006)

16. Literature

Selection of (top)publications from co-applicants in NL (max 10)

Birgit Meyer

1999 *Globalization and Identity. Dialectics of Flow and Closure*. (edited together with Peter Geschiere), Oxford: Blackwell. Second Edition in 2003.

2004 'Praise the Lord....' Popular Cinema and Pentecostalite Style in Ghana's New Public Sphere. *American Ethnologist* 31 (1): 92-110.

2006 *Religion, Media and the Public Sphere* (edited together with Annelies Moors). Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
Fc Powerful Pictures. Popular Christian Aesthetics in Southern Ghana. Accepted for publication in the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, fc in March 2008.

Herman Roodenburg

1998 *Managing Ethnicity: Perspectives from Folklore Studies, History and Anthropology* (edited together with Regina Bendix), Amsterdam: Spinhuis, 2000.
2004 *The Eloquence of the Body: Perspectives on Gesture in the Dutch Republic* (Zwolle: Waanders.
2007 *Reframing Dutch Culture: Between Otherness and Authenticity* (edited together with Peter Jan Margry) (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Mattijs van de Port

2005 Circling around the Really Real. Possession Ceremonies and the Search for Authenticity in Bahian Candomblé. *Ethos* 33(2):147-179.
2006 Visualizing the Sacred. Televisual Styles and the Religious Imagination in Bahian Candomblé. *American Ethnologist* 33 (3): 444-461.
2007 Bahian White. The Dispersion of Candomblé Imagery in the Public Sphere of Bahia. *Material Religion. The Journal of Objects, Art and Belief* vol. 3, no.2: 242-272.

Selection of (top)publications from international co-applicants (Max 10)

David Chidester

1996 *Savage Systems: Colonialism and Comparative Religion in Southern Africa* (University of Virginia Press, 1996).
2000 *Christianity: A Global History* (Harper Collins, 2000)
2003 *Salvation and Suicide: Jim Jones, the Peoples Temple, and Jonestown* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, Revised Edition)
2004 *Nelson Mandela: In His Own Words* (Little, Brown, 2004)
2005 *Authentic Fakes: Religion and American Popular Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Luis Nicolau Pares

2005 Transformations of the sea and thunder voduns in the Gbe-speaking area and in the Bahian Jeje Candomblé. In: J. C. Curto; R. Soulodre-La France. (Org.). *Africa and the Americas: Interconnections during the Slave Trade*. Trenton NJ: Africa World Press, Pp. 69-93.
2005 The birth of the Yoruba hegemony in post-abolition Candomblé. *Journal de la Societe des americanistes de Paris, França*, v. 91, n. 1, p. 139-159, 2005.
2006 A formação do Candomblé: história e ritual da nação jeje na Bahia. 1. ed. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2006. v. 1. 390 p.

Kodjo Senah

1997 *Money Be Man The Popularity of Medicines in a Rural Ghanaian Community*. Amsterdam: het Spinhuis.
2005 Child Labour Productivity and wages: Case Study of Coastal Fishing and Local Restaurants in Ghana. *Legon Journal of International Affairs* 2(2):89-115.

International literature (max 10)

Anderson, Benedict 1991 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso.
Bourdieu, Pierre 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Chidester, David, 2005, *Authentic Fakes: Religion and American Popular Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Csordas, Thomas J. 1994 *Embodiment and Experience. The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Howes, David 2005 *Empire of the Senses. The Sensual Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg.
Karp, Ivan, Christine Mullen Kreamer, Steven D. Lavine (eds.), *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press 1992.
Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara, 1998, *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley; California UP.
Mauss, Marcel, [1935] 1973, The Techniques of the Body. *Economy and Society* 2: 70-88.
Taylor, Charles 1991 *Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Taylor, Diana, 2003, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham and London: Duke UP.

17. Summary for non-specialists

Cultureel erfgoed was lange tijd een staatsaangelegenheid: materiële (en steeds vaker: immateriële) overblijfselen uit het verleden vormden de ankergrond voor nationale geschiedenissen en toekomstvisies, voor publieke educatie en de verbeelding van de natie. De rol van nationale staten in de bepaling van cultureel erfgoed is nog steeds cruciaal, maar vragen wie stemhebbend (zouden moeten) zijn bij de toekenning van het predikaat ‘cultureel erfgoed’ spelen op nu nieuwe groepen het publieke debat betreden.

Dat is niet enkel het geval in Nederland, waar het debat over de Nederlandse identiteit volop woedt, en nieuwe Nederlanders zichzelf terug zouden willen vinden in de culturele canon, maar even zozeer in de snel veranderende samenlevingen van Ghana, Zuid Afrika en Brazilië. Hoe verschillend die settings ook mogen zijn, overal geldt dat deze discussies meer dan ooit duidelijk maken dat cultureel erfgoed niet gegeven is, maar *gemaakt*: de uitkomst van een selectieproces, waarbij criteria zijn gebruikt die niet voor iedereen even vanzelfsprekend zijn.

Dat gegeven van gemaaktheid laat zich moeilijk rijmen met de rol van cultureel erfgoed als ankergrond voor culturele identiteiten. Als identiteiten zich moeten gronden in het drijfzand van ‘uitgevonden tradities’, ‘opgevoerde authenticiteit’, ‘verbeelde gemeenschappen’ – zo zou verwacht kunnen worden – dreigt die identiteitsconstructies als zodanig onderuit te gaan.

Dat dit niet gebeurt, sterker nog, dat de rol van de staat als leverancier van identificatie punten allesbehalve is uitgespeeld, leert dat mensen er in slagen zich cultureel erfgoed ‘eigen te maken’. Hoe die toeëigening in zijn werk gaat – in de termen van dit onderzoek: op welke wijze wordt cultureel erfgoed ‘geauthenticeerd’? – is de vraag die in dit onderzoek centraal staat. In de verschillende samenlevingen zal worden onderzocht hoe de specifieke *framing* van cultureel erfgoed – d.w.z. de verhalen die rond erfgoed worden gesponnen, maar ook de performances waartoe die framing uitnodigt, en de emoties en zintuigelijke gewaarwordingen die door die framing worden opgeroepen – de identificatie met erfgoed bepaalt. Aandacht voor retoriek, stijl, esthetiek, mediatizing, en de mobilisering van het lichaam en de zintuigen is daarbij cruciaal.

Omdat dit onderzoek een vergelijkend karakter heeft, waarbij bekeken zal worden hoe constanten als ‘Afrika’, ‘roots’, ‘de natie’ en ‘traditie’ in de verschillende settings opspelen, zal beter inzicht worden verkregen hoe de relatie tussen processen van authenticering enerzijds en de specifieke sociaal-politieke configuratie anderzijds moet worden begrepen.

18. Research budget See following page

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	TOTAL
Staff costs: employees Dutch institutions(in k€)						
Post-doc (0,5fte 4 years)	26.310	26.310	31.339	31.340		115.299
AIO	33.636	40.013	42.789	61.057		177.495
Replacement Mattijs van de Port					25.000	25.000
Staff costs: researchers from developing countries						
PhDs 2 X 24 Months in Netherlands (€ 1.500 per month)	36.000		18.000	18.000		72.000
PhDs 2X 24 Months in DC (€ 1.000 per month)		24.000	12.000	12.000		48.000
Post doc - Months in Netherlands						
Post doc - Months in DC						
Replacement						
Non staff costs: (k€)						
Benchfee (postdoc & AIO)	10.000					10.000
Travel and subsistence	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000		20.000
Popular/societal knowledge dissemination	6.000	10.000	10.000	10.000	6.000	42.000
Internationalization Research cost 2 PhD international students	7.500	7.500	7.500	7.500		30.000
Other (research costs AIO and postdoc) 1 Postdoc 1 Aio	2.500	2.500 2.500	2.500			10.000
TOTAL	126.946	117.823	129.128	144.897	31.000	549.794

