

Cultural dynamics

Research Programme 2007-2014

Programme notes

March 2009

This document is the translation of the Dutch Programme notes. In case of different interpretation of the original (Dutch) Text and this (English) translation the original Dutch text prevails.



Contents

- I. Description of the research field
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Objectives
 - 3. Content and structure of the programme

- II. Organisation of the programme
 - 1. General
 - 2. Organisation
 - 3. Type of subsidy
 - 4. 2009 subsidy round
 - 5. Dissemination of knowledge
 - 6. Internationalisation
 - 7. Programme committee

I. Description of the research field

1. Defining the problem

In the last few years, the perception and opinions of societal dynamics have gradually undergone fundamental change. While societal renewal and societal innovation were until recently seen as politically and socio-economically driven processes that could be realised on a world-scale given the right parameters, things are now less certain. The limits to political and societal action would appear to be in sight. Now that the homogeneity of national societies is breaking down, the importance ascribed by societal partners and other players to cultural differences and diversity is being given greater weight, and that globalisation seems to be generating unexpected effects on societal integration and social cohesion, more and more doubts are being expressed about the degree to which the steerability of such processes is universal and can be taken for granted. The perception of differences in group cultures, of historic identity and of the cultural dimension of innovation processes has gained a growing significance in the analysis of this problem. Culture has crept unnoticed into the heart of the problem, not just as a deciding factor in shaping society, but also in particular as a central dimension of perception, analysis, and prospecting of social development. In other words, the cultural factor can no longer be ignored without there being consequences. From now on, societal dynamics will also, and in many respects first and foremost, be recognised as a cultural dynamic, to be localised and shaped according to limited and changeable spatial, temporal and dimensional cultural frameworks. If they are to be made relevant to the societal debate to which, in the final analysis, they relate, then the change must be thoroughly rooted in a scientific analysis. The programme proposed here attempts to embody such an analysis and lay down academic conditions under which the societal debate about cultural dynamics can be conducted meaningfully and bring about lasting results.

The background to the rediscovery of the cultural dynamics of our society is experiencing a sudden feeling of crisis. It is not just society in the Netherlands that has lost its self-assuredness: the same applies to almost all Western societies. They are wrestling with their identities, with their place in the world, and with their contributions to man's overall happiness. It was not that long ago that the solutions were assumed to lie in the expansion of Western market economies, in Western models of societal order, of political values like freedom, tolerance and democracy, which historically have achieved their most workable forms in the West. The linear view of history that dominates Western thinking appeared to guarantee a durable and problem-free process of modernisation in which upscaling and globalisation would be able to solve every aspect of regional and national problems by having local societies conform to an idealised societal model that had historically evolved in Western societies. That feeling of societal crisis requires a scientific analysis. Where does it come from? What does it mean for the cultural identity of the societies involved? And how can it be converted into socially productive solutions? Although the legitimacy of this programme is found not just in the social valorisation of scientific insights, it is obvious that cultural dynamics is closely involved with societal reality and that the validity of cultural analyses is part of that.

This programme attempts to locate the heart of the analysis of this feeling of crisis in cultural dynamics itself, with the implication that that is where the heart of the solution is also to be found. National societies have become multiform to a previously unprecedented degree. Their historical identity, in the inward-turning form given to it during the past two centuries, no longer guarantees them sufficient social cohesion today, because the traditional parameters of national consciousness, of national citizenship and national culture, are no longer enough. Old values are being thoroughly questioned, while conflicting with new ones. Events with a strong symbolic value such as, in the Netherlands, the murders of Fortuyn and Van Gogh, but also the inability almost throughout Europe, to find workable solutions for new, large-scale problems like the question of refugees, or the position of Islam in a society regarded by some as fundamentally secular, and by others as Christian, are unmistakable symptoms of that. Everywhere, indigenous populations and ethnic minorities, both well established and newly arrived, are

unsure about the route they should be following in both the short and long term in order to find a joint cultural identity that is actively shared by everyone in society.

This problem of integration is rooted in a historic perspective. Our past and heritage may not determine our future: culture is praxis as well as fulfilment, and therefore dynamic in itself. The group identity, of whatever group, including those who are well established, has to be constantly rediscovered and imagined by everyone in actual interaction with other groups. But the past and heritage must not determine culture: culture is practice as well as perception, and is therefore dynamic in itself. The group identity, of whatever group, including those who are well established, has to be constantly rediscovered and imagined by everyone in actual interaction with other groups. The cultural concept with which this programme is working is therefore not product but process oriented. It is a concept of actions. Heritage often has a rigid meaning, like objective chunks of legacy from the past that could autonomously generate a sense of purpose. A lack of insight into the dynamic role of heritage and the past would then have a destructive effect on the development of culture and society. Insight into these dynamics assumes not only an awareness of heritage as such, but also, primarily, the ways in which it is conveyed, presented and renewed. The innovation process therefore constitutes an independent theme in this programme. In addition, the technology of cultural dynamics in itself results in a transformation of cultural participation, with its own inclusion and exclusion processes, and a continuous redefining of the fields of popular and elitist culture. In other words, the interaction between the media and their mutual involvement (intermediality) adds new dimensions to traditional views about linear transfer.

Culture here is not primarily regarded as an autonomous product with an aesthetic, societal or moral value, but as a process that is given shape and meaning through the individual and collective actions in the material and mental world, that use on the one hand physical reality, and on the other, techniques and technologies, repertoires of collective action, value patterns, moral consideration, intellectual arguments, traditional depictions and mental imagery. For each group, the past (whether real or imagined) plays a guiding role as a factor in and motor of culture and identity. A lack of insight into this role is fatal to the development of culture and society. The historical dimension plays a role which is just as indispensable as that of the societal dimension, and a research programme into cultural dynamics should devote sufficient space to historical analysis of the theme.

When making the analysis, we should not overestimate the importance of current issues; we should find the right balance between historical components and present-day dimensions. Many societal analyses of the problems outlined here give heritage a central role in the traditional Western society. According to these analyses, social cohesion and national identity can no longer rely on a canon that is shared by everyone, and values that are considered fundamental for Europe, such as tolerance, participation and integration are no longer shared by every group. These deficiencies are said to be particularly related to a distortion in public and private perception and the management of the material and immaterial cultural heritage. Such analyses highlight the growth of fundamental cultural differences within a single national community; of uncertainty about good citizenship; of randomness in the processes of inclusion and exclusion of citizens and newcomers; on stealthy, often one-sided forms of selection of cultural norms and values; on the ill-considered use of rigid forms of cultural heritage in discussions on religion and identity; in other words, on cultural dynamics that are not controlled, sometimes determined by prejudice, but more often are insufficiently known and managed. The problem of integration or lack of integration is therefore closely rooted in a historic perspective: the past plays a guiding role as an engine of cultural development and as a factor in identity.

The problems described here are not confined to the Netherlands. On the contrary, they presently dominate societal reflection in every country in Europe, and indeed beyond. Both government and cultural organisations are shaping new heritage policies, cultural education and types of citizenship. New group values are being sought in an attempt to mould social cohesion into new parameters, or restore them. One particular characteristic of Dutch society is the suddenness of the change. The assumption by the Netherlands of its being a model country with exemplary values (tolerance, consensus and cohesion, and a rational approach to religion) has been replaced by a divided society looking for answers, culturally and societally unsure of itself. It needs a new internal structure and to construct a new external image, for which incidental schemes will not do. After all, because of globalisation, communication technology and the digital revolution, the development is irreversible. The same

problems can be found in almost all other societies, although it is against the criteria of national parameters that the problems are measured. This implies that the analysis should always extend beyond national contexts in two ways: on the one hand, regional and national aspects of the problems can only be clarified through a comparative approach on a regional and national scale, and on the other, these are transnational problems that require an analysis and explanation on an international scale. It also means that there is absolutely no need to put the situation in the Netherlands at the centre of the discussion. International analysis has its own course, especially when it concerns problems of development. An academically based internationally and comparatively oriented programme into the dynamics of the formation of cultures is therefore necessary to define the conditions for new cultural identities, and to help develop instruments for the purpose. In addition, it is of great importance that all involved parties and users are consulted in order to safeguard the necessary valorisation in the social arena in the short and long term.

2. Objectives

The central role played by the processes of formation, attribution, transfer and appropriation of cultural heritage in cultural dynamics justify the central position that cultural heritage, in its various forms and components, occupies in this programme. Cultural heritage (Erbe, patrimoine) arises when a group, no matter how large or small, defines goods, artefacts, material or immaterial values as a feature or property of its own, actively claims them, and creates an identity based thereon. This process of production, mediation and claiming of goods and customs, norms and values is at the heart of cultural dynamics. Although the factors of reception, mediation, claims and the meaning that is given to something are all heavily accentuated in the process-based approach of cultural dynamics as shown here, it should not be forgotten that there can be no mediation or reception without production, and that every form of claim implies a new production of cultural artefacts or values – through creation from new, hybridisation or creolisation – which in turn is included in the process. Looked at this way, the programme provides sufficient resistance to the conservative, and indeed rigid effect that the term heritage has sometimes had in the past, while simultaneously devoting sufficient attention to the historical dimension of all types of heritage.

Although it is semantically linked to the past, cultural heritage is the key to the identity of the future, like a selection from the material and immaterial legacies that we are handed down from history, one that is made again and again and is driven by group processes that give it meaning. This programme is therefore seeking to approach cultural heritage in a new and dynamic way, less oriented towards conserving the past (although that of course is very much a precondition, to which nowhere near enough attention has been given) than to the cultural and social process that shared heritage creates for the future. Based on a thorough analysis of cultural dynamics in its different forms and dimensions, this programme aims to reposition cultural heritage both academically and societally, as the potential heritage of everyone who is involved with the formation and establishment of the identity of groups and societies. In active alliances between the academic world and various societal partners – to start with the heritage organisations themselves which in principle are the first bearers and most experienced performers of cultural dynamics – the programme seeks to zoom in on a number of core processes where the cultural heritage is used as a tool for the necessary cultural dynamics. What matters here are not, or not just, descriptions of present-day developments, relationships and situations, but the recognition and analysis of processes with a certain temporal depth, which forms the heart of cultural dynamics. Ensuring a correct analysis of this temporal depth and taking the importance of historical processes into consideration is even more necessary than before within a context of fixation on the shape that societal problems currently assume.

The programme seeks to lay an academic foundation under the re-evaluation of the dynamic role and constant reinterpretation of cultural heritage for the perception and identity of people, groups, and national and international society. Although academic research seldom provides ready-made solutions for policy problems, it is the express wish of this programme to make a contribution to create an insight into the cultural process at the different levels of national, supranational and international culture policies,

and so provide a guide for the preservation of, participation in and development of culture, in combination with the development of societal identities. In other words, the programme wishes to support the valorisation of academic research by societal partners with their own substantial and / or financial input.

As it would be short-sighted to believe that local solutions would be sufficient in what is a world undergoing a process of cultural globalisation, this programme is resolutely intended for research on an international scale, with a transnational theme, a comparative objective or a comparable methodology. This includes an active pursuit of a thematic confrontation in different areas with non-Western situations and developments, partly because of the opportunities that a study of the relationship between European, Western cultural themes and non-European thinking and cultures offers in terms of gaining a deeper insight into the cultural heart of problems relating to development.

3. Content and structure of the programme

The Cultural Dynamics programme is structured around five lines of approach, each of which is ideal for international and comparative research. These five lines of approach seem not only to predominate in most academic literature, but they also determine the lion's share of societal discussions on cultural heritage, as viewed from the deployment of these lines of approach for the benefit of cultural dynamics.

The five lines of approach are as follows:

- processes of inclusion and exclusion, substantiated as 'citizenship';
- processes of certifying sustainable values, substantiated as 'canon formation';
- processes of creative design, summarised as 'innovation' and substantiated in terms of broadly conceived implementation;
- forms of migration of heritage between the media (old as well as new) and the significance ascribed thereto, summarised by the term 'intermediality';
- forms of widely supported cultural participation, substantiated as 'popular culture' and focusing on present-day cultural practices and the new media, from radio, film and TV to computer games and the internet, while also taking the historical dimension into account.

These three processes / approaches and two facets or form classes have many areas of overlap, as will become clear in the descriptions that follow. Together, they can be regarded as a matrix that enables many of the aspects of cultural heritage to be located and analysed on the scale of cultural dynamics. None of them is limited to national society – on the contrary, they are without exception all hot issues on the international scientific agenda.

Above the five lines of approach is the theoretical meta-level, in which there is room for the necessary meta-reflection on the terms that are used in the field of cultural heritage as well as on the theories and methodology in the field of cultural dynamics. Naturally, the development of theories is always closely allied to specific research into the individual lines of approach and sub-themes. However, it is important to emphasise here that research into cultural dynamics does not automatically have to be instrumentalised with a view to resolving current problems. On the contrary, free reflection on the theory and methods of culture analysis which is not bound by explicit or implicit policy aims can give the research an essential incentive for innovation. The same applies to the historical analysis of cultural processes: there is a danger that this will suffer if too much stress is laid on the importance of cultural dynamics for the present and the future. It is this very autonomous historical research into processes of heritage formation and heritage conservation and of cultural dynamics that can provide insight into the essential historical nature and the characteristic features of each type of cultural transfer and cultural appropriation.

For the continuation of the programme, applicants are invited to submit applications relating to the following lines of approach: intermediality, on the interface of old and new media, and/or popular

culture, interpreted as a multitude of types of broad-based cultural participation whose importance is rapidly growing within a context of diversity. Since intermediality and popular culture are both closely allied to the other lines of approach, the description of these has been included in the programme memorandum in italics.

Theoretical meta-level

Terms like heritage, inclusion and exclusion, and canon formation merit a thorough analysis before being deployed as instruments or methods for analysing cultural dynamics. In addition, it will have to be accepted time and again that cultural problems are rooted in social relationships and societal processes: cultural sciences and social sciences have a mutual dependency in this area. Heritage in the sense of how we wish to study it in this case refers to a cultural practice with historical as well as behavioural science dimensions.

Research at the theoretical meta-level will in any case have to involve the terms and processes that are used in this programme. The historical dimension plays a key role in the terms used as well as in the processes.

Terms. The notion of (cultural) heritage, its development, scope and implications, its use, standardisation and possible misuse, is at the heart of this programme. What did cultural heritage used to mean, and what does it mean now? How wide was or is the cultural field that it covered (monumentally or aesthetically, materially, immaterially)? What were its contours in space and time? What scientific questions lie at its foundations? How was and is the perception of heritage translated into cultural policies, not just as local and national but also at international level? As well as the notion of heritage, other terms recur constantly in this programme, whether or not in relation to cultural heritage, such as culture, knowledge, memory, identity, tradition, canon, medium, values and so on. It is important, from an interdisciplinary approach, to be familiar with the semantic field in which these terms are used, and vital that such terms (especially culture) should not be regarded essentialistically as timeless abstractions, but that they should be defined as behavioural terms within an anthropological framework approach. It is only in this way that they can be deployed in a programme based around cultural dynamics. As cultural heritage means different things in different parts of the world, a history of the terminology in relation to cultural heritage (comparative, international and diachronic) is an essential requirement for the success of the programme. This includes a gradual transformation of the terms, such as the changing relationship between their scientific and societal usage, and their growing or diminishing role in forms of political valorisation and use of knowledge. In other words, research into a term should always be integrated into the history of its use, precisely because this programme is not about abstract cultural opinions, but about the way in which culture in society comes about, is transformed, and is deployed and valorised.

Processes. The second core element of this programme is cultural dynamics in its proper sense. Culture, after all, is a dynamic concept. It comes about in a multitude of processes which together form the theme of this programme. The formation of theories about and comparative research into the relationship between cultural heritage and cultural dynamics is therefore a second requirement. In the various parts of the programme, such as canon formation, inclusion and exclusion, innovation or popular culture, all kinds of processes are deployed or are deemed to be operative. The most important are:

- a. forms of perception and experience, including emotions and taboos;
- b. processes of identification, appropriation and representation;
- c. processes of value creation and valorisation;
- d. processes of societal attribution and differentiation (according to gender, age, ethnic origin, religion, and so on);
- e. processes of dissemination, circulation and transformation of knowledge and culture
- f. processes of migration, crossing borders, and penetration of culture;

g. processes of collective formation, conserving and ordering, of choice, selection and rejection.

The central process around which this programme runs is that of production, mediation and appropriation of heritage, in the framework and function of cultural dynamics, and in various grades of intensity: from simple consumption and functional use to identification. Apart from the transfer process in a more general sense, as a societal action with social, anthropological, psychological and other various dimensions that assume an interdisciplinary approach, this programme focuses in particular on specific forms of cultural transfer in the area of citizenship formation, canon formation, culture production and intermediality. For that reason it is important to carry out fundamental research into the various dynamic elements of the transfer process, such as the processes of appropriation and identification, from acculturation and transculturation, from globalisation and (g)localisation of cultural goods and values, including the 'invention of tradition' and the depiction of culture, identity, society and community, and without neglecting the types of exercising of power that are enclosed in such processes.

Apart from those processes of a more general nature, several specific developments can be identified for which analysis is important for the success of the programme. First, science itself forms an essential part of cultural dynamics: it (and it is the express ambition of this programme as a scientific programme to play a significant role in this) forms culture, influences it, and transforms both the conditions under which cultural dynamics work and the information itself. For that reason, a scientific approach to the cultural process is part of the core of the theoretical part of this programme. A second development also merits some attention, namely the way in which the fast-moving digitisation of larger and more complex segments of heritage is transforming the dynamics of the process of conservation and selection, as well as appropriation and identification. It is precisely because this programme seeks to focus on the future that a principled examination of the relationship between reality and virtuality is of crucial importance.

The theoretical component briefly described here forms an indispensable part of the programme, even though it is the most difficult to valorise in the societal field. However, that is the price that has to be paid for depth, insight and innovation.

Cultural Heritage and the Struggle for Citizenship Shifting Terms of Inclusion and Exclusion

The renewed focus in and outside the Netherlands on cultural heritage and cultural dynamics in general are closely related to the increasing uncertainty about the definition of citizenship and the associated processes of identity and the inclusion and exclusion of population groups. The background to this uncertainty is clear. More intensive processes of globalisation – described in terms of the faster movement of goods, people and ideas on an ever-wider scale – mean that the nation state is no longer the automatic unit of world order. It remains to be seen whether the institutions of the nation state will retain their power. But it is clear that the meaning of 'citizenship' – often previously regarded as the same as 'national citizenship' – is under threat as a result. More local or more transnational forms of identity are clearly emerging as alternatives. Added to this is that the more intensive movement of people around the world is making questions of belonging – who belongs where (or rather, who does not belong where) – ever more pressing. Somewhat paradoxically, hastened processes of globalisation seem to go with an increasing preoccupation with the demarcation of identities. It has become more and more clear recently that this is far from being an innocuous term: the preoccupation with identities can in practice lead to ever-starker forms of inclusion and exclusion. It is not unusual for the struggle for recognition (or the denial thereof by dominant groups) to lead to widespread violence. Rwanda is perhaps the most significant example, but there are similar problems of an urgent nature in Fiji, for example, or France, or in the Balkans, to mention three very different areas. It has also recently become a hot issue in the Netherlands. The struggle for redefinitions of the term 'citizenship' seems to be crucial all over the world for the effects of globalisation processes and equally for the realisation of good governance locally.

In these discussions, culture plays a central role as a criterion of demarcation. However, the role is often fairly confusing in practice: cultural demarcations present themselves as being obvious, but they

turn out to be fluid and subject to constant redefinition. This is also directly relevant for the purpose of understanding the fast and far-reaching changes that have taken place globally and in the Netherlands in the last few years: the general disappointment about the idea of the multicultural society and the ever-louder calls for 'integration' which inevitably raise the question of how to describe the cultural complexity into which outsiders are supposed to integrate. Such burning questions here are still not studied often enough in an emphatically international-comparative perspective. It is important to underline that this is not a typically Dutch problem. Greater insight into the problems of good governance in so-called 'developing countries' – especially into the problems of securing accountability of the state to its citizens, so that the citizens can identify with the state – is directly relevant to the study of similar problems here. Everywhere, cultural criteria appear to be crucial to the question as to who can and cannot be regarded as a citizen of a particular community (national, subnational or even transnational), but it is shown everywhere that these cultural criteria are also constantly subject to alteration.

Recently, many anthropologists in particular have called for more attention to be given to cultural aspects of globalisation processes. They emphasise that these have led not so much to cultural homogenisation – the inevitable spreading of one world culture à la Coca Cola and McDonald's – but that in practice there is actually more of a new cultural heterogeneity and an increasing obsession with cultural differences. The term 'globalisation' is therefore misleading: this suggests an image of increasing global flows, while in fact it is these very flows that are prompting such strong counter currents – firm attempts at closure – for the protection and demarcation of identities that claim their authenticity on the basis of their history, but which in practice often show 'neo-traditional' tendencies. A search for belonging is the obverse to globalisation, but this also means that the lines of inclusion and exclusion (or of citizenship in the broad sense of the word) are constantly subject to change.

Citizenship has become a lively topic of discussion in recent times, especially in literature from English-speaking countries. Izin and Turner (2002) see citizenship studies as the field of study for the future, precisely because the term 'national citizenship' is becoming less and less natural. In the US especially, it is argued that the old liberal principle of equality of all national citizens before the law, as autonomous individuals, is in urgent need of modification. It benefits established group and denies the right of minorities to differ, hence the plea for group-based, or group differentiated, citizenship.

Discussions about cultural heritage take place on the cutting edge of such tendencies. In Africa, as in the Netherlands, serious discussions are underway about what can and cannot be considered as 'indigenous' – compare the bloody attempts by President Gbagbo and his cohorts in the Ivory Coast to purify their nation of alien elements, so that people from the north of the country are excluded from national citizenship; compare too the role of the exploitation of indigenes in the recent unrest during the elections in Congo. But even where other terms are used to derive special rights from the claim to 'belong' somewhere – the examples of Fiji and the Balkans have already been mentioned – developments are determined by a fierce battle about the redefining of citizenship. A focus on the constitution of cultural heritage offers a useful point of entry for translating the role of culture in such contexts into concrete starting points for further comparative research.

The dynamic constitution of cultural heritage takes place on the cutting edge of the processes of globalisation and identity creation. Among the important aspects is, first of all, the politicisation of cultural heritage, in particular in the context of shifting demarcations of citizenship, belonging, and exclusion. The constitution of cultural heritage always has political implications, but they can long remain implicit. An important question is when cultural utterances or objects cross the threshold and become political: when does heritage – always susceptible to continuous dynamics, even though it is always presented as a fixed culture – become the tool for political confrontations?

Together with this politicisation, the objectives and practices of cultural governance – that is, the consolidation and control of cultural heritage – have been made by government and other bodies into a key aspect. It is precisely for this aspect that an emphatically international comparative approach, which enables an interchange between research in the Netherlands and elsewhere, is essential. How is the shifting demarcation of heritage shown in policies and management of heritage organisations? How do new interpretations of heritage get noticed? How do organisations reflect the diversity of heritage, and how are the various actors involved?

Extra literature

- Appadurai, A., *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization* (Minneapolis: Minneapolis U.P., 1996).
- Bayart, J.-F., *Le Gouvernement du monde* (Paris: Fayard 2004).
- Duyvendak, J.W., and M. Hurenkamp, Eds., *Kiezen voor de kudde, lichte gemeenschappen en de nieuwe meerderheid* (Amsterdam: van Gennep 2004).
- Geschiere, P., and B. Ceuppens, 'Autochthony: local or global? New modes in the struggle over citizenship and belonging in Africa and Europe', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34 (2005), 385-409.
- Isin, E.F. and B.S. Turner, Eds., *Handbook on citizenship studies* (London: Sage 2002).
- Kymlicka, W., *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An introduction* (Oxford: Oxford U.P. 2004).
- Schuyt, K., *Steunberen van de samenleving. Sociologische essays* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2006).
- Taylor, C., *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U.P. 1994).

Canon formation in cultural dynamics

Cultural heritage that enjoys relatively extensive and enduring prestige forms a canon. The term 'canon' has its origins in the Christian tradition. The Biblical books recognised as authentic are described as 'canonical'. In the cultural sphere, the canon means the selection of the best, most well-known and most prominent works. The content of the canon changes. Works may drop down the hierarchy or disappear altogether. Older works that have been lost may be discovered or rediscovered (Epic of Gilgamesh); they can gain new prestige (for example, fairy tales in the Romantic Movement, or female artists resulting from the feminist consciousness of the late twentieth century). Entirely new genres may be born, and with their genre-specific canons influence existing canons and value attributions: jazz or other types of non-classical music; comic strips, films, crime novels, etc. The birth of such shifts in genres and canons is not just related to the rise of 'new media' (typography, wood-pulp paper, lithography, photography, film, sound recording devices, television, digital electronics), but also to demographic shifts and shifts in purchasing power or the societal position of a societal layer, age group, gender, or ethnic group. This dynamic of canon formation is at the heart of this approach.

Canons change not just in terms of content but also function. The text of the *Wilhelmus*, the Dutch National Anthem, has been part of Dutch literature and the Dutch historical consciousness for centuries. However, the symbolic value and function of the *Wilhelmus* has repeatedly undergone a shift: first it was a modern-day political apologia, then a reminder of the Eighty Years' War, then an Orangist text, a national anthem, and since 1940 primarily a symbol of national resistance against foreign rule, and collective rejection of repression. Just as the public determines the significance of a canon, or influences the composition of a canon, it is the canon which in turn determines the composition of the public. The communal acceptance of a canon can function as a means of forming or confirming identity, both at subcultural and national level. What becomes, or remains, a canon, then, does not depend only on the artistic level of the cultural expression in question, or the artistic taste of the general public, but also on the changing historical, societal and political context in which a canon functions. Such a functionalistic approach of the term canon is an essential part of research into cultural dynamics.

The canon appears to be a complex system (polysystem) of interwoven and overlapping subcanons, each determined by the tastes and valuation of separate cultural circuits and subcultures. They encroach upon each other, form part of larger systems, and works from one canon system can 'jump' to another. Examples could include the relationship between regional, national and 'world' literature, and sub-circuits of women's literature, gay literature, immigrant literature, 'cult' genres, and so on. The relationship between peripheral areas and the centre is dynamic in the sense that the centre often renews itself by exploiting genres and types that originate on the peripheries. The pattern whereby previously rejected genres and types, which have continued to thrive on the margins, are re-adopted is well-known; they may have started to appeal to a new group of users, and then started to influence the

centre once again. In historiography, the literary domain, music, film, media and the world of entertainment, we see how parts of the subcanons at a particular time begin to resonate within more dominant canons. This polysystemic approach has proved to be productive and innovative in the formulation of theories regarding canonicity. It also enables canon formation to be studied as a process with societal and political repercussions. Anyone studying cultural heritage studies an economy of attributions of value and prestige related to the societal position and interests of those making such attributions. Processes of canon formation are cultural as well as social and political, in the sense that they are related to social power, status and influence. Canons create cultural visibility and invisibility, they distribute inclusion and exclusion. It is therefore important in the scientific study of canon formation to adopt a metaposition with regard to the canon, and to take these value attributions themselves as an object of research.

Canonicity and the formation of canons are, like 'heritage', diachronic concepts. They do not relate so much to modern-day cultural production but rather to cultural products or constructions emanating from the past. The temporal depth of this diachronicity (short, medium or long term) forms a complex variable in the analysis. How does a bestseller relate to a classic, what is the trajectory of the historical canon of Ali B., Mulisch, Wolff & Deken, Vondel, Hadewych and Horatius? Enduring canonicity consists not only of repeatedly appealing to new generations, it also entails the generation and regeneration of new reasons for appreciation. Additionally, enduring canonicity seems to function intermedially to a significant degree: the cultural product in question should possess the capacity to be 'translated' into new types of media and genres: film versions, operas, comic strip versions. Canonicity expresses itself in the public domain in street names, commemorations, establishment of monuments, exhibitions, 'cultural tourism', and so on. Even the use of Van Gogh's 'Sun Flowers' on mugs, mats and screensavers is example of this. This intermediality can be traced far back into history: for centuries, biblical texts have been disseminated in song and pictorial art and elsewhere, parts of Orlando Furioso were frequently adopted as madrigals during the Renaissance.

These theoretical insights regarding the formation of canons may inspire research into numerous subjects with the field of the theme of cultural dynamics. One promising area seems to be the interaction between heritage status and processes of canon and nation formation, or the pluralisation of canons and nations, particularly, but not exclusively, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the late twentieth century, the national monopolisation of cultural heritage was increasingly undermined, influenced by the anti-nationalism of the years after 1945, as well as the rise of new generations with different ideas of identity to the traditional national one (regions, women, immigrants, minorities). This process coincided with the rise of new and pluralistic canon formation processes. Future research will have to dare make the link with a history of tradition constructions, together with processes of cultural forgetfulness.

Another promising line of research can be found in the study of canon formation processes and cultural dynamics in underexposed areas like popular music, songs, cabaret, musicals, comic strips, digital games, advertising slogans, radio and television, alternative and subcultural forms of historiography and different forms of immigrant culture. Both (1) the canonisation processes in the subdominant areas and (2) the degree and nature of interaction between the centre and the periphery are the central lines of approach here. How are canons in areas of subdominant or popular culture constructed? The historiography of the area certainly plays a role, but also the way in which artists model their work according to famous predecessors, as well as commercial interests, technological developments, institutional and economic concentrations of power and accumulation of symbolic capital, such as fame, success and intellectual authority. Subdominant heritage organisations, like the Jewish Historical Museum, the Ritman Library, the Moluccan Museum, the IIAV, archives for gay and lesbian history, the pop-history archive, regional and private museums could all give a good idea of the process of subcultural canon formation and of the processes of inclusion and exclusion that operate in the cultural field. Immigrant culture also offers an interesting concretion. Which internalised canons do immigrant artists bring with them from their country of origin, and what significance do these canons have in the culture of the country of destination, and how are they transformed?

Extra literature

Arnold, H. L., Ed., *Literarische Kanonbildung* (Text + Kritik volume. 9 part 2: 2002).

Assmann, A., *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnis*, (Munich: Beck 1999).

Bourdieu, P., *La Distinction: critique sociale du jugement* (Paris: Minuit 1979).

Buikema, R., and M. Meijer, Eds., *Cultuur en migratie in Nederland* (2 parts; The Hague: SDU 2004).

Even-Zohar, I., 'Polysystem theory', *Poetics today* 1 (1979), 287-310.

Guillory, J., *Cultural capital: The problem of literary canon formation* (Chicago: Chicago UP 1995).

Huysen, A., *After the Great Divide. Modernism, mass culture, postmodernism* (Basingstoke: MacMillan 1986).

Lowenthal, D., *Possessed by the past: The heritage crusade and the spoils of history* (New York: Free Press 1996).

Zerubavel, E., *Time maps: Collective memory and the social shape of the past* (Chicago: Chicago UP 2003).

Creative design and innovation

Historical and modern developments in practice

Design in the broadest sense of the word fulfils a pivotal function in the dynamic process of localisation, appropriation, vitalising and marketing of (collective) cultural heritage. The musealisation of the landscape, the corresponding design of chic department stores and museums, striking architecture, heritage as a tourist attraction, cultural demonstrations, exhibitions, multimedia productions, fashion, everyday and luxury consumer goods; they are all trends and products that involve designers. The strategies of temptation and styles of communication and persuasion that they develop in this process of cultural creation, are themselves part of heritage-related design traditions from both elite and popular culture from all over the world. The culture-scientific study of design is an excellent way of better penetrating the cultural dynamics of present-day economic treatment of cultural heritage and the nature of the processes of localisation in an era of globalisation. It is not just that such studies contribute to the highly necessary insight into innovation as a cultural process, but when related to the heritage sector itself, they also create a basis for reflection on the workings of the field. Given its societal and economic relevance, design is undoubtedly a neglected area in scientific research, especially when compared to autonomous art, which has its non-utilitarian character to thank for its position. Rigid hierarchies in the history of art and culture form a hindrance to historic design practice (now cultural heritage) being adequately documented and opened up for the benefit of research and further formation of theories. There is much to catch up on here. At least as urgent is the development of a productive synergy between cultural scientists and present-day designers.

In what now follows, it is the dynamics of this cultural production in relation to cultural heritage that is the central point. Instead of 'culture as a context', the emphasis is laid on 'creating culture' in a broad sense. Dutch developments can be the point of departure, placed in a comparative framework, where disciplinary limits between culture production and cultural practice on the one hand, and cultural sciences on the other are decided. Innovation is approached as a cultural process where the heritage of today and tomorrow are defined in relation to what is now referred to as historical heritage.

More specifically, this can be detailed as follows. The artificial division between technologically constructing sciences on the one hand and cultural sciences on the other means that the potential of cultural heritage (material culture, knowledge and skills) in the field of design and innovation in the Netherlands remains underused. Following the example in English-speaking countries, it should be possible, with the development of research and expertise in the field of design ethnography, to break down this division. Design ethnography means that new products and services are defined and designed with the help of ethnographic methods based on everyday practice. The idea is that designers can justify situating their designs in the lives of potential consumers, in accordance with their needs and experience. In spite of the important design tradition in the Netherlands, there is a lacking of the necessary socio-cultural insight for making a success of design in real life. To break through this impasse, the

methodological and theoretical development of design-ethnography needs to be tackled, in close cooperation between ethnographers and designers. It is not just Dutch designers (including immigrants), but also talented southerners who should be involved in this. Apart from the benefit that cultural diversity offers in finding creative solutions, the collective development of know-how contributes to innovations in the field of starvation and poverty, healthcare systems, sustainable living environments, and global relations. The intercultural exchange also stimulates new designs and innovations at home, aimed at improving the quality of life, economic and ecological sustainability and promoting social cohesion.

More specifically, but not exclusively, this is a call for more attention to be given to Dutch design, which can be regarded as an important piece of cultural heritage. A great deal of basic research still remains to be carried out in the archives of companies, organisations and private practitioners. This inventory research forms a foundation for research with a wider scope, such as the preoccupation of design with the *Zeitgeist*, but also the importance that is deemed to be attached to design (including fashion) retrospectively in terms of heritage, for giving a portrayal of an era. Opening up these sources is part of the framework of extending the bodies that could lie at the foundation of further formation of theories and applicable innovation research.

In the history of design in the societal context, it is important to study how designers and artists from different disciplines have dealt with their own and other cultural heritage over time and contributed to the creation of new cultural forms and culture products. 'Naturally' or spontaneously designing as an aspect of daily life – present as cultural heritage in museum collections and within families – and the interchange with industrial design and graphic techniques is also an important factor here. Because although in the industrial European context, design in terms of shape and materials are often closely associated with modernity, the traditional side of the trade and the more everyday, rural and colonial heritage are often deliberately used as a source of inspiration. This interchange between heritage and innovation is an example of the dynamics of design processes as an expression of cultural aspirations and identity.

The demand for economic association with cultural heritage also affects the functioning of the heritage sector in itself. This concerns the explicit and implicit objectives of cultural production in this sector, but also the educational goals, the business culture, and the field of tension between product and market. Often it is very deliberate constructions, such as the creation of an atmosphere of nostalgia, or the protection closing off of heritage in terms of cultural and intellectual property rights. The question of what criteria in the 'criticism' and operation of the professional circuit apply is also relevant. The latter societal field, in which reputation is important, aims for high-quality provision that is nevertheless coming under increasing pressure from the demand for economic return. In the 'market conformist' business operations of the organisations there is too little room for the necessary reflection, which is not found in the academic world either. Also of importance is research into the politics of representation of the organisations, their relationships to 'source communities', opinions about ownership and the connection between representation and renewal of cultural practices outside the organisations. Cultural organisations like the museum, which came about in the West, form an organisational model that has been translated in many different ways all over the world. The question about how this model relates to the world's various cultural practices is also an important line of approach for research into possible innovations in the heritage sector.

Extra literature

- Attfield, J., 'Design as a practice of modernity', *Journal of Material Culture* 2 (1997) 3, 267-289.
- Florida, R., *The rise of the creative class* (New York: Basic Books 2002).
- , *The flight of the creative class* (New York: HarperBusiness 2005).
- Frascara, J., Ed., *Design and the social sciences: Making connections* (London: Taylor & Francis 2002).
- Rutten, P., W. Manshanden, M. den Blanken and O. Koops, *Vormgeving in de creatieve Economie* (Delft: TNO 2005) [report 33553].
- Squires, S. and B. Byrne, Eds., *Creating breakthrough ideas: The collaboration of anthropologists and designers in the product development industry* (Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey 2002).

Timmer, P., *Een toekomst voor vormgevingsarchieven* (Amsterdam: Premsele Stichting 2004).
Wasson, C., 'Ethnography in the field of design', *Human Organization* 59 (2000) 4, 377-388.

Intermediality and heritage mobility

In 2005, during the opening of the world football championships for the under-20s in the Parkstad stadium in Kerkrade, 26 actors re-enacted the pose taken by the figures in Rembrandt's *Night Watch*. The main people in the painting were walking around on the pitch, before eventually adopting the positions as shown in the painting, with the goalposts and crossbar serving as the picture frame. It was an excellent example of intermediality of cultural heritage: the art of painting and the art of performance, high and low culture, museum and football pitch mixed with each other in a real-life display. The *Night Watch* has been reproduced in books, documentaries and films, can be found on posters, T-shirts, key rings, can be made from ready-made sewing kits, and has been performed live as a *tableau vivant*. These are all manifestations that relate to the 'real' painting, to the museum where the painting is on display, and to the national and international art historical canon in which it is included. This phenomenon is not limited to today's world. The "Royal Entries" made by Renaissance monarchs, for instance, were equally multimedial and intermedial: urban theatrical traditions and religion mingled with the scholarly culture of the Renaissance in spectacles comprising odes and triumphal arches, *tableaux vivants* and *Masses*. Emperor Charles V was King Solomon and Hercules as well as "the good Emperor" who figured in popular legends.

Cultural heritage is fundamentally intermedial: it migrates continually from one medium to another, expressed in objects, buildings, pictures and images, texts and the whole gamut of practical applications. It is appearing all the time in new places and taking on new functions, gaining a fresh appeal, and is targeted at an ever-changing audience. This intermediality has always been a feature of heritage and encompasses many directions and forms of expression. Producers of culture have traditionally incorporated various types of media and genres in their work, monomedial culture products can be transmitted to various layers of the population through various media, while the function of the same items of cultural value can change completely against the background of different contexts and eras. This makes the movement of heritage between various media and its transfer both a diachronic and synchronic process, and an essential feature of the dynamics of cultural heritage. The term intermediality is closely related with intertextuality, interactivity, convergence and performativity. By intermediality, we mean here that the production and reproduction, distribution and consumption of heritage by various instruments take place through a range of media and different processes of attributing significance. The theme of the research is directed at questions in which the 'migration process', or the nature and meaning of diachronic and/or synchronic shifts, remains key.

The concept of 'intermediality' requires a more systematic formation of theory that uses interpretations of heritage like 'text', where 'text' should be broadly taken as all forms of expression or artefacts that portray a meaning. The notion of 'performativity' can provide an important link for research into the intermediality of such 'texts'. Formations of theories from the history of art and literature, communications and media science and anthropology come together here, involving the appeal to and effect of texts in relation to individual and collective audiences, as well as the autonomous interaction between individual texts.

Intermediality generates new heritage-centred actor networks, new conflicts and controversies, new power relationships, which as yet have hardly been systematically researched at all. Individual and autonomous culture producers work together with other individuals and institutions, have to be able to practise other disciplines and take other interests into account. As a result, heritage is found and develops in ever-changing power configurations of cultural industries and actors, the interaction of which is of great importance for the creation and disappearance of heritage. Intermediality always affects the relationship between the creator, commissioning party, and client. Nowadays, intermediality affects financial interests associated with ownership rights, where the tension around the commercial reproduction of collective cultural heritage, such as indigenous music or art, is a constantly recurring area of conflict.

The content and form of heritage, in other words its character, change, depending on the medium in which it is depicted. In the context of this research programme, the question of how cultural meanings shift between different media and media cultures is of particular importance. The way in which heritage was understood and defined in oral culture had a different significance to print culture, which in turn was not the same as heritage in visual or digital culture. This is about meanings of heritage that shift at a 'textual' level, in the broad sense mentioned above.

The performativity of heritage in concrete-use situations will depend on various factors: which medium is involved, which modalities are involved (image, word, sound, material, immaterial), the context in which reception takes place (leisure time, school, work, public or private setting). Research into the specific articulations of these factors in an actual heritage 'performance' is generally centred round the question of how, in different eras and down the years, the wide-ranging performativity of the media involved keeps, and has kept, heritage alive and renewed. In concrete terms, it can be directed at policy-related relevant questions in relation to cultural literacy and the spread of culture, but also in the embedding of heritage in the everyday lives of different groups of citizens.

Extra literature

Benjamin, W., *Illuminations*, Ed. and with an introd. by H. Ahrendt [1955] (London: Pimlico edition 1999).

Butler, J., *Bodies that matter. On the discursive limits of "sex"* (New York etc.: Routledge 1993).

Edwards, E., *Raw histories. Photographs, anthropologies and museums* (Oxford and New York: Berg 2001).

Genette, G., *Narrative Discourse* [1972] (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1980).

Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, B., *Destination culture: Tourism, museums, and heritage* (Berkeley CA, etc.: University of California Press 1998).

Kristeva, J., *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art* (New York: Columbia University Press 1980).

Oosterling, H., Slager, H. en Van de Vall, R., *Intermediale reflecties* (Rotterdam: DAF Cahiers 2007).

Oostrom, F.P. van, *Maerlants wereld* (Amsterdam: Prometheus 1996).

Schechner, R., *Performance theory* (London: Routledge 1988).

Popular culture and heritage

The term 'popular culture' embraces the shape and content of broad cultural participation, supported by (new) media, outside the field of the traditional arts. In addition, the usual definitions distinguish popular culture from what is known as folk culture. However, the historical and contemporary interrelationships between folk culture, popular culture and the arts are such that the demarcation lines between these three cultural fields are constantly shifting, as well as being the subject of societal and cultural conflict. It is precisely in the light of these shifting lines of demarcation that interesting questions are raised in the context of cultural heritage and cultural dynamics. This is translated in two directions of research within the Cultural Dynamics programme, namely the shifting boundaries and new cultural fields. In both cases, the programme assumes that popular culture is not only an international phenomenon, but it is precisely the local appropriations thereof, including by the Dutch, that are of particular interest.

What influence does popular culture have on artistic theory and aesthetics? On the one hand, popular culture saw the development of its own aesthetics, and on the other, art itself responded to popular culture by borrowing, transforming, parodying, or repeating its themes, styles and products. An important area of conflict in all cultural fields (music, visual, literature, computer games) is the delicate relationship between art (as serious, cerebral or critical) and amusement or pleasure (one of the cornerstones of popular culture). Relevant questions here include the presumed autonomy of the arts versus the (commercial) heteronomy of popular culture, the relationship between subsidised and commercial culture, and national culture policies.

The way in which older and newer mass media have been included in 'everyday', non-medial culture that is tied to specific areas and points of time, such as fairs, street markets, public holidays and

birthdays, etc. is a second important research theme. The historical dimension plays a significant role here: older types of mass media such as illustrated papers, which gave a pictorial account of the major world exhibitions held in the second half of the nineteenth century, or travelling cinemas (cinematographs), which were able to show local communities moving pictures of the outside world for the first time, may just as easily be incorporated into the research as today's mass media. This particularly concerns processes of appropriation that are situated in time and place. Based on such processes of appropriation, more light could be thrown on the cultural dynamics of a more or less closed national culture making the transition to a transnational, more hybrid and intermittent cultural reality, in which on the one hand global influences and on the other, diasporic influences such as those of immigrant cultures, play a more and more prominent role. These dynamics are also crucially important in the post-colonial world, for example in Africa and parts of Asia, where 'global' elements of an international popular culture sometimes function as a crowbar in local cultural relationships, but where also adaptations and transformations from traditional culture play a new role in international settings.

As well as this theme of shifting movements, further research is possible into the following new cultural fields that are emerging: in terms of cultural heritage, youth culture and pop music played a principal role in the crucial historical transformation of the Netherlands (and Western Europe) in the late sixties. Crucial processes like individualisation, internationalisation, Americanisation, informalisation, etc. were attributed to this transformation. With regard to its societal effect, youth culture and pop music have in that sense been an unequivocal part of Dutch cultural heritage in the last three decades.

The mediums of film and television are in fact 'containers' in which various cultural genres and practices are brought together and sometimes combined. Here, there is a dynamic working in two directions, through the rise of a supranational or transnational cultural representation (partly through the influence of immigrant cultures) and of a regional or local cultural representation. Many of the characteristics of film and television culture are strongly duplicated in the cultural role and significance of the personal computer. For young people especially, the PC functions in a similar fashion as a sort of all-purpose cultural instrument. Nowadays, popular culture is increasingly interpreted as convergence culture, whereby "convergence" refers to the situation in which various media coexist, and media content flows from one medium to another. An example of this is the way in which the book *Crusade in Jeans* (Beckman, 1972) recently inspired the eponymous film, computer game and hunt in Museum Catharijneconvent.

Radio is the quintessence of what 'popular culture' is: an unemphatic, prosaic, unremarkable, not expressly canonised or sacred aspect of everyday culture of virtually every citizen. More than television, radio also functions as an interactive medium, to which listeners can make an active contribution in many different ways. Some radio programmes in the Netherlands have, down the years, literally become (living) 'cultural heritage' and have made an indelible mark on Dutch popular culture. The proliferation of both local and regional radio stations and of commercial news and music channels will in the last twenty years have changed everything about the role that radio plays as the medium of popular culture, but hardly any research has been carried out into these developments.

Sport, finally, is a separate cultural phenomenon; sporting heroes are particularly idolised in popular culture, advertising, and the world of management and leadership. They are also the object of literary description and continual comments by journalists. In the case of regional sports especially, it can clearly be seen how this can be an important part of cultural heritage, or as with the Elfstedentocht (Eleven-City Skating Race), an important factor in regional identity. As well as the relationship between sport and localised identities, the articulation of gender and ethnicity in sporting cultures is also important.

Extra literature

- Abercrombie, N. and B. Longhurst, *Audiences* (London: Sage 1998).
- Barker, C., *Television, globalization and cultural identities* (Buckingham: Open University Press 1999).
- Bauman, R. Ed., *Folklore, cultural performances and popular entertainments. A communications centered handbook* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1992).
- Burke, P., *Popular culture in early modern Europe* (Aldershot: Wildwood House 1988).
- Castells, M., *The Internet galaxy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2002).
- Couldry, N., *Media rituals. A critical approach* (London: Routledge 2003).

- Fiske, J., *Reading the popular* (Boston: Unwin Hyman 1989).
- Frith, S., *Performing rites. Evaluating popular music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1996).
- Gans, H., *Popular & High Culture. An analysis and evaluation of taste. Rev. and updated edition* (New York: Basic Books 1999).
- Jenkins, H., *Textual poachers. Television fans and participatory culture* (New York: Routledge 1992).
- Jenkins, H., *Convergence culture. Where old and new media collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006)
- Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, B., *Destination culture: Tourism, museums, and heritage* (Berkeley CA, etc.: University of California Press 1998).
- Mul, J. de, *Cyberspace Odyssee*, (Kampen : Klement 2002).
- Negus, K., *Popular music in theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press 1996).
- Rothenbuhler, E., *Ritual communication: from everyday conversation to mediated ceremony* (London: Sage 1998).
- Rowe, D., *Popular cultures. Rock music, sport and the politics of pleasure* (London: Sage 1995).
- Taylor, T.D., *Global pop. World music, world markets* (New York: Routledge 1997).
- Wicke, P., *Von Mozart zu Madonna. Eine Kulturgeschichte der Popmusik* (Leipzig: Kiepenheuer 1998).

II. Organisation of the programme

1. General

The Cultural Dynamics programme is a joint programme of the Humanities and Social Science Divisions of the NWO, and WOTRO Science for global development. The total budget for the programme is EUR 8.5 million. It is assumed that the programme will run for seven years (2007-2014).

The first phase of the programme was launched in 2007 with a call for proposals, and a total of 9 research projects were approved. You will find a brief description of these projects on the programme website www.nwo.cultureledynamiek. The research projects involve cooperation with societal and cultural institutions. A second call for proposals will be made in 2009, in which researchers are invited to submit applications for projects relating to the Intermediality and/or Popular Culture lines of approach.

2. Organisation

The overall management of the programme and responsibility for its content lie with the programme committee. The programme committee consists of researchers who are experts in the field of Cultural Dynamics.

The assessment of the research proposals will be carried out by an ad hoc assessment committee. The organisation and the administration of the programme, and the selected research proposals, are subject to the general rules of the NWO. An evaluation is planned both during and after the programme.

3. Types of subsidy

The Cultural Dynamics programme has one type of subsidy for the second phase, namely: research projects with a maximum volume of EUR 450,000. These research projects are intended to encourage researchers with a promising multidisciplinary research plan.

Applications for the research projects should elaborate on the Intermediality and/or Popular Culture lines of approach. We will be asking applicants to establish links - within the Intermediality and/or Popular Culture line of approach - with one or more of the other lines of approach contained in the theme programme in order to ensure that applications really are compatible with the entire framework of the theme programme. We also explicitly ask applicants to devote attention to the historical dimension of all types of heritage.

The subsidy of EUR 450,000 is intended for at least two researchers, to be subsidised by NWO, whereby at least one PhD researcher place is obligatory. Other options include post-docs or possible replacements for senior researchers, provided that this results in one or more publications in connection with the programme.

For proposals involving research to be carried out in developing countries,¹ the research team should consist of at least one applicant from a partner institute in the country concerned, and one PhD- or post-doc researcher from a developing country.

¹ Developing countries are low and average wage countries that are entitled to official development aid (*Official Development Assistance*, ODA), as defined by the OECD is (see www.oecd.org/dac/stats/dacelist).

4. 2009 subsidy round

The second call for proposals will be launched in mid-March 2009, and will invite researchers to submit detailed research proposals for research projects with a maximum volume of EUR 450,000 no later than 4 June 2009.

The call for proposals gives detailed information about the subsidy round.

5. Dissemination of knowledge/communication

The results of the programme will initially be publicised by the researchers through the usual circuit of specialised trade literature (dissertations, magazine articles, monographs). Given the nature of the theme, other forms of knowledge transfer will be used, involving new, less common methods, or will be targeted at wider audiences, such as media productions, opinion articles in quality papers, exhibitions and websites, participation in policy formation, and perhaps the creation of a piece of art or a cultural production. Knowledge dissemination could also occur through opening up sources, in other words classifying source material (collections) on which the research is based and making it available to the public. Finally, the results of the programme will be presented in a synthesising overview.

Each research project will be subject to the condition that the transfer of knowledge will receive a great deal of attention. A communication plan should form a standard part of any detailed application. The programme website will not only maintain communication between the disciplines and researchers taking part in the programme, but it will also make available the results. An express aim is to disseminate the results through educational channels.

6. Internationalisation

A condition for submitting a research proposal is that of an international orientation, highlighted by a broad, non-nationally limited theme, by a comparative approach, and/or by a partnership with external parties.

The programme committee will emphasise the international orientation of the programme by organising two international conferences halfway through and at the end of the programme.

The programme committee will also attempt to organise an international scientific and cultural event in the Netherlands that makes a link between the culture and migration within Europe and cultural dynamics in the countries of origin of immigrants. In addition to scientists, societal and cultural organisations will be invited to take part. Discussions will also be held with UNESCO to decide how the results of the research projects that are awarded a subsidy can play a role in the relevant UNESCO policy bodies in Paris.

More particularly, consideration will be given to the organisation of conferences in partnership with research institutes in the most important immigration countries, with a twofold purpose: scientific, and in the form of reach-out seminars.

7. Programme committee

The programme committee, chaired by Prof. W.Th.M. Frijhoff, comprises the following members:

- Prof. W.Th.M. Frijhoff (em.) (president), VU University, Amsterdam
- Prof. T. F. M. ter Bogt, Utrecht University
- Prof. P.L. Geschiere, University of Amsterdam
- Prof. M.S.S.E. Janssen, Erasmus University Rotterdam
- Prof. A.A.M. de Jong, University of Amsterdam/Netherlands Open Air Museum

- Prof. M.J.H. Meijer, Maastricht University
- Prof. J.S. Pollmann, Leiden University
- Dr J. Raessens, Utrecht University