

JAHRBUCH FÜR EUROPÄISCHE ETHNOLOGIE 2017

JAHRBUCH
FÜR
EUROPÄISCHE
ETHNOLOGIE

DIE NIEDERLANDE

IM AUFTRAG DER GÖRRES-GESELLSCHAFT
HERAUSGEGEBEN VON:

Heidrun Alzheimer
Sabine Doering-Manteuffel
Daniel Drascek
Angela Treiber

DRITTE FOLGE 12·2017
VERLAG FERDINAND SCHÖNINGH

Redaktion

Angela Treiber

Andrea Maier, Louise Walker (Redaktionsassistentz)

Franziska Hodek, Gerhard J. Schönhofer

Doris Stocker (Layout)

Umschlagbild: "Rotterdam, Holland. 24th Sep, 2016. Shopping along the West-Kruiskade is like taking a trip around the world. Dim sum, swaying golden cats, Surinamese gilt, authentic Dutch" – Contributor: ZUMA Press, Inc./ Alamy Stock Photo.

Jahrbuch für Europäische Ethnologie

Dritte Folge des Jahrbuchs für Volkskunde im Auftrag der Görres-Gesellschaft

Herausgeberinnen und Herausgeber:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Heidrun Alzheimer, Universität Bamberg

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Sabine Doering-Manteuffel, Universität Augsburg

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Daniel Drascek, Universität Regensburg

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Angela Treiber, Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt

Redaktion:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Angela Treiber, Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Universitätsallee 1, D – 85072 Eichstätt, Telefon: 08421 / 93-21502, Fax: 08421 / 93-21798, E-Mail: angela.treiber@ku.de

Doris Stocker (Layout), Alemannenstraße 78, 97318 Kitzingen, E-Mail: d.stocker@arcor.de

Das Jahrbuch für Europäische Ethnologie erscheint einmal jährlich im Umfang von ca. 240 Seiten zu den Generalversammlungen der Görres-Gesellschaft. Das Jahrbuch zahlt keine Honorare. Mitglieder der Görres-Gesellschaft erhalten 25 Prozent Nachlass auf den Ladenpreis bei Bestellung über die Geschäftsstelle: Görres-Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaft: Collegium Albertinum, Adenauer Allee 17-19, 53113 Bonn

Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh

Auslieferung:

Brockhaus Commission, Kreidler Str. 9, 70806 Kornwestheim, 07154 / 13270
schoeningh@brocom.de

© Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, ein Imprint der Brill-Gruppe (Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, Niederlande; Brill USA Inc., Boston MA, USA; Brill Asia Pte Ltd, Singapore; Brill Deutschland GmbH, Paderborn, Deutschland)

ISSN 1868-131X

ISBN 978-3-506-78875-7

Inhalt

ANGELA TREIBER: Editorial	
Europäische – Niederländische Ethnologie: Alltagskultur, Kulturelles Gedächtnis und Kulturelles Erbe in einer Diversen Gesellschaft	7
European – Dutch Ethnology: Everyday culture, cultural memory and cultural heritage in a diverse society	11
SOPHIE ELPERS: “Alledaagse cultuur” – A matter of opinion. The history and current state of European Ethnology in the Netherlands	15
ROB VAN GINKEL: ‘Quaint and picturesque’ Representing and appropriating Dutch fisher folk	39
LEONIE CORNIPS, VINCENT DE ROOIJ AND IRENE STENGES: Carnavalesque language use and the construction of local identities A plea for languageculture as a field of research	61
MARKUS BALKENHOL: Monuments, bodies, history Commemorating slavery in the Netherlands	91
ALBERT VAN DER ZEIJDEN: Intangible heritage as dialogue and as contestation West-Kruiskade, Rotterdam and the changing face of modern cultural memory	111
MARLEEN DE WITTE: Heritage, identity and the body in Afro-Dutch self-styling	127
HESTER DIBBITS AND NORAH KARROUCHE: Ticking the box? Material cultures of migration in Museum Rotterdam and the Netherlands Open Air Museum	147
HALLEH GHORASHI: Rethinking diversity beyond dichotomies of self-other	169

Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter

BALKENHOL, MARKUS, Dr., postdoc Ethnology, Meertens Institute, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, M PO Box 10855, 1001 EW Amsterdam. Markus.Balkenhol@meertens.knaw.nl

CORNIPS, LEONIE, Dr., Prof., Department of Language Variation, Meertens Institute, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, M PO Box 10855, 1001 EW Amsterdam. leonie.cornips@meertens.knaw.nl – Professor, Literature and Art, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS), Maastricht University, PO Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht. leonie.cornips@maastrichtuniversity.nl

DE ROOIJ, VINCENT, Dr. MA, Assistant-Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Amsterdam. PO Box 15509, 1001 NA Amsterdam. V.A.deRooij@uva.nl

DE WITTE, MARLEEN, Dr., Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology, University of Amsterdam. PO Box 15509, 1001 NA Amsterdam. M.deWitte@uva.nl

DIBBITS, HESTER C., Dr. Prof., Head of the research group Cultural heritage & MA Museology programme director, Reinwardt Academy, Amsterdam University of the Arts, Hortusplantsoen 1-3, 1018 TZ Amsterdam. – Endowed Professor, Historical Culture and Education, Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication, Erasmus University Rotterdam, PO Box 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam. hester.dibbits@ahk.nl

ELPERS, SOPHIE, Dr. M.A., postdoc Ethnology, Meertens Institute, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, M PO Box 10855, 1001 EW Amsterdam. Sophie.elpers@meertens.knaw.nl

GHORASHI, HALLEH, Dr. Prof., Professor, Diversity and Integration, Department of Sociology, VU University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam. h.ghorashi@vu.nl

KARROUCHE, NORAH, Dr., Lecturer, History Department, VU University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam. n.f.f.karrouche@vu.nl

STENGES, IRENE, Dr., Researcher Ethnology – head of scientific board, Meertens Institute, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, M PO Box 10855, 1001 EW Amsterdam. Stenges@meertens.knaw.nl

VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT, Dr., Researcher, Dutch Center for Intangible Heritage/ Kenniscentrum Immaterieel Erfgoed Nederland. Multatulilaan 12, 4103 NM, Culemborg. – Visiting Researcher, Department of History and Art History – Cultural History University Utrecht, Drift 6, 3512 BS Utrecht. a.t.vanderzeijden@uu.nl

VAN GINKEL, ROB, Dr., Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology University of Amsterdam. PO Box 15509 1001 NA Amsterdam. R.J.vanGinkel@uva.nl

Intangible heritage as dialogue and as contestation

West-Kruiskade, Rotterdam and the changing face of modern cultural memory

Albert van der Zeijden

The superdiversity of its large conurbations presents Western Europe with many challenges, not least the politics of social belonging. Due to the influx of migrants and refugees since the 1960s, the ethnic composition of these cities has altered. A city district such as West-Kruiskade in Rotterdam now includes more than 160 different ethnic groups. For the authorities it is a huge challenge to integrate newcomers with so many different backgrounds. The challenge has many dimensions, including economic, political and also - as highlighted in this article – cultural ones. West-Kruiskade was a city district with social and economic problems, including huge unemployment figures and high crime rates, mainly in connection with drug use. West-Kruiskade constituted a problem area that needed to be addressed. This resulted in the founding of the Alliance West-Kruiskade, a joint venture of the city of Rotterdam, the Urban Space Committee [gebiedscommissie], Woonstad Rotterdam and the shopkeepers association. Its main goal is urban improvement in this deprived area. Significantly, the Alliance focuses on diversity. The idea was to transform West-Kruiskade into a site of leisure and consumption with a high ethnic profile and to use ethnic entrepreneurs to achieve this goal. This policy goal focuses on urban regeneration and revitalisation, not uncommon in other cities in Western Europe which face the same problems and also use ethnic entrepreneurs as a key component in their urban policies.¹ On the website of the Alliance this is called ‘transforming West-Kruiskade into a paradise for lovers of good food, hip clothing and real Rotterdam’, ‘real Rotterdam’ meaning the culturally diversified Rotterdam. The Alliance West-Kruiskade is coordinated by ALICE FORTES, who works at Woonstad Rotterdam. She acts as a cultural broker in bringing the different stakeholders together. Woonstad Rotterdam owns property in Rotterdam and wants to enhance the quality of life in the city, aiming at making the Kruiskade more attractive for its inhabitants. The Urban Space Committee acts as a kind of intermediary organisation that organises community participation while implementing the urban improvement plans of the city government. The shopkeepers take part because they can make the whole project feasible in an economic sense. It is thus a powerful mix of different stakeholders.

In 2015 the Alliance West-Kruiskade decided to nominate the cultural diversity of the West-Kruiskade for the National Inventory of Intangible Heritage in the Nether-

¹ VAN LIEMPT, ILSE / VELDBOER, LEX: Problematic Areas or Places of Fun? Ethnic Marketing in the Multicultural City of Rotterdam. In: DUYVENDAK, JAN WILLEM/ HENDRIKS, FRANK/ NIEKERK, MIES VAN (eds.): City in Sight. Dutch Dealings with Urban Change. Amsterdam 2009, pp. 81-99.

lands. What I am going to do in this article is to investigate the role of intangible heritage in fostering social cohesion. In doing this I will build on my work for the Dutch Centre for Intangible Heritage, the organisation that implements the UNESCO convention for the safeguarding of Intangible Heritage in the Netherlands. I will combine this with the theoretical framework on heritage and social memory furnished by heritage scholar RODNEY HARRISON. RODNEY HARRISON was not the first to conclude that intangible heritage is intimately connected with memory.² Intangible heritage is about social practices that give the participants ‘a sense of identity and continuity’, as it is called in the UNESCO convention. The flourishing of a new kind of communal festivals in the West-Kruiskade, with feasts such as Keti Koti and Diwali, will be analysed by referring to the recent work of Swiss based migration historian MONIKA SALZBRUNN. She noted the same trend in Paris, in the city district Belleville, which is comparable to West-Kruiskade in Rotterdam. In my view the new evolving communal festivals that SALZBRUNN studies can be interpreted as intangible heritage manifestations that build on social memories.

It is all about ‘feeling at home’, as the Dutch sociologist JAN WILLEM DUYVENDAK has called it in his study on social belonging and nostalgia in Western Europe.³ Rather than the word ‘nostalgia’, I will use the term ‘heritage’ because it is less pejorative and more dynamic. Heritage is about linking the past to the present or, more precisely, linking present day identities to heritage. As I will show in this case study of West-Kruiskade, social memory is neither static nor unchangeable. In a superdiverse context, social memory involves a continuous process of adaptation and exchange, in which new social identities are shaped. It is a process with many different stakeholders and this makes some sort of dialogue inevitable. RODNEY HARRISON’S concept of ‘dialogical heritage’ proved useful to interpret processes of heritage formation in a superdiverse context such as West-Kruiskade.

UNESCO, intangible heritage and national inventories

First let me explain something about the UNESCO convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The convention was adopted in 2003 and went into operation in 2006. The Netherlands ratified the convention in 2012, followed among others by Germany in 2013. Up to now 172 countries have ratified the convention. It is stated in the preamble that the convention is intended as an answer to challenges ‘of globalization and social transformation (...) which, alongside the conditions they create for renewed dialogue among communities, also give rise, as does the phenomenon of intolerance, to grave threats of deterioration, disappearance and destruction of the in-

² HARRISON, RODNEY/ ROSE, DEBORAH: Intangible Heritage. In: BENTON, TIM (ed.): Understanding Heritage and Memory. Manchester 2010, pp. 238-276.

³ DUYVENDAK, JAN WILLEM: The Politics of Home. Belonging and Nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States. New York 2011, pp. 26-42.

tangible cultural heritage'.⁴ At first sight, this may look like a defensive, conservative stance. But in fact the convention is not about freezing intangible heritage. It is about creating a sustainable future for intangible heritage, which is 'constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity'. In connection with economic, social and environmental issues, the term 'safeguarding' refers to sustainable development. This sustainable development is an important feature of the recently revised Operational Directives, acknowledging 'the dynamic nature of intangible cultural heritage in both urban and rural contexts', an important addition recognising the dynamics and diversity of intangible heritage in different contexts, including the urban.⁵ Also of interest is the bottom-up approach of the Convention, with a strong role for communities, groups and individuals in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and re-creation of the intangible cultural heritage. Communities are defined as networks of people including a great variety of stakeholders, such as tradition bearers, performers or custodians, who are themselves responsible for the safeguarding of their intangible cultural heritage.⁶

To ensure identification with a view to safeguarding, each State Party shall draw up one or more inventories of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory. The Netherlands added that the Dutch Inventory should also reflect the cultural diversity in this country. This is one of the reasons why the Dutch Centre for Intangible Heritage invests in raising awareness not just in the rural parts of the Kingdom but also in the urbanised west. In cooperation with others we organised several conferences on Intangible Heritage in the city, with the planned nomination of the West-Kruiskade as a useful starting point.

The challenge of superdiversity

West-Kruiskade is a city district in Rotterdam near the central railway station. This city district, at least the western part of the Kruiskade, escaped the German bombardment of 14 May 1940, which destroyed the rest of the city centre of Rotterdam. It is now a thriving shopping street in 'the Old West' (het Oude Westen) of the city, which, because of the diverse backgrounds of its inhabitants and the multicultural atmosphere of its shops, reflects the cultural diversity of Rotterdam: 70 % of the shops are exploited by newcomers of diverse backgrounds. Also the number of Chinese shops is strik-

⁴ Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003, Paris, 17 October 2003, article 2 of the General Provisions: <http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URLID=17716&URLDO=DOTOPIC&URLSECTION=201.html> (10. 3. 2017).

⁵ Operational Directives for the Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, article 170: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/directives> (10. 03. 2017).

⁶ Expert Meeting on Community Involvement in Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage: Towards the Implementation of the 2003 Convention 13-15 March 2006, Tokyo, Japan: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/00034-EN.pdf> (10. 03. 2017).

ing and constitutes a Rotterdam Chinatown in itself. In the 'Old West' (het Oude Westen) there is not a dominant ethnic group: 27 % are indigenous, 15 % Surinamese, 14 % Turkish, 13 % Moroccan, 7 % Cape Verdean, 3 % Dutch Antillean.⁷ The more recent figures of CBS Statistics Netherlands are:

Onderwerpen	Bevolking	Aantal inwoners	Allochtonen						
			Westers totaal	Niet-westers totaal	Marokko	Nederlandse Antillen en Aruba	Suriname	Turkije	Overig niet-westers
Wijken en buurten	aantal								
Rotterdam		629 606	76 908	236 689	43 064	23 859	52 584	47 778	69 404
Rotterdam Centrum		32 925	5 845	12 065	1 940		960	2 415	1 630
Stadsdriehoek		14 825	3 020	3 625	310		320	700	350
Oude Westen		9 350	1 140	5 475	1 300		250	1 170	1 000

Fig. 1: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek – Kerncijfers wijken en buurten 2016 (<http://statline.cbs.nl/Statweb/publication/?VW=T&DM=SLNL&PA=83487NED&D1=4,16-22&D2=12032-12146&HD=170214-1541&HDR=T&STB=G1> [13. 3. 2017])

A city district such as West-Kruiskade represents a new cultural diversity for which sociologist STEVEN VERTOVEC coined the concept of superdiversity. This concept of superdiversity supersedes the older concept of multiculturalism.⁸ Since the sixties, migration has become a permanent feature of all larger cities in Western Europe and this has completely overturned the ethnic composition of most of the larger city conurbations. In these conurbations there is no longer a clear majority of any ethnic group, not even of the former dominant host culture. They have all become minorities in a diversified urban surrounding and this has completely changed the dynamics of culture in these conurbations. The older concept of multiculturalism strongly focused on the mutual enrichment of different cultures in a city or in a country and underestimated possi-

⁷ Figures of 2007: <https://zoek.officielebekendmakingen.nl/kst-30995-30-b5.pdf> (13. 3. 2017)

⁸ VERTOVEC, STEVEN: Super-Diversity and Its Implications. In: Ethnic and Racial Studies 30:6 (2007), pp. 1024-1054. A useful introduction to superdiversity is: – GELDOLF, DIRK: Superdiversity in the heart of Europe. How migration changes our society. Leuven 2016. See also: – BAUMANN, GERD: The multicultural riddle. Rethinking National, Ethnic and Religious Identities. Abingdon, Oxon 2014. Especially on diversity and urban space see: BERG, METTE LOUISE/ SIGONA, NANDO: Ethnography, Diversity and Urban Space. In: Identities 20:4 (2013), pp. 347-360. – CHIMIANTI, MILENA/ VAN LIEMPT, ILSE: Super-diversity and the art of living in ethnically concentrated areas. In: Identities 22:1 (2015), pp. 19-35. In connection to intangible heritage our Swiss and German colleagues organized a conference: *Lebendige Traditionen in der urbanen Gesellschaft // Les traditions vivantes dans la société urbaine*. Verlag für Kultur und Geschichte, Baden 2015.

ble tensions and areas of conflict. It was also a more or less essentialist approach to 'cultures'. The advocates of the new concept of superdiversity call for a more dynamic approach in which 'the living together of different cultures', which is the usual starting point of multicultural studies, is no longer central. Instead, the contact and exchange between the different groups is taken as a starting point, the dynamics of culture. Post-colonial thinker HOMI K. BHABHA uses the metaphor of the stairwell as a 'third' space, where people of different backgrounds meet on a stairwell as an interactive social space.⁹ According to BHABHA, cultural differences are nowadays negotiated in city conurbations interpreted as 'contact zones'. In this process of appropriation and adaption, cultural identities are shaped. BHABHA states the following: 'In protecting the tangible and intangible heritage of any one culture, we preserve its living memory – its values, norms and aesthetic forms – and can study the way in which it participates in the multifocal and multivalent mosaic of meanings and customs that defines intercultural dialogues in our times.'

The cultural aspect

What does this mean for the West-Kruiskade? When ALICE FORTES and her group of entrepreneurs of the Alliance West-Kruiskade came to the Dutch Centre for Intangible Heritage, they indicated that they wanted to nominate 'the cultural diversity of the West-Kruiskade' for the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Netherlands. When we asked them how this cultural diversity was related to concrete social practices that may count as intangible heritage practices, they came up with feasts and practices such as Keti Koti, the Chinese New Year celebrations, the Hindu Feast of Diwali and the different food cultures in the West-Kruiskade. They were presented to the Dutch Centre for Intangible Heritage as new kinds of communal feasts, reflecting the cultural diversity of the West-Kruiskade as a whole. What is clear is that these local celebrations are rooted in countries other than the Netherlands, and were brought in by new ethnic groups in the West-Kruiskade. The celebration of the Chinese New Year is of course of Chinese origin. Keti Koti was brought along by the Antillean community living in the West-Kruiskade. Keti Koti ('the breaking of the chains') is the annual celebration of the abolishment of slavery, with which the Antillean community identifies strongly. What is special is that these social practices derive from the social memories of different ethnic groups but also function as identification markers for the West-Kruiskade as a whole.

This emergence of new communal celebrations or festivities is not restricted to Rotterdam. MONIKA SALZBRUNN noted the same trend in Paris, where she studied the city district of Belleville, interestingly enough also a city district confronted with enormous

⁹ BHABHA, HOMI: *The Location of Culture*. New York 1994, p. 5. See also: – BHABHA, HOMI: Cultural policies as catalysts of creativity. In: *Echoing Voices. Cultural Diversity: A Path to Sustainable Development*. Tenth anniversary of the adoption of the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. Paris 2011, p. 34: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/aic/echoingvoices/downloads/echoing-voices.pdf> (13. 3. 2017).

social challenges and a great amount of petty crime. Just like in Rotterdam, the Parisian government decided to embark on a programme of social improvement that instrumentalises cultural diversity.¹⁰ SALZBRUNN noted the emergence of new communal festivals such as, in her case, a new type of summer carnival, inspired by the London Notting Hill carnival, and the colourful Barbès Tour as a new type of multi-ethnic feast. She describes this process, which involves many stakeholders, as an interactive creation of space. She describes Belleville as a multicultural social space that functions as a political arena ‘where inclusion/ exclusion and transformation is negotiated’.

This concept of the interactive creation of space is useful to analyse the situation in West-Kruiskade. Intangible heritage involves agency and in the case of West-Kruiskade, this agency materialised in the stakeholders present during the deliberations with the Alliance West-Kruiskade. The feast of Ketu Koti was brought in by GUNO ZWAKKE and WIM REIJNIESE. FRED FITZ-JAMES brought in several traditions of Surinam origin, such as the traditional Afro-Surinam religion Winti. With his Fred Kulturu Shop Institute, FITZ-JAMES wants to disseminate information on Surinam cultural heritage. As an entrepreneur he works on commercial projects connected with this. The different food cultures were represented by JINAI LOOI. JINAI was born in Singapore but raised in Rotterdam. Diversity is her trademark, just as it is the trademark of the West-Kruiskade as a whole. What is interesting is that these different entrepreneurs more or less position themselves as fiduciaries or representatives of a specific tradition connected with a diversified community.¹¹ GUNO ZWAKKE and WIM REIJNIESE represent the foundation ‘Shared Past Shared Future’, focusing on strengthening the historical awareness of a shared past to enhance a shared future. FRED FITZ-JAMES with his activities in connection with the Surinam heritage acts as a fiduciary for the Caribbean roots in the West-Kruiskade community. In UNESCO language they could count as representatives of a community association or, perhaps more to the point, as stakeholders in a more or less organised but floating network. It illustrates SALZBRUNN’s dictum of the interactive creation of space as a process that involves many stakeholders. It should be realised that there is a strong link between intangible heritage and the location in which it takes place. According to the German ethnologist CHRISTOPH WULF, intangible heritage is always embodied in social practices taking place in concrete and specific cultural spaces.¹² To qualify as ‘intangible heritage of the West-Kruiskade’ this intangible heritage should be diverse and include the possibility of

¹⁰ SALZBRUNN, MONIKA: The Place-Making of Communities in Urban Spaces: The Invention of the Village Saint-Louis Sainte Marthe. In: ADELL, NICOLAS et al. (eds.): *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage* (= Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property 8). Göttingen 2015, pp. 185-199, here p. 186, 196.

¹¹ More in general about the concept of ‘zaakwaarnemer’ or ‘fiduciary’ in an anthropological context see KÖBBEN, ANDRÉ JOHANNES FRANCISCUS: *De zaakwaarnemer, Oratie Erasmusuniversiteit Rotterdam*. Deventer 1983. See also – HEDICAN, EDWARD: *Public Anthropology: Engaging Social Issues in the Modern World*. North York, Ontario 2016, p. 151.

¹² WULF, CHRISTOPH: *The Performativity and Dynamics of Intangible Cultural Heritage*: http://www.ies.stuba.sk/erasmus_meia_euc/file.php/1/Workshops/Presentationsofmodules/Module_1.pdf (13. 3. 2017).

sharing in the public space of West-Kruiskade and/ or be visible as such in the West-Kruiskade. Concerning the stakeholders, the term ‘network’ implies that the composition of representatives might alter and in the future might also include other stakeholders that represent different kinds of intangible heritage practices. The example of the Chinese New Year might well have been replaced by another. In 2015 it was called off because of lack of funding. In 2016 it was organised again, this time by Rotterdam Festivals, an organisation that coordinates the events policy for the city government of Rotterdam. Studying West-Kruiskade, it turns out that the concept of ‘networks’ is more useful than the older term ‘communities’ because it implies more fluidity. In a superdiverse context, intangible heritage presents us with a dynamic mix of different social practices based on tradition. This mix is dynamic in the sense that it alters with the changing composition of the population. Furthermore, it is dynamic because of the interactive nature of heritage formation, in a superdiverse context even more than ever. This would be the first observation in connection to this case study: communities should be interpreted as volatile and fluid networks, involving many different stakeholders. The other, second observation would be that intangible heritage formation is a dialogical process.

The problem of memory in multicultural society

What I want to argue, is that superdiversity calls for a dialogical approach of heritage and memory, that may help us explain how different ethnical traditions can operate as identification markers signifying the cultural diversity of West-Kruiskade as a whole.

Multicultural society presents us with what RODNEY HARRISON called ‘the problem of memory’.¹³ HARRISON mentions that the exponential growth of heritage sites, the inclusion of intangible heritage and the introduction of participative models of heritage that have led to an abundance of heritage are not easy to manage. In my view the new superdiversity is an even greater challenge, also in connection with possible discord or contestation. How to identify with diversity?

The cultural diversity of West-Kruiskade that was put forward in the nomination of the ‘intangible heritage of the West-Kruiskade’ included manifestations such as Diwali and the Chinese New Year, which build on social and cultural memories of different ethnic groups. But they are transformed into a powerful mix in which social memory is used in creating a new sense of belonging in the West-Kruiskade, which is not based on homogeneity but on cultural diversity. This seems to me an important aspect of the problem of memory in multicultural societies, especially in connection with superdiversity, to which I would like to draw attention in the next paragraph. In my view superdiversity gives a different turn to processes of identification which can only be un-

¹³ HARRISON, RODNEY: Heritage and the 'problem' of memory. In: HARRISON, RODNEY: Heritage: Critical Approaches. New York 2013.

derstood in connection to what LAURAJANE SMITH has called ‘the authoritative heritage discourse’.¹⁴

Identification processes always have two dimensions. Identifying with a ‘we’ group is often accompanied by creating difference to others. This is one of the paradoxes of superdiversity. Inclusion and exclusion are two sides of the same coin. What I would like to suggest for the West-Kruiskade is that the claim of cultural diversity as a distinctive characteristic of West-Kruiskade is to distinguish oneself from the dominant heritage discourse in the Netherlands.

Contestation

The fact that not all intangible heritage can qualify as intangible heritage of the West-Kruiskade draws our attention to what seems to me a defining characteristic of superdiverse intangible heritage: the aspect of contestation. The issue of ‘contested heritage’ can be illustrated by the example of Ketikoti. As I said, Ketikoti celebrates the abolishment of slavery.¹⁵ The feast is particularly important for the Antillean community living in the Netherlands. According to an expert in Dutch colonial history, GERT OOSTINDIE, the new slavery loci of memory in Amsterdam and elsewhere were strongly modelled on the American-inspired example of the so-called Black Atlantic.¹⁶ In this ‘Black Atlantic’ orientation, ‘national’ memories were deconstructed as part of the nineteenth-century rhetoric of nationalism. The ethnic trauma connected with the Dutch slavery past was turned into a different national memory in which the Dutch colonial past was transformed from pride into shame. In Amsterdam this was literally the case when the monument of former colonial ruler VAN HEUTSZ, erected in 1935, was firmly ‘decolonised’ in the sixties and in 2004 was transformed into the Monument Indië-Nederland, 1596-1949’.¹⁷ Approximately in the same period, in 2002, the National Slavery Monument was erected in Amsterdam. This is, significantly, also the place where Ketikoti is celebrated every year. Also Middelburg now has its own slavery monument and its own Ketikoti celebration. Each year the abolition of slavery is commemorated through a wreath at the Monument to Slavery in Middelburg.

Ketikoti can be interpreted as a counter memory against the formerly sacrosanct Dutch past. The recent discussion on Black Pete presents us with another example of the new ‘Black Atlantic’ orientation. Since the nineteenth century Black Pete had become one of the most popular features of Dutch children’s feast of Saint Nicholas. For

¹⁴ SMITH, LAURAJANE: *Uses of heritage*. London, New York 2006.

¹⁵ In connection with loci memoriae of slavery in Amsterdam see BALKENHOL, MARKUS: *Tracing slavery: An ethnography of diaspora, affect, and cultural heritage in Amsterdam*. PhD VU Amsterdam 2014.

¹⁶ OOSTINDIE, GERT: *Slavernij, canon en trauma: debatten en dilemma’s*. In: *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 121 (2008), pp. 4-21, here p. 15.

¹⁷ See BLOEMBERGEN, MARIEKE: *Amsterdam: het Van Heutszmonument. Het Nederlandse koloniale geheugen*. In: VAN DEN DOEL, WIM (ed.): *Plaatsen van herinnering. Nederland in de twintigste eeuw*. Amsterdam 2005, pp. 72-87.

the children Black Pete was a fantasy figure easy to relate to, a cheerful character handing out presents. The popular feast of Saint Nicholas incorporates many unusual aspects, not least the legendary Saint Nicholas himself, an early medieval saint supposedly born in Asia Minor, but in the Netherlands dressed up like a nineteenth century catholic bishop - all this during a period in history when the Netherlands was still a firmly established *protestant* nation.¹⁸ Also the nineteenth century invention of his companion Black Pete was unusual: dressed in exquisite Moorish garb, and with his face painted black. During a conference in the West-Kruiskade, organised by the Dutch Centre for Intangible Heritage, the representative of Ketj Koti asked me why the feast of Saint Nicholas was included in the Dutch National Inventory. In his view Black Pete presents us with a derogatory stereotype of black people in this country, strongly reminiscent to the period of slavery in Dutch history.¹⁹ Black Pete should be abolished or transformed just as the monument of VAN HEUTSZ was transformed. We can easily imagine that this met with a fierce reaction, also in Rotterdam. The fact that Pete could retain his black appearance during the official welcoming in 2014 in Rotterdam was celebrated as a victory by right wing politicians of Leefbaar Rotterdam, who had organised a demonstration introducing black dolls in a symbolic action to preserve the traditional Black Pete. A year later, in 2015, the decision of the School board BOOR to advise the schools to alter Pete's appearance was of course welcomed by others. BOOR is an umbrella organisation for more than eighty schools in Rotterdam.

We should realise that the fierce debate on Black Pete resonated strongly internationally, but was essentially a discussion about the Dutch nation and about Dutch identity, about inclusion *and* exclusion. The Dutch-American anthropologist J. NEDERVEEN PIETERSE, who studied processes of identification from a global perspective, argues that the frame of the nation state has been superseded by other allegiances, such as religion, gender and ethnicity.²⁰ The interesting thing about the Black Pete discussion is that although the opponents identify strongly with the Afro-American discourse on blackness and slavery, Black Pete is disputed within a strict national context about the Dutch ('shared') past. It has a counterpart in the discussion about the religious identity of Europe and the place of Muslims within Dutch society. That these discussions can be very abrasive is documented in recent discussions in France about the burkini. That it might also have huge consequences for the former 'Leitkultur' became clear in the recent discussions in France on public presentations of the Nativity scene (die Weihnachtskrippe), which, according to some, should be banned from public spaces such as

¹⁸ HELSLOOT, JOHN: Sinterklaas, katholieken en de natie. In: Aan plaatsen gehecht. Katholieke herinneringscultuur in Nederland. Nijmegen 2012, pp. 157-175.

¹⁹ More in general about the discussion on Black Pete see VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT: Sinterklaas in the Netherlands: a beleaguered tradition. Stichting Nederlands Centrum voor Volkskultuur en Immaterieel Erfgoed, Utrecht 2014. – VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT: Dealing with Black Pete. Media, Mediators and the Dilemmas of Brokering Intangible Heritage. In: Brokers, Facilitators and Mediation. Critical Success (F)Actors for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. Theme issue *Volkskunde* 115:3 (2014), pp. 349-360.

²⁰ PIETERSE, JAN NEDERVEEN: Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange. 2nd ed. Plymouth 2009.

town halls or railway stations. We should not underestimate that this will create feelings of pain and loss that also need to be addressed. Dutch anthropologist MAURICE CRUL recently initiated a large scale research project in which he wants to explore the consequences of the new superdiversity for the former majority group, a research project that is aptly called 'Becoming a minority'.²¹ It may even challenge the Dutch progressive notion about a 'tolerant' Dutch nation. Most liberal-minded Dutchmen might easily say farewell to Black Pete. But what if equal rights of women or gay people are at stake? Gay pride is celebrated in Amsterdam as a fine example of Dutch toleration. But comparable gay parades in Eastern Europe have met with strong opposition and even riots. It is interesting to note that in the leading liberal quality papers, the discussion on identity and integration, just as in Germany, focuses on endorsing civil virtues as toleration towards others and equal rights for women and also for gay people, and it almost excludes a shared history or religion.²²

The concept of contested heritage challenges the notion of the heritage canon.²³ In this multifocal situation RODNEY HARRISON calls for a more democratic approach towards memory, for which he has introduced the term 'dialogical heritage'. According to HARRISON and his fellow researcher DEBORAH ROSE, 'A dialogical concept of heritage suggests that heritage making is interactive - meaningfulness arises out of encounter and dialogue among multiple subjects'.²⁴ According to the American public folklorist RICHARD KURIN, it is even more complicated. As KURIN has rightly remarked, heritage workers should situate themselves in a contemporary world 'of multiple, if not contending, cultural narratives' and give up the illusion of a singular, monological reality.²⁵ Memories have evolved into something ambiguous, a multi layered reality in which different stakeholders formulate different claims on memory. These different claims on memory may also imply contestation and civic strife. Hence MONIKA SALZBRUNN'S remark that multicultural social spaces function as 'political arenas where inclusion/ exclusion and transformation are negotiated'.

²¹ ERC Advanced Grant for VU socioloog Maurice Crul, <https://www.vu.nl/nl/nieuws-agenda/nieuws/2017/jan-mrt/erc-advanced-grant-voor-vu-socioloog-maurice-crul-voor-onderzoek-bam.aspx> (25. 5. 2017).

²² In an interview for the Dutch quality newspaper NRC the German scientists HERFRIED AND MARINA MÜNKLER argued: 'Also the native German should change' (NRC 8 september 2016). In this article they summed up the five characteristics of German identity: 'The willingness to have to ensure by working for yourself and your family, and only to fall back in an emergency on the community. The opportunity to progress and climb up in your work. The belief that having this individualistic society everyone decides for himself what is his faith. And also how to live together is an individual choice with a man or a woman that is not prescribed by family'.

²³ HARRISON, RODNEY: Multicultural and minority heritage. In: BENTON, TIM (ed.): *Understanding Heritage and Memory*. Manchester, New York 2010, pp. 164-201.

²⁴ 'Heritage and the problem of memory', see chapter 8 in his book *Heritage: critical approaches*. Specifically on intangible heritage see – HARRISON, RODNEY/ ROSE, DEBORAH: *Intangible Heritage*. In: BENTON, TIM (ed.): *Understanding Heritage and Memory*. Manchester 2010, pp. 238-276, here p. 264.

²⁵ KURIN, RICHARD: *Reflections of a Culture Broker. A view from the Smithsonian*. Washington, London 1997, p. 281.

Paradoxically, contestation is also a bid for inclusion. Why else should the Alliance West-Kruiskade bother to apply for the National Inventory of Intangible Heritage in the Netherlands, showing the uniqueness of the West-Kruiskade but also demonstrating that the intangible heritage of West-Kruiskade is part of the Dutch nation? Writing about the nineteenth century period, human geographer HANS KNIPPENBERG once described a comparable process, namely the inclusion of the large minority of Catholics within the Dutch nation, significantly enough described by him as a process of ethnisation in which ‘differences’ were accentuated within the broader perspective of the Dutch nation.²⁶ At the start of the nineteenth century ‘pillarisation’ was the answer to accommodate minorities within the Dutch nation. At the start of the twenty-first century, the ideology of diversity is a possible answer from a more global perspective. In his famous phrase ZYGMUNT BAUMAN talks about the ‘accelerating liquefaction of modern life’ and the possible answers of communitarianism. BAUMAN proposes a ‘republican model of unity’, ‘of an emergent unity which is a joint achievement of the agents engaged in self-identification pursuits, a unity which is an outcome, not an a priori given condition, of shared life, a unity put together through negotiation and reconciliation, not the denial, stifling or smothering out of differences.’²⁷

Managing ethnic diversity in Rotterdam

It will be clear by now that superdiversity calls for a multi-layered approach, recognising that intangible heritage formation is a dynamic process, involving many stakeholders. In the approach of Rotterdam we see a strong role for the ethnic entrepreneurs. Furthermore, the city government plays an important, coordinating role in initiating the Alliance West-Kruiskade. This private-public partnership proved to be very successful, although perhaps there might be questions. Concerning the role of entrepreneurs in the whole process, UNESCO might have doubts about the possible dangers of ‘overcommercialisation’, always a strong concern for UNESCO.²⁸ Others might have questions

²⁶ KNIPPENBERG, HANS: Nationale integratie en de ‘etnisering’ van katholieken en protestanten: de rol van onderwijs. In: TE VELDE, HENK/ VERHAGE, HANS (eds.): *De eenheid en de delen. Zuilvorming, onderwijs en natievorming in Nederland 1850-1900*. Amsterdam 1996, pp. 177-196.

²⁷ BAUMAN, ZYGMUNT: *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge 2006, p. 178, see also p. 170: ‘The volatility of identities, so to speak, stares the residents of liquid modernity in the face.’ See also, in connection with intangible heritage – DIBBITS, HESTER/ WILLEMSSEN, MARLOUS: *Stills of our liquid times. An essay towards collecting today’s intangible cultural heritage*. In: ELPERS, SOPHIE/ PALM, ANNA (eds.): *Die Musealisierung der Gegenwart. Von Grenzen und Chancen des Sammelns in kulturhistorischen Museen*. Bielefeld 2014, pp. 173-194.

²⁸ On this fear of UNESCO in connection with tourism see VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT: *Cultural Tourism and Intangible Heritage: A Critical Appraisal and Policy Guidelines*. In: MUNSTERS, WIL/ MELKERT MARJAN (eds.): *Anthropology as a Driver for Tourism Research*. Antwerpen, Apeldoorn 2015, pp. 191-202. Regina Bendix once remarked that heritagisation turns culture into a good and thus always involves politics and economy. – BENDIX, REGINA: *Heritage between economy and politics: an assessment from the perspective of cultural an-*

about the coordinating role of the city government. That the city government of Rotterdam encourages and supports communal feast such as Diwali and Ketu Koti is in my view understandable because of the huge social problems that have to be addressed.

Is the Rotterdam model of dealing with diversity transportable to other cities dealing with the same challenges? What will be a challenge for the future is that the support of the Rotterdam city government might come to an end because there are other challenges to be solved in other city districts of Rotterdam. In a recent communication it has been stated that the Alliance worked out well and after six years of hard work proved a great success, but that it is now time that ‘the West Kruiskade must learn to stand on its own feet again’ now the problems are more a less over.²⁹ In the communication it has been stated that ‘the entrepreneurs and the general public should take care of it themselves’. Can these entrepreneurs really function as fiduciaries for the different ethnic groups? What is interesting is that the shopkeepers have a strict policy in creating a mix of different shops and that newcomers should always demonstrate what they can add to the specific ethnic flavour of the West-Kruiskade. This means that multinationals such as Starbucks or Primark are denied access to the West-Kruiskade, because you can already find them in all the other large cities in the Netherlands. The shopkeepers association prefers local shop owners, preferably quirky, innovative and enterprising businessmen. In Toko 51, a pop-up store in a former Chinese supermarket, Cretopia functions as an open platform for all kinds of cultural activities. The challenge would be to find a proper balance involving different stakeholders. It should be added that the government does not withdraw completely. An organisation such as Rotterdam Festivals still coordinates the event policy in Rotterdam. Rotterdam Festivals primarily supports festivals that have grown from the population itself and have a strong focus on multicultural events. Museums such as Museum Rotterdam have a special focus on intangible heritage and in developing participatory methodologies in collecting today’s intangible heritage that reflects the cultural diversity of West-Kruiskade.

In my view the most promising option would be to involve all the relevant stakeholders to develop a sustainability mix, based on an equilibrium of the various stakeholders’ interests that can serve both as a useful instrument to analyse the objectives of the key actors and as a strategic framework for implementation, in which community associations such as Rotterdam’s ‘Shared Past Shared Future’ also play a role. The role of heritage institutions such as museums or, for that matter, the Dutch Centre for Intangible heritage, is one of brokering: a . facilitating, stimulating role, being as inclusive as possible.³⁰

thropology. In: SMITH, LAURAJANE/ AKAGAWA, NATSUKO (eds.): Intangible heritage. New York 2009, pp. 253-269.

²⁹ Communication 12 January 2016: <http://ditisonsrotterdam.nl/west-kruiskade-weer-op-eigen-benen/> (13. 3. 2017)

³⁰ WILDT, ANNEMARIE DE: From Multiculturalism to (Super)diversity: examples from the Amsterdam Museum. In: WHITEHEAD, CHRISTOPHER/ LLOYD, KATHERINE/ ECKERSLEY, SUSANNAH/MASON, RHLANNON (eds.): Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe. New York 2015, pp. 207-232. More in general about cultural brokerage in connection with intangible

The challenge of superdiversity calls for an open and more fluid approach of communities and a more diversified approach of memory. Comparative research from different angles might teach us more about processes of social belonging and the involvement of different stakeholders in general. February next year (2018) the Dutch Centre for Intangible heritage is planning an international symposium on Superdiversity and intangible heritage that focuses on specific case studies from Germany, Great Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands.

Implications for the Dutch inventory of intangible heritage

As I have shown in this article, intangible heritage is a constant process of exchange and interactivity, in which different stakeholders take part. For the Dutch Centre for Intangible Heritage this calls for an open approach, not just towards intangible heritage but also towards the communities behind this intangible heritage. Superdiversity means that communities have evolved into floating and volatile networks, loosely formed and loosely connected. The traditions which the newcomers introduced in the West-Kruiskade are rooted in a historical past. But in the new superdiverse context, these traditions get a new meaning as traditions reflecting the enormous diversity of West-Kruiskade. Superdiversity dynamizes the notion of intangible heritage and the notion of community that, more than before, should be interpreted as a complex interplay of different stakeholders in a dynamic cultural diversified environment. A network approach should be as inclusive as possible, always open for new and aspiring stakeholders.

References

BAUMANN, GERD: *The multicultural riddle. Rethinking National, Ethnic and Religious Identities*. Abingdon, Oxon 2014.

BALKENHOL, MARKUS: *Tracing slavery: An ethnography of diaspora, affect, and cultural heritage in Amsterdam*. PhD VU. Amsterdam 2014.

BAUMAN, ZYGMUNT: *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge 2006.

BENDIX, REGINA: *Heritage between economy and politics: an assessment from the perspective of cultural anthropology*. In: SMITH, LAURAJANE/ AKAGAWA, NATSUKO (eds.): *Intangible heritage*. New York 2009, pp. 253-269.

BERG, METTE LOUISE/ SIGONA, NANDO: *Ethnography, Diversity and Urban Space*. In: *Identities* 20:4 (2013), pp. 347-360.

BHABHA, HOMI K.: *The Location of Culture*. New York 1994.

heritage see – JACOBS, MARC/ NEYRINCK, JORIJN/ VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT (eds.): *Brokers, Facilitators and Mediation. Critical Success (F)Actors for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Theme issue *Volkskunde* 115:3 (2014).

BHABHA, HOMI K.: Cultural policies as catalysts of creativity. In: *Echoing Voices. Cultural Diversity: A Path to Sustainable Development. Tenth anniversary of the adoption of the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*. Paris 2011. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/aic/echoingvoices/downloads/echoing-voices.pdf> (13. 3. 2017).

BLOEMBERGEN, MARIEKE: Amsterdam: het Van Heutszmonument. Het Nederlandse koloniale geheugen. In: VAN DEN DOEL, WIM (ed.): *Plaatsen van herinnering. Nederland in de twintigste eeuw*. Amsterdam 2005, pp. 72-87.

CHIMENTI, MILENA/ VAN LIEMPT, ILSE: Super-diversity and the art of living in ethnically concentrated areas. In: *Identities* 22:1 (2015), pp. 19-35.

DIBBITS, HESTER/ WILLEMSSEN, MARLOUS: Stills of our liquid times An essay towards collecting today's intangible cultural heritage. In: ELPERS, SOPHIE/ PALM, ANNA (eds.): *Die Musealisierung der Gegenwart. Von Grenzen und Chancen des Sammelns in kulturhistorischen Museen*. Bielefeld 2014, pp. 173-194.

DUYVENDAK, JAN WILLEM: *The Politics of Home. Belonging and Nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States*. New York 2011.

GELDOLF, DIRK: *Superdiversity in the heart of Europe. How migration changes our society*. Leuven 2016.

HARRISON, RODNEY: Multicultural and minority heritage. In: BENTON, TIM (ed.): *Understanding Heritage and Memory*. Manchester, New York 2010, pp. 164-201.

HARRISON, RODNEY/ ROSE, DEBORAH: Intangible Heritage. In: BENTON, TIM (ed.): *Understanding Heritage and Memory*. Manchester 2010, pp. 238-276.

HARRISON, RODNEY: Heritage and the problem of memory. In: HARRISON, RODNEY: *Heritage: critical approaches*. London, New York 2013, pp. 166-203.

HEDICAN, EDWARD J.: *Public Anthropology: Engaging Social Issues in the Modern World*. North York, Ontario 2016.

HELSSLOOT, JOHN: Sinterklaas, katholieken en de natie. In: *Aan plaatsen gehecht. Katholieke herinneringscultuur in Nederland*. Nijmegen 2012, pp. 157-175.

JACOBS, MARC/ NEYRINCK, JORIJN/ VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT (eds.): *Brokers, Facilitators and Mediation. Critical Success (F)Actors for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage* Theme issue *Volkskunde* 115:3 (2014).

KNIPPENBERG, HANS: Nationale integratie en de 'etnisering' van katholieken en protestanten: de rol van onderwijs. In: TE VELDE, HENK/ VERHAGE, HANS (eds.): *De eenheid en de delen. Zuilvervorming, onderwijs en natievorming in Nederland 1850-1900*. Amsterdam 1996, pp. 177-196.

KÖBBEN, ANDRÉ JOHANNES FRANCISCUS: *De zaakwaarnemer, Oratie Erasmusuniversiteit Rotterdam*. Deventer 1983.

KURIN, RICHARD: *Reflections of a Culture Broker. A view from the Smithsonian*. Washington, London 1997.

Lebendige Traditionen in der urbanen Gesellschaft // Les traditions vivantes dans la société urbaine. Verlag für Kultur und Geschichte, Baden 2015.

OOSTINDIE, GERT: Slavernij, canon en trauma: debatten en dilemma's. In: *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 121 (2008), pp. 4-21.

PIETERSE, JAN NEDERVEEN: *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. 2nd ed. Plymouth 2009.

SALZBRUNN, MONIKA: *The Place-Making of Communities in Urban Spaces: The Invention of the Village Saint-Louis Sainte Marthe*. In: ADELL, NICOLAS et al. (eds.): *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice. Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*. (= Göttingen Studies in Cultural Property, Vol. 8) Göttingen 2015, pp. 185-199.

SMITH, LAURAJANE: *Uses of heritage*. London, New York 2006.

VAN LIEMPT, ILSE/ VELDBOER, LEX: *Problematic Areas or Places of Fun? Ethnic Marketing in the Multicultural City of Rotterdam*. In: DUUVENDAK, JAN WILLEM/ HENDRIKS, FRANK/ VAN NIEKERK, MIES (eds.): *City in Sight. Dutch Dealings with Urban Change*. Amsterdam 2009, pp. 81-99.

VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT: *Sinterklaas in the Netherlands: a beleaguered tradition*. Stichting Nederlands Centrum voor Volkscultuur en Immaterieel Erfgoed. Utrecht 2014.

VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT: *Dealing with Black Pete. Media, Mediators and the Dilemmas of Brokering Intangible Heritage*. In: *Brokers, Facilitators and Mediation. Critical Success (F)Actors for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Theme issue *Volkskunde* 115:3 (2014), pp. 349-360.

VAN DER ZEIJDEN, ALBERT: *Cultural Tourism and Intangible Heritage: A Critical Appraisal and Policy Guidelines*. In: MUNSTERS, WIL/ MELKERT, MARJAN (eds.): *Anthropology as a Driver for Tourism Research*. Antwerpen, Apeldoorn 2015, pp. 191-202.

VERTOVEC, STEVEN: *Super-Diversity and Its Implications*. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30:6 (2007), pp. 1024-1054.

WILDT, ANNEMARIE DE: *From Multiculturalism to (Super)diversity: examples from the Amsterdam Museum*. In: WHITEHEAD, CHRISTOPHER/ LLOYD, KATHERINE/ ECKERSLEY, SUSANNAN/ MASON, RHIANNON (eds.): *Museums, Migration and Identity in Europe*. London, New York 2015, pp. 207-232.

WULF, CHRISTOPH: *The Performativity and Dynamics of Intangible Cultural Heritage*: http://www.ies.stuba.sk/erasmus_meia_euc/file.php/1/Workshops/Presentationsofmodules/Module_1.pdf (13. 3. 2017).