

SPATIAL INJUSTICE IN ROTTERDAM: PAST AND PRESENT PRACTICES OF RACIAL VIOLENCE INFLICTED UPON CERTAIN RACIALIZED BODIES THROUGH THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT



20-05-19

MASTER THESIS

LEANA BOVEN

GENDER STUDIES

4022734

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION		PAGE 4
	METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH QUESTION	PAGE 6
	STATE OF THE ART	PAGE 9
	STRUCTURE	PAGE 13
CHAPTER 1	EMBODIED OTHERS/POSTCOLONIAL CITIZENSHIP	PAGE 14
	AFFECTIVE POLITICS: ALIENATION AND EXCLUSION	PAGE 15
	MIGRATION TO THE NETHERLANDS	PAGE 21
CHAPTER 2	RACIAL VIOLENCE THROUGH THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT: SPATIAL STRUCTURES OF PRIVILEGE	PAGE 25
	SPREADING POLICIES IN THE 1970'S AND 1980'S	PAGE 27
	ROTTERDAM	PAGE 35
CHAPTER 3	CONTINUATION OF RACIAL PRACTICES OF EXCLUSION IN PRESENT-DAY PRACTICES	PAGE 40
	ROTTERDAMWET	PAGE 41
	GENTRIFICATION	PAGE 44
CONCLUSION		PAGE 48
REFERENCES		PAGE 51

Abstract

This thesis goes into the many ways spatial boundaries are created to secure neighborhoods through state-led practices of exclusion aimed at certain racialized bodies. The lasting spatial structures of privilege and advantage have established a climate where certain racialized “others” are consigned to different physical and metaphorical spaces than those who are seen as belonging. It has become clear that the idea that certain bodies are naturally entitled to certain spaces, and others are not, is very persistent in the Netherlands. In Rotterdam different practices such as spreading policies in the 1970’s and 1980’s and present-day practices such as the Rotterdamwet and state-led processes of gentrification are examples of this continuation of exclusion.

INTRODUCTION

Everyday my brown body walks through and takes in space in Rotterdam, a large city in the Netherlands that is inhabited by many different people. I have a white Dutch mother and a father who is Indigenous Surinamese, and who belongs to the Wayana tribe who are located in the south of Surinam nearby the borders with French Guyana and Brazil. I identify as mixed Indigenous Surinamese and Dutch, and I am an example of a postcolonial subject or citizen. At young age my parents split up, and my mother got in a relationship with my white Dutch stepfather whom she also met in Surinam. They had my younger brother (who is also white), which made people outside my family perceive me as an outsider. People were confused by our dynamic, and I have been asked very often if I was adopted. For me moving to the Netherlands when I was eight manifested a shift towards being “othered” and becoming an outsider. I was suddenly being noticed, and people would ask me questions to understand how to relate to me. Due to the white privilege from my white parents and my own light skinned privilege I have been included in spaces where other people of color would have not, and I would notice the shifts in inclusion and exclusion, depending if people would have knowledge about my parents’ whiteness, education- and higher income levels.

Being a Person of Color in the Netherlands means being hyperaware of your surroundings. How Black and Brown bodies are encountered by white native Dutch people – on a personal as well as institutional level - is often one of neglect, dismissal. Racialized affected bodies, or embodied “others” in a postcolonial society are seen as not belonging, out of place, but acceptable under certain circumstances. However, Rotterdam has to me always felt like home. Rotterdam is a “superdiverse” city: there is a large population with a migration background, and this population is a complex one. It is an intercultural city where more than 170 nationalities are stationed. There are different generations of migrants, as well as refugees and asylum seekers. Large diaspora communities inhabit Rotterdam, what makes this city a “majority-minority” city: different non-native ethnic groups make up the majority. The fact that Rotterdam is a “majority-minority” city has its influence on the ways the concept of citizenship is shaped. It gives room to critique regarding the ways in which positions of power are still occupied by mostly white people, and a lack of representation of the city’s mixed population. Egbert Martina describes how certain bodies in the Netherlands move

through and occupy spaces differently, and are encountered as embodied others. Martina argues that:

the experiences and attitudes of Black and blackened people in White Autochtoon Dutch spaces have been shaped by “ugly feelings,” intimate injuries, political disregard, and neglect. The emotions—what we often think of as private feelings—that we might experience as a result are, in effect, social processes inscribed with power relations that tend to center White Autochtoon Dutchness, which, then, acts as “the affective ruler that measures and naturalizes white [Autochtoon Dutch] feelings as the norm.” (Muñoz, *Feeling Brown*) The emotional responses of White Autochtoon Dutch folks to the emotionally charged subject of race are, thus, perceived as *rational*, *appropriate*, and *valid*. As such, Black and blackened folks navigate the material world on a different affective register: we are what Sara Ahmed calls “affect aliens”, those who are alienated by and from the normative power configuration of White Supremacy, which has shaped race, gender, sexuality, family, nation, and the normative affective expectations of society at large.¹

When looking at racial violence, this thesis will focus mainly on the Surinamese context. This because of my own roots in Surinam, and my affiliation with Surinamese people and culture. Through this approach I position myself as both in/and outsider. The fact that I have not been personally affected makes me an outsider. It is important to mention that the bodies that the racial violence is inflicted upon that are discussed in this thesis - mainly Surinamese people - are in this case mostly Black bodies. Of course, non-Black People of Color have also been excluded and discriminated against, but when addressing the Surinamese context this thesis will address the situation of Black people, mostly due to the fact that policy makers and politicians meant Black people when talking about Surinamese people (when Surinamese Hindustani and other groups are meant this is explicitly mentioned). Being an insider meant to me that I have had access to stories, perspectives, and archives.

¹ Martina, E. A., ‘Bitter’, March 25, 2014, Website: <https://processedlives.wordpress.com/2014/03/25/bitter/#more-1790>.

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH QUESTION

This thesis explores the exclusion of certain affected racialized (and inherently sexualized) embodied others from spaces where whiteness is normalized and where those racialized bodies are perceived as not belonging. By looking into specific encounters or narratives one can see the complex histories and meanings attached to these spaces. The built environment is one area where practices of exclusion, in this case spatial, are inflicted upon certain racialized bodies. This thesis aims to provide a deeper insight into the development of the dominant culture in Rotterdam, one that is based on architecture, city planning, and the accompanying narratives and norms. This all forms the base of processes of identity making of the individuals, groups, and societies in the city. It explores racial violence as operating through dominant ways of knowing, interpreting, and feeling. To illustrate how this racial violence operates, racial violence and coloniality in relation to the built environment will be researched. Hereby spatial arrangement (spatial injustice) in the Netherlands will be researched, with Rotterdam as case study. Attention will be paid to racialized housing policies in the 1970's and 1980's and the continuation of those racialized practices in present days. Here it is of great importance to pay attention to racial and class divides to illustrate how racist housing policies are spatially segregating populations even further. The research question is as followed:

How have certain affected racialized embodied others been excluded through racial violence in relation to the built environment in Rotterdam?

This thesis will have an intersectional feminist approach and will make use of intersectionality as a theoretically challenging methodology, as well as understanding and listening to experiences of "the other/s" as legitimate knowledge. Intersectionality was introduced in the text 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics' by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989. In this text Crenshaw developed a Black feminist criticism of the treatment of class and race as mutually exclusive categories of experience and analysis. Crenshaw stated that this single-axis framework

theoretically erases Black women's experiences.² Thus, Crenshaw offers a political and theoretical approach that stresses the importance of taking into consideration the interlocking systems of power and oppression and the need to account for multiple grounds of identity in analytical frameworks.³

As Nikita Dhawan and Maria do Mar Castro Varela discuss in 'What Difference Does Difference Make?':

the intersectional approach not only addresses differences and heterogeneity, but also seeks to overcome the pitfalls of single-issue politics, as proposed by Black feminist scholarship (Hill Collins, 1990). Thus, an analysis is attempted that takes into consideration the varied experiences of diverse constituencies without losing sight of the simultaneity, contradictions, and interdependencies of these perspectives. Intersectionality, as legal doctrine, can thus be described as a critical project that allows contemporary feminist research to carefully discern heterogeneity of standpoints and yet be politically and academically efficacious.⁴

As inherent to feminist research this thesis aims to 'disrupt traditional ways of knowing to create rich new meaning, a process that Trinh (1991) terms becoming "both/and" - insider and outsider - taking on a multitude of different standpoints and negotiating these identities simultaneously. It is important to ask new questions 'that place women's lives and those of "other" marginalized groups at the center of social inquiry.'⁵ Thus, this thesis will be written with the awareness of intersectional situated knowledges, related to embodiment and affect, whilst paying attention to difference. By engaging with embodied feminist research, in reference to Donna Haraway, writing

² Crenshaw, K., 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics,' (1989), p. 139.

³ Crenshaw, K., 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics,' (1989), p. 139.

⁴ Nikita Dhawan and Maria do Mar Castro Varela, 'What Difference Does Difference make?': Diversity, Intersectionality and Transnational Feminist Politics.' *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies*, 2016, vol. 16, p. 16.

⁵ Hesse-Biber, S.N., 'Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method,' in *Handbook of Feminist Research*, ed. S.N. Hesse-Biber (2011), p. 3-4.

from a god-trick perspective will be avoided, and the researcher will be made accountable. Haraway writes that in feminist research one should move away from doctrines of scientific objectivity and the consideration of an “object” as a passive thing without agency.⁶ Haraway states: “I would like a doctrine of embodied objectivity that accommodates paradoxical and critical feminist science projects: Feminist objectivity means quite simply *situated knowledge*.”⁷ Haraway wants to move to “a practice of objectivity that privileges contestation, deconstruction, passionate construction, webbed connections, and hope for transformation of systems of knowledge and ways of seeing.”⁸

This thesis draws and combines insights from the fields of postcolonial studies, gender studies, cultural studies, sociology of social movements, cultural history, and urban studies. By combining theories from different fields this thesis creates an analytical framework that will highlight interlocking systems of oppression and illustrate how they impact the most marginalized members of society. In this way, this thesis goes into the ways certain bodies have redefined and resisted the dominant hegemonic understandings of space and the body itself.

I will make use of primary sources such as newspapers and zines which are present in *The Black Archives*, which is: ‘*a unique historical archive for inspiring conversations, activities and literature from Black and other perspectives that are often overlooked elsewhere*.’⁹ When it comes to Surinamese immigrants arriving in the Netherlands in the 1970’s and 1980’s, the stories about their dire housing conditions and racist housing policies are unknown to the larger Dutch audience. *The Black Archives*, based in Amsterdam, is an unique archive where unheard black voices and stories are made heard and discussed. *The Black Archives* has for a great part inspired this research topic, and Mitchell Esajas from *The Black Archives* has provided useful insights and literature. Miguel Heilbron, who is co-founder of *The Black Archives*, researched the history of the spreading policies in Amsterdam, and wrote about racist housing policies in Amsterdam and the squatting history of Surinamese people in the

⁶ Haraway, D., ‘Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective,’ *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988), p. 591.

⁷ Haraway, D., ‘Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective,’ (1988), p. 581.

⁸ Haraway, D., ‘Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective,’ (1988), p. 585.

⁹ Website the Black Archives: www.theblackarchives.nl.

Bijlmer. When it comes to Rotterdam, most people do not know about spreading policies in this city. Surinamese organizations and activists formulated critique and archived documentation around this issue and put in the hard work against these racist housing policies (they referred to these practices as *Apartheid*).

I will make use of *Zwartboek* (1978), a zine where different news articles and opinion pieces regarding spreading policies were collected by Surinamese activists. This is also the case with *Span'noe* (1981). *Zwartboek* and *Span'noe* were both provided to me by *The Black Archives* after discussing this thesis' topic. Those resources are important to incorporate to make silenced voices heard, and to move away from mainstream Eurocentric narratives. I am also studying primary resources such as policy documents from the municipality of Rotterdam. These will be for example *Woonvisie* where the policy plans from Rotterdam regarding housing and city planning until 2030 are presented, and the policy note *Binnenstad Als City Lounge* (City Center As City Lounge) from 2008, where the city's policies regarding liveability in the city center in the time period 2008-2020 are discussed. These policy notes were easily found online. I will also use older online newspaper articles that have discussed housing policies in Rotterdam, as well as the website from *Vers Beton*, which is a platform for journalism in Rotterdam that has provided many up-to-date insights. *De Correspondent*, also a platform for journalism, has also provided useful articles.

STATE OF THE ART

In this thesis contributions by Philomena Essed, Kwame Nimako, and Gloria Wekker are included, who have been pioneers in formulating an intersectional critique addressing racism, sexism, classism and coloniality among other issues in Dutch society. They have discussed discourses around ethnic minorities and racism in relation to academia and policy making. The heated conversation about racism, whiteness, and colonialism in the Netherlands is one that has not been welcomed eagerly.

The neglect of taking responsibility for slavery and acceptance of a colonial nostalgia have strongly shaped discourses around ethnic minorities. In 'Designs and (Co)Incidents' (2006) Philomena Essed and Kwame Nimako offer "transparency about

the relation between policy, politics and scholarship in relation to race and ethnic relations in the Netherlands.”¹⁰ They address the space for Race Critical Theory in the Dutch arena and responses to contestations of dominant paradigms. According to Essed and Nimako, Race Critical Theory exposes how taken for granted claims of race neutrality, colorblindness and the discourse of tolerance often hide from view “the hidden, invisible, forms of racist expressions and well-established patterns of racist exclusion that remain, unaddressed and uncompensated, structurally marking opportunities and access, patterns of income and wealth, privilege and relative power.”¹¹ Reflecting on the space of Race Critical Theory in Dutch academia, Essed and Nimako write that Race Critical Theory is:

rooted in the tradition of radical thinkers and movements against racial oppression and exploitation in the history of colonization and decolonization. Its very nature, radical critique, makes this paradigm hardly attainable in the Netherlands as polder model society. This might (partly) explain why Essed’s studies of every day racism caused a national commotion. The concept of every day racism challenged the Dutch self-image as the most tolerant country in the world, while claiming that racism was a structural feature in Dutch history and society.¹²

Essed and Nimako write that the formal and systematic regulation of race and ethnic relations started in the 1970’s as a response to the Moluccan revolts, when Moluccan youngsters started to express their disappointment with their dire situation.¹³ The establishment of the Department of Minorities Affairs within the Ministry of Home Affairs was a result of the Moluccan revolts, and led to the publication of the *Minority Policy Note* in 1983.¹⁴ A central focus point in the research done in the 1980’s has been the problematizing of ethnic minorities (but not always), while generally downplaying the influence of racism, the ramifications of the colonial history, and

¹⁰ Essed, P. & Nimako, K., ‘Designs and (Co)Incidents’, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* (2006), p. 282.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 282.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 297.

¹³ *Ibid.* p. 283.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 283.

coexistent presuppositions of European (Dutch) civil and cultural superiority.¹⁵ The denial of racism in Dutch society done by Dutch researchers resulted in the fact that, according to Essed and Nimako, representatives and spokespeople of minority research “generally denied the existence of, and thus lacked comprehensive knowledge about, systematic racism, its historical transmutations, its cultural expressions, its roots in the development of modernity of which Orientalism has been part and parcel.”¹⁶ Additionally, in the 1990’s “racism research would be disqualified and labeled a product of “political correctness.”¹⁷ The notion of racism in research was considered an import product from the United States and the United Kingdom, which resulted in the silencing of racism research. Instead, assimilation and integration paradigms took up space in the national research agenda and funding.¹⁸

Studies on ethnic minorities were conducted against the backdrop of three general assumptions about the nature of race and ethnic relations, write Essed and Nimako. The first general assumption was that the migrant groups in question were temporary residents of the country and would return to the countries of birth eventually.¹⁹ This conception changed however with the formation of the Minority Policy Note in 1983 where the focus was now changed into developing instruments to facilitate the integration and emancipation of the target groups, which were Surinamese people, Antilleans, Moluccans, Moroccans and Turks.²⁰ This was a shift away from the presumption that these immigrants would move back to their countries of birth.

The second general assumption was that the ethnic minorities were demographically a small group. It turned out these groups were larger than thought due to family reunification. In 1989 the Minority Policy Note was replaced by the “Allochtonous Policy” (“Allochtonenbeleid”) where the word “allochtoon” (non-native) was introduced into the Dutch vocabulary. The Allochtonous Policy had a much harder tone, and moved away from the focus on integration and emancipation as key points. In 1992 the Allochtonous Policy was replaced by the Integration Policy Document,

¹⁵ Essed, P. & Nimako, K., ‘Designs and (Co)Incidents’ (2006), p. 285.

¹⁶ Ibid. p. 285.

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 285.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 285-6.

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 286.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 288.

where there was an emphasis on citizenship.²¹

The third general assumption was that the Netherlands is a plural society, especially in terms of religion: “the *grey middle ground* based on compromise, tolerance and majority consensus, is perceived as the ideal bases from which to build.”²² This meant that “in academia, in the media and in politics, radical points of view are shunned and those taking radical positions tend to be ignored, avoided, excommunicated, ridiculed, or symbolically assassinated.”²³ In the 1990’s the discourse of multiculturalism and diversity became present in discussions around the position and status of migrants and ethnic minorities.²⁴

Through the research done by Essed and Nimako it becomes clear that the main features that characterize the nature of the development of a minority research industry are opportunity hoarding in academia (the same key figures take in many different positions) so no new insights would be offered, limited perceptions of racism, and the problematizing of ethnic minorities.²⁵ There has been a strong overtone that “we (white Dutch) have become victims of our own goodness.”²⁶ Additionally, five strategies of denial of racism are analyzed when looking at key publications of the late 1980’s, according to Essed and Nimako. These are: (1) naturalizing hostility against foreigners, (2) exceptionalism, (3) resistance against using the term racism, (4) defense of Dutch tolerance, and lastly (5) self-victimization: Dutch people are prisoners of tolerance.²⁷

Gloria Wekker’s book *White Innocence* addresses the denial of racism and the Dutch perception of innocence and tolerance as well. In the critically acclaimed book *White Innocence* Wekker discusses three central concepts that are central in the presented national Dutch identity, namely: innocence, the cultural archive, and dominant white Dutch self-representation. According to Wekker, the acknowledgement of whiteness as racialized/ethnicized positioning is an important move to make.²⁸

²¹ Essed, P. & Nimako, K., ‘Designs and (Co)Incidents’ (2006), p. 288.

²² Ibid. p. 288.

²³ Ibid. p. 289.

²⁴ Ibid. p. 289.

²⁵ Ibid. p. 297.

²⁶ Ibid. p. 298.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 299-303.

²⁸ Wekker, G., *White Innocence* (2016), p.2.

STRUCTURE

This thesis consists of three chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter *Embodied Others/Postcolonial Citizenship: We are Taught to Fear the Stranger* will make use of the large body of knowledge around affect theory and postcolonial citizenship to analyze the becoming of the Dutch identity through practices of alienation and exclusion towards people perceived as “other.” This chapter starts with affect theory to make us understand how emotions are cultural practices that influence bodies, and can break open the construction of national subjectivity. To look at emotions on a deeper level means that we think about the political implications of emotions, and how this can lead to “othering.” This is of great importance to show what impact colonialism had and continues to have on individual experiences, where the postcolonial subject comes into being. After this analysis, this chapter moves to a discussion of post-colonial migration to the Netherlands to better understand the historical context, and to see the shifting understandings of Dutch citizenship.

In the second chapter, *Racial Violence Through the Built Environment: Spatial Arrangements*, this thesis looks into racist housing policies in the Netherlands, and more specifically Amsterdam and Rotterdam. It will become clear that the alienation of postcolonial subjects took place in order to “secure” certain neighborhoods. Although spreading policies were only officially implemented in Rotterdam twice, on a national level migrants were also spread unofficially. This chapter will include a discussion about spreading policies as put into practice in the 70s and 80s, as well as a discussion about the Bijlmer in Amsterdam where many Surinamese migrants ended up. Later in this chapter the official spreading policies in Rotterdam will be discussed together with resistance against these practices.

In the third chapter *Continuation of Racial Practices of Exclusion in Present-Day Practices* the discussion of racial violence inflicted upon certain racialized bodies through the built environment will be continued. The Rotterdamwet will be included in this analysis, as well as gentrification. These topics will be used as examples of present-day practices as part of certain discourses around colonialism, whiteness, and spatial injustice. In the conclusion of this thesis, I will come back to the findings of my research and conclude with the importance of confronting and discussing colonial legacies.

CHAPTER ONE EMBODIED OTHERS/POSTCOLONIAL CITIZENSHIP

This chapter looks at the historical context of Dutch postcolonial citizenship by including affect theory. The Netherlands and its colonial past are inherently intertwined, resulting in the creation of embodied others through bodily practices and spatial configurations. Somatic norms that privilege white bodies have created a certain Dutch standard resulting in the construction of the norm, the self and the other. According to Gloria Wekker, the construction of whiteness creates alien bodies.²⁹ Guno Jones argues that ‘the alienation of citizens’ is a characteristic of Dutch political discourses concerning post-colonial citizenship in the post-war era.³⁰ How come that certain bodies are perceived as negative?

Sabrina Marchetti in ‘Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro-Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands’ asks the question “in what sense is today’s Europe a *postcolonial* Europe?” Marchetti writes that “today’s Europe is actually postcolonial in the opposite sense, for colonial mentalities are still alive and operative in several ways. This is especially true in discourses and encounters between white, migrant, and black people.”³¹ To understand these discourses and encounters it is important to reflect on the aftermath of colonialism and connections between trauma and nostalgia, the past and the present that are brought with. The entanglement of power, fear, and desire at various levels in society is important to understand and analyze when it comes to injustice and oppression. When looking at racialized, gendered, and sexualized (among other aspects) bodies in Dutch society one can see certain imbalances as present-day realities formed by colonial sentiments. By looking at postcolonial Europe and the historical context of postcolonial migration one gets a better understanding of those colonial sentiments that shape daily life. In the article ‘Dutch Politicians, the Dutch Nation and the Dynamics of Post-colonial Citizenship’ Guno Jones provides the reader with an extensive historical background

²⁹ Wekker, G., *White Innocence*, p. 41.

³⁰ Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands*, p. 41.

³¹ Marchetti, S., ‘Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro–Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands,’ p. 133.

of Dutch policies and debates around postcolonial citizenship after 1945, and goes into the constant redefining of the meaning of Dutch nationality by Dutch politicians. Jones' work is of great importance and will be elaborated upon extensively in this chapter.

By integrating the writings of scholars engaged in postcolonial citizenship, racism, Dutch colonial mentalities, affective practices, and policies regarding ethnic minorities and immigrants, this chapter brings together many aspects that lay out the various dimensions of racism and its entrenchment in Dutch society. This chapter aims to explore how Dutch politicians have throughout history redefined the meaning of Dutch nationality for postcolonial citizens, meaning that Dutch citizenship does not automatically guarantees inclusion into Dutch society. This chapter starts with affect theory to make us understand how emotions are cultural practices that influence bodies, and can break open the construction of national subjectivity. To look at emotions on a deeper level means that we think about the political implications of emotions, and how this can lead to "othering." This is of great importance to show what impact colonialism had and continues to have on individual experiences, where the postcolonial subject comes into being. Afterwards, post-colonial migration to the Netherlands will be discussed to better understand the historical context, and to see the shifting understandings of Dutch citizenship.

AFFECTIVE POLITICS: ALIENATION AND EXCLUSION

Migrants from former colonies arrived in great numbers in Europe between the 1960's and 1980's. The context of their migration was reflected in citizen rights, in the language(s) they spoke or in their previous knowledge about their destination country, which until recently had been ruling their own.³² In her research on postcolonial Europe, Marchetti addresses *resentment* as colonial legacy. In Marchetti's words:

resentment refers to the emotional legacy off past violence, hatred, and domination between colonizers and the colonized. This legacy continues to resurface and

³² Marchetti, S., 'Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro-Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands,' p. 133.

permeates the interactions between the descendants of these groups, in their sentiments and imaginations, in line with the positions once occupied by their ancestors, be they the colonizers or the colonized. Resentment is thus a legacy that is passed from one generation to another when the two share a similar repertoire of ideas or direct experiences of privilege and inequality. This legacy can remain alive for several generations, and eventually physically travel with those who migrate, accompanying them on their journeys.³³

Jones writes that Dutch citizens from the former colonies who came to the Netherlands after 1945 did not receive the same treatment as their white fellow Dutch citizens. Members of the Dutch Parliament and government neglected the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) which concerns the principle of equal citizenship in this way.³⁴ Although these migrants from former colonies were granted Dutch citizenship, they were not automatically included into society, which leads Jones to question the meaning of formal legal citizenship with regard to inclusion in society.³⁵ Jones argues that “Dutch political discourses on people from the former Dutch colonies do not conform to the universalistic inclusive model, but illustrate that status citizenship is a historically contingent construction rather than a stable ‘predictor’ of rights.”³⁶

Jones argues that the “alienation of citizens” is a characteristic of Dutch political discourses concerning post-colonial citizenship in the post-war era. Even after they relocated to the Netherlands, their symbolic inclusion in the nation – as ‘real’ and competent members of Dutch society – was far from obvious, as we have seen.”³⁷ Contemporary discrimination and (white) resentment to Dutch nostalgia for the position of power that was lost with the end of colonialism are brought together by Marchetti, who writes that:

³³ Marchetti, S., ‘Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro–Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands,’ p. 134.

³⁴ Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands*, p. 27.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 27.

³⁶ Ibid. p. 28.

³⁷ Ibid. p. 41.

the position of power that the Dutch held during colonial times is seldom subjected to criticism. Little attention has been paid to the responsibility of the Netherlands for slavery in Suriname and the Antilles. This is a responsibility that cannot be reduced to an intermediary role for someone else's profit, as is often done with the slave trade; it involves the everyday coercion inflicted by Dutch colonial households on the slaves working for them. As a consequence, the neglect of these responsibilities and acceptance of a colonial nostalgia make it difficult to discuss contemporary discrimination against postcolonial migrants, insofar as it points to a surviving colonialist mind-set in the Netherlands.³⁸

Affect theory helps us understand how emotions are cultural practices that influence bodies, and is useful when it comes to postcolonial issues because it can break open the construction of national subjectivity. It encourages us to think about the political implications of emotions: "others" are created because individuals, thus bodies, become aligned with popular ideology which results in the racialization of citizenship. Theorists in the field of affect theory explore the way "feeling is negotiated in the public sphere and experienced through the body."³⁹ Some bodies are aligned with each other inside a community and marginalize other bodies, which happens at a conscious and non-conscious level. The influence of emotions and the ways bodies relate to communities produce social relations that determine the rhetoric of the nation. There is a repetition of certain emotional responses, and they have affective power. Key to studying affect is the notion of emotions not as private, but as socially organized. Implications of affect and emotion are engaged with on a political, cultural, economic and psychoanalytical level.⁴⁰

Affective politics are able to provide different, and potentially transformative, ways of knowing. Important is that "feminist engagement with affective politics requires attention to the ways in which feelings can (re)produce dominant social and geopolitical hierarchies and exclusions."⁴¹ With the focus on affect there is a shift away

³⁸ Marchetti, S., 'Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro-Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands,' p. 141.

³⁹ Pedwell., C. & A. Whitehead, 'Affecting Feminism: Questions of Feeling in Feminist Theory,' *Feminist Theory* (2012), p. 116.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p. 116.

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 120.

from text and discourse as theoretical foundations, and the body takes in a more central position: “affect [...] cannot be reduced to either ‘discourse’ or ‘emotion’, but rather exceeds these categories; it [...] emerges via the ‘in-between’ spaces of embodied encounters, circulating power not primarily as a mode of discursive regulation but rather as the potential to ‘become otherwise.’”⁴² As is discussed in ‘Affecting Feminism: Questions of Feeling in Feminist Theory’:

affective frameworks also figure centrally in feminist and postcolonial analyses of the embodied and psychical legacies of colonialism and slavery, as well as the emotional politics of contemporary forms of nation building, migration and multiculturalism. Notwithstanding their differences, these analyses are linked by a concern with how power circulates through feeling and how politically salient ways of being and knowing are produced through affective relations and discourses.⁴³

In *Affective Economies* Sara Ahmed elaborates on how emotions can be seen as part of an economy because their attachment to material objects that join some people together while separating others, and where anxiety and fear have an important role in drawing the boundaries. When it comes to affect and bodily practices Ahmed makes the connection to racism, and writes that that it should be considered “how the language of racism sustains fear through displacement, and how this surfaces through bodies.”⁴⁴ Ahmed refers to a well-known quote from Frantz Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks* where he writes about one of his experiences with racism:

my body was given back to me sprawled out. Distorted, recolored, clad in mourning in that white winter day. The Negro is an animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is mean, the Negro is ugly; look, a nigger, it’s cold, the nigger is shivering because he is cold, the little boy is trembling because he is afraid of the nigger, the nigger is shivering with cold,

⁴² Pedwell., C. & A. Whitehead, ‘Affecting Feminism: Questions of Feeling in Feminist Theory,’ *Feminist Theory* (2012), p. 116.

⁴³ Pedwell., C. & A. Whitehead, ‘Affecting Feminism: Questions of Feeling in Feminist Theory,’ *Feminist Theory* (2012), p. 116.

⁴⁴ Ahmed, S., *Affective Economies*, (2004), p. 126.

that cold that goes through your bones, the handsome little boy is trembling because he thinks that the nigger is quivering with rage, the little white boy throws himself into his mother's arms: Mama, the nigger's going to eat me up.⁴⁵

By providing a thoroughly analysis of this quote, Ahmed makes a connection between fear and coldness felt by the body. According to Ahmed “fear both envelops the bodies that feel it, as well as constructs those bodies as enveloped, as contained by it, as if it comes from outside and moves inward.” Ahmed continues that “in the encounter, fear does not bring the bodies together: it is not a shared feeling, but works to differentiate between white and black bodies.”⁴⁶ By a misrecognition of anger instead of fear – as illustrated in Fanon’s quote - the white child fears the black other, which is then returned back through fear, as “a fear of the white subject’s fear.”⁴⁷ According to Ahmed “fear opens up past histories that stick to the present (in the very rehearsal of childhood fantasies about “being eaten up” that “take on” the value of social norms as “truths” about the other) and allow the white body to be constructed as apart from the black body,” which restricts the black body.⁴⁸ Thus, surfaces and boundaries are the effect of the circulation of affect, which is not random, but subject to those particular ‘sticking points’ or sites of tension.⁴⁹

Ahmed writes in *Affective Economies* that anxiety and fear *create* borders, and not defend them: “the other has to get too close, in order to be recognized as an object of fear, and in order for the object to be displaced” and additionally, “the transgression of the border is required in order for it to be secured as a border in the first place.”⁵⁰ It is not only fear that creates the border between the self and the other affected. However, these histories of fear “stick” and make some objects more fearsome than others.⁵¹ Ahmed continues to make an important connection with contemporary politics in postcolonial Europe and helps us visualize narratives of border anxieties and crises:

⁴⁵ Ahmed, S., *Affective Economies*, (2004), p. 126.

⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 126.

⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 126.

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 127-128.

⁴⁹ Pedwell., C. & A. Whitehead, ‘Affecting Feminism: Questions of Feeling in Feminist Theory,’ *Feminist Theory* (2012), p. 124.

⁵⁰ Ahmed, S., *Affective Economies*, (2004), p. 132.

⁵¹ Ibid. p. 127-128.

this is why the politics of fear as well as hate is narrated as a border anxiety: fear speaks the language of “floods” and “swamps,” of being invaded by inappropriate others, against whom the nation must defend itself. We can reflect then on the ontology of insecurity within the constitution of the political: it must be presumed that things are not secure, in and of themselves, in order to justify the imperative to make things secure. More specifically, it is through announcing a crisis in security that new forms of security, border policing, and surveillance become justified. We only have to think about how narratives of crisis are used within politics to justify a “return” to values and traditions that are perceived to be under threat.⁵²

One can look at the recent treatment of Muslims in the Netherlands and statements made by Member of Parliament and the Freedom Party’s leader Geert Wilders. In an interview with Danish television station DR2 in 2009 he suggested to expel “millions of Muslims” from Dutch territory.⁵³ Here one can think about border anxieties as discussed above, and the fact that some people are made more fearsome than others. Jones states that discourses around the integration of postcolonial citizens are in fact “techniques of exclusion from Dutch society, especially during periods of increased migration during and after decolonization”⁵⁴ and illustrate the “alienage of citizens.”⁵⁵

Thus, through alienation and “Othering” one clearly sees the making of boundaries separating (white) Dutch society from “inappropriate others”, even though these “others” have the Dutch nationality. Through politics of fear policies that exclude certain groups of people are legitimized, where one can think for example about forced education about Dutch traditions and values. This relates to comments made in 2018 by Dutch People’s Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD) leader Klaas Dijkhoff. He proposed the idea that certain “problem” areas in The Hague - where more than fifty per cent of the population has a non-Western migrant background, criminality and

⁵² Ahmed, S., *Affective Economies*, (2004), p. 132.

⁵³ Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands*, p. 28.

⁵⁴ Ibid. p. 30.

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 30.

unemployment numbers are high, and university levels are low - the people living there should follow Dutch language courses as well as courses about democracy and Dutch traditions. He stated that “we cannot tolerate intolerance.” If the inhabitants of these “problem” areas would reject following these classes they would get cut on their alimentionation.⁵⁶

This also reminds of the “postwar uplifting regime”⁵⁷ as mentioned by Gloria Wekker in *White Innocence*, when upon her family’s arrival in the Netherlands, unexpected visits from social workers were aimed at checking if people were living according to Dutch standards. This meant eating cooked potatoes instead of rice, doing laundry on Mondays, eating minced meat balls on Wednesdays, and having a properly cleaned house.⁵⁸ Wekker writes that if they not had measured up these standards, they would likely have been sent to resocialization camps.⁵⁹ These examples illustrate the long tradition of “securing” neighborhoods through the alienation of migrants in the Netherlands. To understand these processes of “othering” and alienation of certain racialized bodies this chapter will now shortly go into postcolonial migration to the Netherlands.

MIGRATION TO THE NETHERLANDS

Approximately 312,500 Eurasian Dutch and Moluccans arrived in the Netherlands in the 1950s and 1960s. This group that migrated to the Netherlands from the Indonesian archipelago was made out of around 200,000 ‘Indo-Dutch’, 12,500 Moluccans, and 100,000 ‘white’ Dutch citizens.⁶⁰ Jones writes that the “troubled relations between the Moluccans and Indonesian nationalism, their loyalty to the Netherlands or the fact that they strongly resisted Indonesian nationality” were not taken into consideration by

⁵⁶ ‘VVD-plan om criminaliteit in probleemwijken harder te straffen valt slecht in Den Haag’, Omroep West, September 19th 2018.

⁵⁷ Wekker, G., *White Innocence* (2016), p.9.

⁵⁸ Ibid. p.9.

⁵⁹ Ibid. p.10.

⁶⁰ Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands*, p. 32.

Dutch policy makers.⁶¹ After 1949, Moluccans in the Netherlands became Indonesian citizens, and the eventual goal was their integration into Indonesia. This changed again however in 1951, when Moluccans collectively were granted Dutch citizenship. It should be underlined that this collective admission became a reality after a political and legal battle between Moluccans and the Dutch government.⁶² Still, the idea of return was persistent, making their citizenship status seen as temporarily. The articulation of essentialist discourses on Moluccan identity fabricated differences between the Moluccans and Dutch society.

These essentialist discourses were made tangible through the implementation of certain citizenship policies. It was only until 2005 that the Dutch government proved ready to make Dutch citizenship for Moluccans a fact.⁶³ Jones states: “while Indo-Dutch in the 1950s, like Moluccans, were constructed as people who were ‘biologically and culturally’ very different from the Dutch majority, today Dutch politicians no longer see them as groups with innate and problematic differences.”⁶⁴ According to Jones, socio-biological discourses regarding Dutch citizens from former Dutch colonies developed into discourses around cultural “differences” when race-thinking was considered “out of date.”⁶⁵ However, political representations of Surinamese and Antillean Dutch identity still remained reductionist and a new form of essentialism surfaced. Jones states that “culturalist discourses even became instrumental in drawing the boundaries of the Dutch nation when migration from the West Indies increased in the 1970s.”⁶⁶

After the “loss” of the East Indies, Dutch politicians began to stress the importance of the continuation of internal affairs between the Netherlands and the West Indies. Thus, the Kingdom of the Netherlands would continue its presence overseas.⁶⁷ Citizens of the West Indies were granted full Dutch citizenship, and Dutch royalties visited the colonial territories often. Hence, in the 1950s, politicians did not

⁶¹ Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands*, p. 32.

⁶² Ibid. p. 34.

⁶³ Ibid. p. 35-36.

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 38.

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 39.

⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 39.

⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 39.

discourage the migration from the overseas territories to the Netherlands at all and even recruited Surinamese male laborers and female nurses on a selective basis.

However, Jones argues, when migration from the West Indies increased in the 1960s, “the emphasis of political attention gradually shifted from care for the Kingdom of the Netherlands to concern about the ethnic composition of the Dutch nation.”⁶⁸ Concern did not only refer to the amount of people coming to the Netherlands, but did also refer to identities that were perceived as incomprehensible with “Dutch identities.” A shift was visible from members of the elite to members of the working class who would move to the Netherlands, which eventually led to the construction of cultural differences and stereotyping, as well as a fear of Surinamese men “stealing” white Dutch women.⁶⁹ that “the combined effect of these discourses on migration – ‘Surinamese workers culture’ and ‘mixed relations’ – was that the boundaries of the ‘Dutch people’ were drawn symbolically along lines of gender, ethnicity and class.”⁷⁰ Furthermore, Jones continues that in post-colonial Dutch society “ethnic *othering* played an important part in these discourses: politicians excluded Dutch citizens in overseas territories from the imagined Dutch community by portraying their identities as ‘unfit’ for Dutch society.”⁷¹

To put an end to the large influx from Surinam to the Netherlands, the Dutch government wanted to achieve Surinam’s independence as soon as possible.⁷² In 1975, 40,000 Surinamese Dutch citizens migrated to the Netherlands, and on the 25th of November 1975 Surinam became an independent Republic.⁷³ Marchetti refers to this large amount of people leaving Surinam as the “leaving psychosis:” “it was exactly many Surinamese people’s distrust in the economic and political stability of their country on the eve of independence that inspired the greatest emigration, in absolute terms, toward a former colonizer.”⁷⁴ Surinam’s independence meant the closure of Dutch borders to people from Surinam, and Surinamese citizenship for overseas Dutch

⁶⁸ Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands*, p. 40.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 40.

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 40.

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 41.

⁷² Ibid. p. 40.

⁷³ Ibid. p. 41.

⁷⁴ Marchetti, S., ‘Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro–Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands,’ p. 137.

citizens. As a concession, the Dutch government agreed to less restrictive migration policies from 1976 to 1980 after a civil war almost broke out in Surinam. The Dutch Antilles remained part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.⁷⁵

With this large amount of people arriving from Surinam in the Netherlands tensions surfaced. This was partly due to the fact that at the same time there was a massive wave of postwar unemployment in the Netherlands, which affected Surinamese and other postcolonial migrants. There were tensions in urban areas and increased racist sentiments.⁷⁶ A statement made by Ruud Lubbers in 1990 that “the State should stop pampering minorities, and [...] minorities should assume their own responsibility” created an image of minorities as being responsible for provoking racism, while on the other hand white Dutch people were innocent and not racist. This led to migrant minorities being considered a problem.⁷⁷ What the alienation and practices of exclusion directed at migrant minorities entailed in regard to spatial injustice will be elaborated upon in the next chapter.

⁷⁵ Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands*, p. 41.

⁷⁶ Marchetti, S., ‘Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro–Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands,’ p. 137.

⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 141.

CHAPTER TWO RACIAL VIOLENCE THROUGH THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT: SPATIAL STRUCTURES OF PRIVILEGE

The alienation of postcolonial subjects in order to “secure” certain neighborhoods has been discussed in the previous chapter, and this chapter will elaborate further upon these practices of exclusion directed at migrant minorities. Postcolonial critique will be made tangible with a discussion of racial violence inflicted upon certain bodies through the built environment and spatial structures of privilege. As previously discussed, colonial nostalgia has been key in shaping Dutch identity as a part of national sentiments around cultural superiority. The refusal to recognize wrongdoings in its colonial past but instead glorifying this past, the Netherlands keeps up a positive image of the self. After colonial independence, many people from the former Dutch colonies migrated to the Netherlands, with the highest numbers after Surinam’s independence in 1975. With the arrival of these migrants and increased tensions, white Dutch people started to perceive themselves as “prisoners of tolerance.” According to Essed and Nimako, this sentiment originated in the 1980’s to protect innocent white people in poor neighborhoods who expressed their concern about newly arrived immigrants. This set the tone for the future where, as we have seen, a climate of aggression and intolerance is normalized.⁷⁸

To answer this thesis’ main question ‘How have certain affected racialized embodied others in Dutch society been excluded through racial violence in relation to the built environment?’ this chapter lays out different practices illustrative of racial violence carried out through the built environment in Rotterdam. This will entail the period starting in the 1970’s and 1980’s. Additionally, present-day practices such as the Rotterdamwet (a law where people with lower incomes can be restricted from moving into disadvantaged neighborhoods) and gentrification will be elaborated upon in the next chapter. Ways of exclusion that are present in today’s society are an extension of past exclusive practices will be discussed. In Rotterdam - a city where poverty rates are high but at the same time globalization is very visible - issues such as the inaccessible housing market, discriminatory estate agents, and gentrification are on the political agenda.

After presenting spreading policies in the Netherlands on a national level this

⁷⁸ Essed, P. & Nimako, K., ‘Designs and (Co)Incidents’ (2006), p. 303.

chapter moves to a discussion of the squatting of the Bijlmer flat the Glippenhoeve 1. The involvement of Surinamese Dutch people in the squat movement is often not included in mainstream narratives on squatting actions. This chapter will mostly use information from the extensive research by Janneke Jansen and an article written by Miguel Heilbron's about spreading policies in Amsterdam. Hereafter spreading policies in Rotterdam will be debated. These spreading policies have only been implemented for a short period of time, due to resistance from minority rights organizations. Surinamese activists at that time have created a magazine where newspaper articles, pamphlets and other materials were collected, which resulted in *Zwartboek* (Blackbook). The information collected in *Zwartboek* provides an image of the discourse and thought present at that time, and are incorporated in this chapter. What has been the critique of these (mostly) Surinamese organizations? Were they able to redefine and resist the dominant hegemonic understandings of space and the body itself?

Urban practices of spatial exclusion are not new. One can see the resemblance between spreading policies in the 1970's and 1980's aimed at immigrants from former colonies, and present-day policies such as the Rotterdamwet that aim to exclude certain populations to protect (white) citizens and secure certain neighborhoods. In 'The City and Spatial Justice' Edward W. Soja writes:

taking the socio-spatial dialectic seriously means that we recognize that the geographies in which we live can have negative as well as positive consequences on practically everything we do. Foucault captured this by showing how the intersection of space, knowledge, and power can be both oppressive and enabling. Building on Foucault, Edward Said states the following: "Just as none of us are beyond geography, none of us is completely free from the struggle over geography. That struggle is complex and interesting because it is not only about soldiers and cannons but also about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings." Locational discrimination, created through the biases imposed on certain populations because of their geographical location, is fundamental in the production of spatial injustice and the creation of lasting spatial structures of privilege and advantage.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Soja, E. W., 'The City and Spatial Justice' (2009), p. 2-3.

Geographical location is intrinsically linked with class and race, as is visible in Rotterdam. The lasting spatial structures of privilege and advantage, to use the wording of Edward W. Soja, create an unjust city. This creates a deepening of racial and class divides, where already spatially segregated populations are segregated even further by education and class.

SPREADING POLICIES IN THE 1970'S AND 1980'S

It is clear that some places in the Netherlands have a larger concentration of people with a migrant background than other places. On a local level it is surprising that areas with a lot of social housing and a population belonging to the same economic class have turned out to stay very white.⁸⁰ Even though migrants would have Dutch citizenship, their perceived “otherness” has shaped spreading policies. The geographical spreading related to available housing was compatible with ideas around assimilation, later framed as integration.⁸¹ Because of this perceived “otherness,” inclusion on the practical level was hindered, because the government wanted to prevent concentration in certain areas and cities. The free agency of certain organizations and individuals with important positions on the housing market made it possible for them to exclude those they did not want to settle somewhere. This was the case with municipalities, corporations, and particular renters.⁸²

Making space for migrants turned out difficult, not only in a physical sense, but also figuratively speaking: the housing market was not as accessible for everyone. Migrants were seen as different and that label was a negative one. Jansen writes that not only work opportunities or an available shelter decided where migrants would settle, but also labels such as “different,” “not Dutch,” “guest worker” or eventually “allochtoon” led to the placement of migrants where the Dutch society wanted them to

⁸⁰ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 17.

⁸¹ Ibid. p. 97.

⁸² Ibid. p. 97.

live in the name of assimilation or integration.⁸³ The way Dutch society received migrants is on the one hand to be read through analyzing the opportunities and chances given for them to climb the economic and social ladder, and on the other hand their position on the housing market, according to Jansen. These conditions could be seen as an indicator for the position in society for migrants. Consequently, it is important in this analysis to look at two parties: the receiving society and the migrants.⁸⁴ Important to mention is that much attention has been paid to migrants: their request for a place in society was translated into terms such as assimilation and integration, and behaviors and traits were studied. One-sidedness was the result of the idea that the receiving society was a fact where migrants should develop themselves around. Moreover, the receiving society was not seen as a restraint on the way to integration, while altogether the receiving society is the most powerful in majority-minority relations.⁸⁵ It is that powerbase where distinctions, discrimination, stereotypes, racist and xenophobic ideas present in the receiving society can have bad consequences for migrants or minorities as groups.⁸⁶

Jansen writes that there were shelters spread all over the nation for people who were not able to arrange their own housing after migrating to the Netherlands. An example of this practice of spreading was that in 1982 7.500 migrants lived in the north of the Netherlands, in Friesland. Around 90% of this number was Hindustani Surinamese.⁸⁷ Spreading migrants from the (ex-)colonies all over the nation was the goal of the central government. This had to do with the available locations, but also with the wishes and need for migrants to assimilate and integrate. Migrants from Indonesia were either labelled “eastern” or “western oriented Indonesian-Dutch,” something that also influenced their place of housing.⁸⁸ An exception were Moluccan migrants: they were placed far way in the north, east or south, because of the persistent

⁸³ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 16.

⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 19.

⁸⁵ Ibid. p. 21.

⁸⁶ Ibid. p. 21.

⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 15.

⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 17.

aim to keep them separated from the rest of society because they were expected to return back to the Moluccan islands.⁸⁹

The Netherlands arranged the passage of migrants from Indonesia and continued to take care for them. When it comes to Surinamese people, the government acted later. This happened only when there was a dire emergency situation due to housing shortages. Municipalities did not adequately welcome both Indonesian-Dutch as the Surinamese migrants. Housing corporations did not want to house Surinamese migrants sufficiently. Important to note is that the most important governmental party involved with the housing of migrants was the Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work (CRM), and not the Ministry of Housing. Taking care of shelter and housing was seen as a societal problem, but in practice this had many consequences.⁹⁰ Changing circumstances in society influenced the involvement of various parties. The involvement of churches and particular initiatives in the 1950's was large regarding Indonesian-Dutch migrants, where in the case of Surinamese and Antillean migrants in the 1970's this involvement disappeared.⁹¹

Most Surinamese people were able to find housing for themselves, mostly by virtue of their networks. Surinamese migrants that could not themselves arrange housing when firstly arriving ended in shelters. A relatively small number was placed in houses all over the nation by the Central Bureau, first in shelters and later in the municipalities. This was also the case with Antillean and Aruban migrants. In different places in the nation these shelters were designed. A shelter would have around 120 places available. However, interest rates were very low. In these shelters Surinamese migrants were taught how to "behave Dutch." They had to learn this from the course booklet "This is How the Dutch Are." After staying in these shelters the Central Bureau arranged housing somewhere in the nation. Through these practices Surinamese people came to live spread out over regions and places, where there were often no other Surinamese families, which led to isolation and loneliness. There would be housing available, but no opportunities for work or education. Surinamese migrants were not forced to live there, but there were really no other options. For this reasons

⁸⁹ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 96.

⁹⁰ Ibid. p. 94.

⁹¹ Ibid. p. 96.

Surinamese welfare organizations argued that this “voluntary” national spreading should be perceived as involuntary.⁹²

Those who were sheltered by the Central Bureau were indeed spread out over the nation, but most migrants eventually ended up more in the west, mostly in the larger cities. Migrants who could not apply for help from the government had to provide housing for themselves, and on a practical level this meant that social networks were depended on heavily. Surinamese families who could not be sheltered went straight to relatives and lived there for a while or would squat, or move to a house or pension.⁹³ The living conditions of many pensions were comparable with the conditions of the pensions where guest workers would live before. Those pensions were already in place because of the need for them in the 1950's and 1960's for labor migrants first, and later on Indonesian and Moluccan Dutch migrants. The government ended up subsidizing the pensions.⁹⁴

In 1980 around 4.000 Surinamese people were living in pensions in Amsterdam, and from the 100 registered addresses were 15 noted unsafe. There are stories about expensive rooms that were 3 by 3 meters and where whole families would live. The housing market was made up for 95% of social housing, where almost all Surinamese people were depended on. Surinamese families often lived in rented flats et cetera, and in comparison they often rented housing in the lowest renting classes that were not wanted by white Dutch people. Those houses were small and old, and had technical and maintenance issues.⁹⁵ Surinamese migrants also ended up in relatively expensive one-family housing, outside the larger cities. Research done into this topic state that Surinamese migrants who did buy housing often did this because they could not find something to rent. It was also the case that in larger cities more discriminatory practices were signaled when looking for housing.⁹⁶

In the early 70's around 60% of the Surinamese migrants were housed by relatives, but the influx of Surinamese migrants increased and the migration affected more families. Larger cities struggled to provide shelter for Surinamese migrants, so

⁹² Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 87.

⁹³ Ibid. p. 87.

⁹⁴ Heilbron, M., 'Niet voor Surinamers.' 2017.

⁹⁵ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 141.

⁹⁶ Ibid. p. 142.

local municipalities called for help. They argued that the central government had to do something, even though the idea of “the Netherlands not being a migration nation” still persisted. The municipalities stated that the government was responsible for the influx of migrants, so it is the one that has to take action. Surinamese migrants were seen as a group that needed extra shelter and guidance, because their so called “special” problems.⁹⁷

Heilbron writes that it were not only words and warnings made by the Dutch government, and that in the 1970’s throughout the whole Netherlands formal and informal policies existed to spread and separate Surinamese and other ethnic groups.⁹⁸ In 1972 a commission was formed and ordered to research ways to restrict the migration flow from Surinam to the Netherlands. Also, in the same year, Minister of Justice Dries van Agt suggested to change the constitution to make it possible to stop Surinamese people at Schiphol Airport and prevent them from entering the Netherlands.⁹⁹

In 1972 a spreading policy was considered via the so called 5% arrangement. Implementation of this 5% arrangement meant in practice that 5% of new housing to be build should be made available to Surinamese people. However, the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM) was in opposition of national responsibility for the housing of Surinamese people, and considered the municipalities responsible. Nonetheless, the wish for spreading was persistent. Voluntary spreading (outside the Randstad) resulted in the establishment of the Central Bureau for Implementation of Settlement Policy of Fellow Nation Citizens.¹⁰⁰ In 1975 this Central Bureau started with two projects: voluntary spreading of already present Surinamese migrants, and spreading of newly arrived Surinamese migrants through “mandatory offers of facilities.”¹⁰¹ Until the abolition of the Central Bureau in 1980 around 5.000 Surinamese and (a small number of) Antillean families were settled, which is 10% of

⁹⁷ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 84-85.

⁹⁸ Heilbron, M., ‘Niet voor Surinamers.’ 2017.

⁹⁹ Heilbron, M., ‘Niet voor Surinamers.’ 2017.

¹⁰⁰ Centraal Bureau Uitvoering Vestigingsbeleid Rijksgenoten.

¹⁰¹ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 86-87.

the families in the period 1975-1980.¹⁰²

Many guest workers and migrants came to live in the larger cities where their work provided housing. Rotterdam and Amsterdam, cities with a harbor, attracted many people. In those cities industries related to the harbor were also thriving, which made these places economically attractive. The Hague and Utrecht were also popular cities to settle.¹⁰³ From Indonesia, Surinam, the Antillean and Aruba large group migrants arrived to the Netherlands, despite aims to create obstacles for this arrival. All the groups were confronted with dire housing shortage, especially after these years short after the war. The preference of Hindustani Surinamese people would go out to The Hague, while the Creole Surinamese people would mostly settle in Amsterdam.

In the article 'Not For Surinamese People.' Amsterdam Closed Off Complete Neighborhoods for Non-White Dutch People' (translated from Dutch to English), Miguel Heilbron writes that some areas in Amsterdam were closed off for Surinamese Dutch people. In Amsterdam this resulted in a massive influx in the Bijlmer (in the south of Amsterdam).¹⁰⁴ The neighborhood Bijlmer (Bijlmermeer) was a place where many empty houses were located (after they turned out too expensive for white people) and where white Dutch people did not want to live. Egbert Martina writes that:

Bijlmermeer was created to serve as a modernist overflow area for the city of Amsterdam. The development consisted mainly of high-rise deck-apartment blocks, built in a honeycomb pattern. The housing was originally intended for white Amsterdam middle-class families. However, by the time the development was finished, the housing preferences of the target demographic had shifted from expensive residential apartment blocks such as those in Bijlmermeer, to lower-priced, low-rise developments in the suburbs. Consequently, many of the spacious apartments remained vacant.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 87.

¹⁰³ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 15.

¹⁰⁴ Heilbron, M., 'Niet voor Surinamers.' 2017.

¹⁰⁵ Martina, E. A., 'Liveability and the Black Squat Movement,' October 12, 2016. Website: <https://processedlives.wordpress.com/>.

Heilbron writes that due to the remaining vacancy, some housing corporations opened the doors for Surinamese Dutch people during the housing shortage. The housing corporation of one flat called Gliphoeve-1 used the slogan “we do not discriminate” in their marketing. Within one year Gliphoeve-1 had 2.100 inhabitants. Almost 90 per cent of these inhabitants were of Surinamese descent, a result the housing corporation did not anticipate upon. Eventually, in 1972 the decision was made to only provide housing in these flats to white Dutch people, but white Dutch people were not interested in living in the Bijlmer anymore because of the large number of Surinamese people living there.¹⁰⁶

In 1973 sixty per cent of the flat Gliphoeve-1 was vacant, because Surinamese people were no longer welcome. Consequently, a group of Surinamese Dutch people looking for housing decided to squat eighty from the hundred houses in 1974. A large solidarity demonstration was organized by, among others, LOSON (a collective organization of Surinamese organizations in the Netherlands). Many more actions were organized in support of the Bijlmer-squatters.¹⁰⁷ It has been argued by Martina that the squatting action was a result of:

the housing shortage, the deplorable conditions in boarding houses, the municipal requirements to qualify for housing, which severely limited the already poor options for young, unmarried Dutch Caribbeans, the high level of vacancy in Bijlmermeer, and the fact that housing associations refused to rent to Dutch Caribbeans in the Bijlmer district due to an already high concentration of black people.¹⁰⁸

Heilbron writes that eventually Gliphoeve-1 became a “social housing project.” The squatters - those who have lived in the Netherlands longer than one year - were given a rent agreement. Unfortunately, Gliphoeve-1 spiraled downwards after these incidents. There was overpopulation, vandalism, and rent was unpaid. Cleaners, post deliverers, and even police officers felt unsafe. Eventually they all together stopped

¹⁰⁶ Heilbron, M., ‘Niet voor Surinamers.’ 2017.

¹⁰⁷ Heilbron, M., ‘Niet voor Surinamers.’ 2017.

¹⁰⁸ Martina, E., ‘Liveability and the Black Squat Movement,’ October 12, 2016. Website: <https://processedlives.wordpress.com/>.

working in the Bijlmer, and it became a place people referred to as a “ghetto.” The situation in the Bijlmer was used by politicians and policy makers as an example of how wrong it could go if Surinamese Dutch people live together, and they used this downfall to propagate a “spreading policy.”¹⁰⁹

In 1974, the year of the Bijlmer-squatting, around 70.000 Surinamese people lived in the Netherlands. After the squatting of Gliphoeve-1, the mayor of Amsterdam said on national television that the around 25.000 - 30.000 Surinamese people led to problems in his city. He called for a national plan due to rising tensions between various groups. Minister of Education, Jos van Kemenade from the Labor Party, warned for a social disaster because of the large amount of Surinamese people migrating to the Netherlands. Other politicians called for drastic measures, such as lowering the alimony for Surinamese people and stricter immigration laws which could be based on skin color. They all agreed this would be a bad development, but that it is an inevitable measure.¹¹⁰

Heilbron continues that Amsterdam used a spreading policy from 1974 until 1979. Per flat it was not allowed to have more than one family with a migrant background living there. This was the rule for Surinamese people as well as guest workers. It was feared that having more than one family with a migrant background could lead to complications and a “Gliphoeve-1 effect.” This policy went even further: in some streets and neighborhoods Surinamese people were not allowed at all. In the neighborhoods not closed off for people with a migrant background it was the rule that per flat with eight families, no more than one family with a migrant background was allowed to live there.¹¹¹ Surinamese organizations and other groups resisted these practices and argued it was discriminatory and unlawful. Also, the spreading policy would instead of a balanced neighborhood or city just lead to more concentration of these groups in neighborhoods where housing was not all owned by housing corporations. Eventually, after political debates about the spreading policy and its contradiction with international agreements around racial discrimination, the spreading policy in Amsterdam was officially erased in 1979.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ Heilbron, M., ‘Niet voor Surinamers.’ 2017.

¹¹⁰ Heilbron, M., ‘Niet voor Surinamers.’ 2017.

¹¹¹ Bolt, G., ‘Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand’ (2004), p. 3.

¹¹² Heilbron, M., ‘Niet voor Surinamers.’ 2017.

ROTTERDAM

Spreading policies were also implemented in Rotterdam. Rotterdam has tried twice to get to a spreading policy: in 1972 and 1979. A spreading policy was first introduced in 1972 after riots in the Afrikaanderwijk broke out. Apparently, a Dutch woman was put on the streets after her Turkish Dutch landlord wanted to turn her house into a pension to provide housing for guest workers, and this news caused many clashes. White native Dutch people were angry, because according to them landlords provided housing more often to guest workers and migrants, while white native Dutch people had to wait. After these riots it was decided by the municipality to aim for a demographic balance, so it was decided that the number of Mediterranean, Surinamese, and Antillean people could not reach more than five per cent in the neighborhood Afrikaanderwijk. This percentage was chosen because the presence of these groups in Rotterdam altogether was five per cent as well. However, the spreading policy was eliminated a year later after many protests and the decision that the spreading policy was unlawful and discriminatory.¹¹³

According to Gideon Bolt in 'Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand' (About Spreading Policies and Quicksand), the rejection of the official spreading policy did not mean that policy makers from Rotterdam let go of this approach that in their eyes would help integrate migrants and could take away tensions in certain old neighborhoods. This became clear again when in 1979 the policy note *Leegloop en Toeloop* (Outflow and Inflow) was introduced that again discussed the necessity of spreading. This policy note stated that intolerance and aggression (and eventually discrimination) would be the result of large concentrations of migrants in certain neighborhoods. As a result the native (white) Dutch citizens would not let themselves be "scared away," which would eventually cause anxiety and feelings of insecurity among those native (white) Dutch citizens. Xenophobia would be the outcome, resulting in what "we Dutch people have been against in South Africa: Apartheid."¹¹⁴

A Spreading Commission was ordered to house migrants as much as possible in areas where the amount of migrants already living there was under 16 per cent, and

¹¹³ Bolt, G., 'Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand' (2004), p. 2.

¹¹⁴ Bolt, G., 'Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand' (2004), p. 2.

housing corporations agreed to cooperate. It was the goal to get people with the same migrant background living together in the same areas, but the amount of the migrant population should thus not exceed the 16 per cent. In *Leegloop en Toeloop* it was argued that migrants with the same background would have more confidence living together, and would enter Western society less anxious and with more enthusiasm, and per nationality a neighborhood was assigned.¹¹⁵ At first sight it looks like policy makers with this policy note wanted to keep in mind the wishes and needs of people with a migrant background. However, Bolt argues, the document also asks the question if native Dutch citizens should carry the burden of migrant groups looking for housing in these neighborhoods. Thus, people with a migrant background were perceived as troublemakers while native Dutch people were seen as victims.¹¹⁶ On the 24th of November and the 4th of December 1980 the spreading policy was agreed upon.¹¹⁷

Roseval and Douglas in a reaction in *Span'noe* (1981) write that *Leegloop en Toeloop* states that it is not favorable if in certain neighborhoods too many people live together who have not been born in the Netherlands. Roseval and Douglas in *Span'noe* present critique as formulated by the National Federation and other minority rights organizations. They write that according to the municipality of Rotterdam, people with a migrant background are the perpetrators of problems regarding liveability in older neighborhoods. Thus, the municipality confirms the bias against people with a migrant background in the older neighborhoods.¹¹⁸ The points of critique as presented in *Span'noe* were that (1) every spreading policy that makes distinction on the base of race, ethnicity, nationality et cetera is inherently discriminatory, (2) spreading does not comply with the principle that everyone is equal for the law, (3) it affects the right to free mobility and establishment, (4) critics fear that in regard to other social benefits a discriminatory line will be followed, (5) a spreading policy is for the affected offensive, denigrating, and hurtful, (6) besides the discriminatory aspects, it is questionable if it is in the interest of the concerning groups, and lastly, (7) it does not become clear how

¹¹⁵ Bolt, G., 'Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand' (2004), p. 2.

¹¹⁶ Bolt, G., 'Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand' (2004), p. 3.

¹¹⁷ Roseval, H. & B. Douglas, 'Uitspraak Kortgeding is Geen Groen Licht voor Gemeente Rotterdam,' (1981).

¹¹⁸ Roseval, H. & B. Douglas, 'Uitspraak Kortgeding is Geen Groen Licht voor Gemeente Rotterdam,' (1981).

the critique formulated against the spreading policy in 1974 has been anticipated upon in this new spreading policy.¹¹⁹ The spreading policy is not credible and it breathes racism, write Roseval and Douglas. It is a form of institutional discrimination. The affected people are not included in policy making, and the spreading policy works contra-productive when it comes to integration is stated.¹²⁰

Other critical writings, manifests, and news articles have been collected and archived in *Zwartboek* (Blackbook) in 1978. On why *Zwartboek* has been created, the authors write that the overcrowded pensions, long waiting lists for Surinamese people, and hesitant policy-making urged them to collect critical writings. Activists have provided knowledge, organized meetings, and negotiated with the municipalities, whilst pressuring for improvements. The closing off of certain neighborhoods for ethnic minorities is considered the main issue in *Zwartboek*. They explicitly state that not *all* people with a migrant background got excluded, and that this exclusion also applies on some native Dutch people, many young people, and the elderly.¹²¹ Closing off neighborhoods led to longer waiting lists for Surinamese people (and other people with a migrant background) which meant that they had to live longer in unsafe and small pensions. They argue that this also resulted in mental health issues and stress.¹²² Another result mentioned by *Zwartboek*, as is discussed above as well, is that to prevent concentration in certain neighborhoods, concentration will take place in other already disadvantaged neighborhoods. The declining liveability of those neighborhoods will be blamed on the people with a migrant background moving there, while them moving there should be considered a result.¹²³ After many protests by organizations involved with minority rights, the spreading policy was put on hold.¹²⁴

An official spreading policy like the ones in Rotterdam was nowhere else in the Netherlands put in practice. However, as mentioned earlier, in Amsterdam agreements were made between the municipality and some housing corporations to not provide housing for guest workers and Surinamese people. These agreements were made

¹¹⁹ Roseval, H. & B. Douglas, 'Uitspraak Kortgeding is Geen Groen Licht voor Gemeente Rotterdam,' (1981).

¹²⁰ Roseval, H. & B. Douglas, 'Uitspraak Kortgeding is Geen Groen Licht voor Gemeente Rotterdam,' (1981).

¹²¹ *Zwartboek*. "Gesloten Wijken," February, 1978, p. 2.

¹²² *Zwartboek*. "Gesloten Wijken," February, 1978, p. 3.

¹²³ *Zwartboek*. "Gesloten Wijken," February, 1978, p. 3.

¹²⁴ Bolt, G., 'Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand' (2004), p. 3.

after white Dutch people complained. In other areas of the Netherlands there may not have been official spreading policies, but it turned out that housing corporations did find their ways to exclude people with a migrant background.

Looking back at this discussion of spreading policies in the Netherlands in the 1970's and 1980's it is clear that inclusion on the housing market turned out to be difficult, and was unequal to access. Dividers of housing had the agency to spread and place migrants where they wanted them, and were in this way able to decide where they *not* wanted them to live, which resulted in the fact that some areas and neighborhoods were closed off. Spatial inequality was the result and no drastic measures were placed on organizations and individuals involved by the government.¹²⁵

The accessibility to the housing market refers to mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. Exclusion is to be defined as all forms of action that limit, restrain or forbid the participation of migrants and their descendants to the society in comparison with white native Dutch people. This exclusion can manifest itself on three levels: the institutional level, the organizational level and/or the individual level. The term exclusion is mostly defined in terms of negative outcomes for the acting on these three levels.¹²⁶ One can see here how the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM), the housing corporations, and individual workers within those organizations as well as particular renters are connected and are together complicit in the exclusion of migrants on various levels.¹²⁷

The spreading policies turned out to have negative outcomes in terms of concentration. Because some neighborhoods were closed off for migrants, the remaining neighborhoods (mostly lower income neighborhoods) had to house large numbers of migrants.¹²⁸ Arguably, inclusion on the housing market by opening all the neighborhoods with the same levels of income and price classes could have meant a better spreading over the city. The spreading policies turned out counterproductive, even though fear of concentration brought about the whole idea of spreading.¹²⁹ Housing corporations named aversion against migrants as a motive for spreading

¹²⁵ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 245-246.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* p. 23.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.* p. 23-24.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* p. 246.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* p. 246.

policies and anticipated upon this aversion, sometimes already upfront.¹³⁰ Surinamese and Caribbean minority rights organizations have extensively formulated critique regarding spreading policies and other racial injustices. Considering spreading policies and the treatment of migrants in the Netherlands one can clearly see the connection between anti-migrant sentiments and organizing principles of social life. Egbert Martina wrote thoroughly about anti-black violence as historic and systemic organizing principle of social life and urban aesthetics. Martina argues that “despite the geographical gulf that separates the Dutch Caribbean and the Netherlands, there is a spatial continuity between plantation and the Bijlmer/black ghetto; the spatial logic of the plantation is migratory.”

In reference to the Bijlmer situation Martina argues that we should not consider the Bijlmer as a static geographical location, but “rather a complex set of political, economic, spatial, racial, gender, and sexual relations that converge on a site that is subsequently marked as black and uninhabitable.” Martina continues that:

the residential outcomes of black people are often outlined in terms of *ghetto* or *ghettoization*, however, the same descriptors are never used in regard to the ‘concentrated’, yet unproblematized, outcomes of white Dutch people living in suburbs. The national spatial imaginary is racially marked: racialized bodies are territorialized through terms like “Allochtoon” and “Autochtoon,” and it is through this territorialization of racialized bodies that spaces are coded as white, or black. As such, blacks and whites are consigned to different physical and metaphorical spaces.¹³¹

In the next chapter the continuation of racial violence inflicted upon certain bodies will be discussed, where three case studies will be shortly touched upon. Starting in 2003 with the policy note *Rotterdam Zet Door – Op Weg naar een Stad in Balans* (Rotterdam Pushes Through – On Its Way to a City in Balance), the chapter then moves to a discussion of the implementation of the Rotterdamwet in 2006 that is today still in practice, and a short discussion of gentrification.

¹³⁰ Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006), p. 246.

¹³¹ Martina, E. A., ‘Liveability and the Black Squat Movement,’ October 12, 2016. Website: <https://processedlives.wordpress.com/>.

CHAPTER THREE CONTINUATION OF RACIAL PRACTICES OF EXCLUSION IN PRESENT-DAY PRACTICES

In 2003 Dominic Schrijer from the Labour Party in Rotterdam called for a spreading policy because of an “emergency situation” in Charlois. The so called threat was that forecasts predicted that in 2017 the population of Rotterdam would be made up for more than half of non-Western migrants, with Charlois as one of the most affected neighborhoods. Gideon Bolt writes in ‘Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand’ (2004) that in 2003 the *Rotterdam Zet Door*¹³² policy note was introduced. Its proposed idea to close off the housing market of Rotterdam for refugees and people with an income of less than the 120 per cent of the minimum income was met with a lot of resistance, but the law was pushed through anyway. Bolt researches in what way the plans to get a “fair” spreading policy could be scientifically backed, as well as the effects of such a spreading policy.¹³³

The policy document *Rotterdam Zet Door* stated that the main problem of Rotterdam was that the limits of certain neighborhoods were reached due to the constant influx of “disadvantaged people” and the departure of “advantaged people,” as well as the rise of criminal activities and other complexities. According to Bolt, using the description “disadvantaged people”, and not “ethnic minorities” is not believable. This because the document was not accompanied with numbers about people with a disadvantaged position in society, but with facts about the focus groups, namely Surinamese, Antillean, Cabo Verdean, Turkish, Moroccan, and other ethnic groups. Additionally, the policy document stated that “the color is not the problem, but the problem has a color.”¹³⁴

Bolt argues that policies and practices of spreading disadvantaged people will not be a solution to systematic inequality. Disadvantaged members of society should get more perspectives on job opportunities or education. Problems such as criminal activity should get solved, but it will not be useful to spread out ethnic minorities only because they are higher represented in statistics regarding criminality et cetera.

¹³² *Rotterdam Zet Door – Op Weg naar een Stad in Balans* (Rotterdam Pushes Through – On Its Way to a City in Balance).

¹³³ Bolt, G., ‘Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand’ (2004), p. 6.

¹³⁴ Bolt, G., ‘Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand’ (2004), p. 6.

Unfortunately, Bolt continues, the belief in the effectiveness of spreading ethnic minorities has taken the shape of a dogma that we will not get rid of soon.¹³⁵ One can see the persistent belief in the effectiveness of spreading with the implementation of the Rotterdamwet in 2006, which was a continuation of the more experimental policy introduced in the policy note *Rotterdam Zet Door*. The controversial Rotterdamwet has been met with a lot of criticism that the following subchapter will go into.

ROTTERDAMWET

The municipality of Rotterdam chose in January 2018 for the prolonging of the controversial Rotterdamwet. As a reaction Dutch newspaper Trouw published an article in that same week written by Jeaninne Julen about the Rotterdamwet and its failures. The Law on Urban Areas (Special Measures)¹³⁶, the official name for the Rotterdamwet, was introduced in 2006 after it turned out that the municipality of Rotterdam was not able to tackle the high unemployment, decay, and criminality in disadvantaged neighborhoods with the available tools. Hence Marco Pasters, back then counselor, decided that the population composition should be different. The goal was to create more pleasant and safer neighborhoods. It became allowed to ban unemployed people, people with alimony, and people looking for housing without a job, student loan, or pension from disadvantaged neighborhoods - if they were living in the city for less than six years. Currently, the law is implemented in five neighborhoods and in around hundred streets.¹³⁷ These neighborhoods are Carnisse, Hillesluis, Oud-Charlois, Tarwewijk, and Bloemwijk. The Rotterdamwet is also implemented in some streets in Delfshaven.

According to Article 3 from the Law on Urban Areas (Special Measures), a neighborhood that is in need of drastic improvement due to socio-economic problems can by the municipality be labelled a risk zone if 1) “within the zone the number of non-actives is at least 25 per cent,” 2) “the number of households with a low income is at

¹³⁵ Bolt, G., ‘Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand’ (2004), p. 11.

¹³⁶ Wet ‘Bijzondere Maatregelen Grootstedelijke Problematiek’ in Dutch.

¹³⁷ Julen, J., The Rotterdamwet, Which Bans People With Lower Incomes From Poor Areas, is Not A Success. Nevertheless, Rotterdam Maintains This Policy. 20 January, 2018.

least 45 per cent,” and 3) “the area has at least 5.000 and at the highest 30.000 inhabitants.” For determining these percentages the most recent numbers as established by the Central Bureau for Statistics (CBS) are used.¹³⁸ Article 10 in the Law on Urban Areas (Special Measures) declares that:

the municipality can state in the housing regulation that a housing permit can be denied if there is a grounded presumption that accommodation of the persons older than sixteen year wanting to settle down in a certain apartment complex, street or area, will lead to an increase of nuisance or criminality in that apartment complex, street or area.¹³⁹

The Rotterdamwet makes it possible to ban lower incomes from disadvantaged neighborhoods, but according to recent research it turned out that the Rotterdamwet does not have positive results. Furthermore, the number of people under the poverty line increases, and the same goes for criminality, according to research done by consultancy Twynstra Gudde. The researchers Twynstra Gudde have doubts about the gains of banning lower incomes to improve neighborhoods. In some parts small improvements are visible, but in larger parts one can see a decline of the neighborhood. Indeed, the group with alimentionation is nowadays smaller and the average income of the population has risen, but the low income is still under the average income of Rotterdam. Also, a growing number of the population of Rotterdam lives under the poverty line (in some areas around the thirty per cent). And in all the five areas that fall under the Rotterdamwet the number of burglaries, thefts, and violent incidents has increased.¹⁴⁰

However, councilor Robert Simons who is responsible for the Rotterdamwet referred to the law as “a law that does what is has to do.” Cody Hochstenbach, social geographer at the University of Amsterdam, says in Trouw that he understands that local administrators implemented this law, because it is a cheap way for administrators to show voters that they are busy with tackling problems in disadvantaged neighborhoods while not having to take down or built buildings. Hochstenbach argues

¹³⁸ Overheid.nl, Law on Urban Areas (Special Measures).

¹³⁹ Overheid.nl, Law on Urban Areas (Special Measures).

¹⁴⁰ Julen, J., The Rotterdamwet, Which Bans People With Lower Incomes From Poor Areas, is Not A Success. Nevertheless, Rotterdam Maintains This Policy. Trouw, 20 January, 2018 (translated from Dutch).

that we should have noticed it by now if the law would have had comprehensive positive results. In the recent years many evaluations have been carried out and none of them have showed a demonstrably effect on liveability and safety.¹⁴¹

While Hochstenbach wonders why the law is still in practice, enthusiasm grows in other municipalities for the approach in Rotterdam. Julen writes that landlords in for example Zaandam, Tilburg, Vlaardingen, Den Bosch and Schiedam can refuse disadvantaged people searching for housing now as well. They can also invoke the law to stimulate entrepreneurship or close down degraded properties. The housing corporation Havensteder based in Rotterdam is less enthusiastic. Director Hedy van den Berk states that problems are not solved, but instead occur again in surrounding neighborhoods. The result is that these neighborhoods in time could become “Rotterdamwet neighborhoods” as well.¹⁴²

The law already caused the municipality of Rotterdam to be challenged in court for the violation of human rights. The prosecutor stated that they were restricted in their freedom of living. After various court cases the European Court of Human Rights decided in favor of the Dutch State, which also meant in favor of Rotterdam and the Rotterdamwet. However, the discussion was not ended. The Council of State called the new part of the law - the possibility to refuse people on the base of police notifications - a serious violation of the lawful freedom of settlement and respect of personal privacy.¹⁴³

Making the city more liveable and resilient should mean the improvement of public services, providing a reliable social safety net, and the aim for equality in all fields. With current policies however, it means the expel of certain groups of people and not fixing root causes of persistent problems. The Rotterdamwet affects mostly people of color and white people belonging to lower socio-economic classes where, in

¹⁴¹ Julen, J., The Rotterdamwet, Which Bans People With Lower Incomes From Poor Areas, is Not A Success. Nevertheless, Rotterdam Maintains This Policy. 20 January, 2018 (translated from Dutch).

¹⁴² Julen, J., The Rotterdamwet, Which Bans People With Lower Incomes From Poor Areas, is Not A Success. Nevertheless, Rotterdam Maintains This Policy. 20 January, 2018 (translated from Dutch).

¹⁴³ Julen, J., The Rotterdamwet, Which Bans People With Lower Incomes From Poor Areas, is Not A Success. Nevertheless, Rotterdam Maintains This Policy. 20 January, 2018 (translated from Dutch).

an attempt to make the city attractive and safe, principles established by law such as equality for everyone and the prohibition of discrimination, are ignored.

How Rotterdam wants to portray itself is in stark contrast with the reality of people living in disadvantaged neighborhoods. In the policy note *Binnenstad Als City Lounge* (City Center As City Lounge) from 2008, where the city's policies regarding living in the city center in the time period 2008-2020 are presented, one can see this discrepancy. The concept of "city lounge" is introduced to articulate the city's wish to attract focus groups: higher educated, creatives, students, elderly, "tastemakers", "knowledge workers", and craftsmen.¹⁴⁴ It was presented in *Woonvisie* (Housing Vision) in 2016, the policy document where the municipality of Rotterdam presents its vision for the city regarding housing and city planning until 2030, that to attract households with a modal or higher income, "social risers", and "young potentials", more expensive housing will be built (+36.000) and cheaper housing will be demolished (-20.000). It is stated in *Woonvisie* that this will restore the balance in the city.¹⁴⁵ One can see how with the Rotterdamwet and its aim to make neighborhoods more socio-economic resilient, processes of gentrification are promoted.

GENTRIFICATION

Malique Mohamud writes in 'Help, Rotterdam Wordt Gekoloniseerd door Yuppen' for Vers Beton that gentrification means the repression of people of color outside their neighborhoods. The upgrading of certain neighborhoods and streets in Rotterdam with new yoga-studios and expensive coffee shops does not have benefits for local people of color, but instead facilitates the lifestyle of middle-class white people.¹⁴⁶ Making a neighborhood more attractive for higher social and economic capital will in time mean higher prices for housing, and eventually the repression of local people of color from the places they always go to. Mohamud writes that because

¹⁴⁴ *Binnenstad Als City Lounge. Binnenstadsplan 2008-2020*, Municipality of Rotterdam, October, 2008, p. 13.

¹⁴⁵ *Woonvisie Rotterdam 2030*, Municipality of Rotterdam, December 15, 2016, p. 16.

¹⁴⁶ Mohamud, M., 'Help, Rotterdam Wordt Gekoloniseerd door Yuppen', Vers Beton, 28 November 2016.

new white middle-class population create their own segregated enclaves and do often not invest in the neighborhoods, one can see the almost physical boundaries that separates certain racialized bodies from others where the class dimension makes the exclusion even more tangible. Here one can clearly see again the intersection of class and race and how spatial injustice affects the ones that inhabit cross-over identities the most.¹⁴⁷

Cody Hochstenbach in 'Inequality in the Gentrifying European City' follows recent scholarship in adopting a broad definition of gentrification that "understands the process as the class-based transformation of urban space for progressively more affluent users."¹⁴⁸ Hochstenbach continues in 'The Influence of State-led Gentrification in Rotterdam' written for *Vers Beton* that gentrification too often is wrongfully perceived as a spontaneous process, driven by the housing preferences of a new middle-class. The state has an important role in the boost of gentrification processes, which is clearly visible in Rotterdam. These gentrification processes can be executed in various ways.

The actualization of icon projects to promote the city is a contested strategy. One can think here about new buildings in Rotterdam like the Markthal for example, or "the Rotterdam." At the same time the municipality is involved with the investment in middle-class neighborhoods, and also with executing the plans presented in *Woonvisie*.¹⁴⁹ As discussed above, *Woonvisie* promotes the idea of mixing neighborhoods. However, the merely focus on poor neighborhoods shows the ambition to increase the number of middle-class households at the expense of lower income households. In this way, this policy can be seen as a clear example of state-led gentrification. In neighborhoods where this is not working, the Rotterdamwet is applied to bring back the number of unemployed population.¹⁵⁰

In Rotterdam's city center the process of gentrification is less visible than in for example Amsterdam's city center, because gentrification in Rotterdam moves more from one neighborhood to the other. Hochstenbach writes that the population of

¹⁴⁷ Mohamud, M., 'Help, Rotterdam Wordt Gekoloniseerd door Yuppen', *Vers Beton*, 28 November 2016.

¹⁴⁸ Hochstenbach, C., 'Inequality in the Gentrifying European City', Academic Dissertation University of Amsterdam (2017), p. 15.

¹⁴⁹ Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', *Vers Beton*, 28 March 2017.

¹⁵⁰ Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', *Vers Beton*, 28 March 2017.

gentrified neighborhoods also changes differently depending on the context. In some neighborhoods low incomes make directly space for higher incomes. In other neighborhoods, one sees the aging of the poorer population and its gradual replacement by higher income groups. Also, upgrading also happens because young and economically upwards mobile households make career within the area.¹⁵¹

Hochstenbach writes that the staying population does not have to feel the impact of gentrification directly. Renters are relatively well protected by Dutch law and can in principle not be forced out their house, or be confronted with strong rent increase. The negative effects of gentrification are because of that mostly felt by outsiders who want to obtain a place in Rotterdam, according to Hochstenbach. These people are directly confronted with the less accessible and affordable housing offers as a result of gentrification processes.¹⁵² Hochstenbach continues that due to the fact that gentrification affects mostly people that are moving, it is important to not only look at changes in the population composition, but also zoom in and look at the motives behind moving. Only then will changes in accessibility of the housing market and changing inequalities become visible. As popular inner city neighborhoods become less affordable, lower incomes increasingly move to periphery neighborhoods in Rotterdam. Hochstenbach calls this the suburbanization of poverty, which mostly affects unemployed households, and not so much working people with a low income.¹⁵³

At first, the suburbanization of poverty leads to more evenly spreading of low income groups over Rotterdam. The number of low incomes in Rotterdam is after all still larger than surrounding regions. From this perspective, gentrification could be seen as an equalizing process. This conceals however that this process comes about because of declining accessibility and affordability of the overall housing market. Moreover, social mixing of different population groups is after all achieved by reducing cheap housing, which makes is harder for low incomes to find affordable housing. Furthermore, these analyses do not consider the fact that gentrification can indeed lead to social mixing at first, but in term will lead just to stronger segregation, as well

¹⁵¹ Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', Vers Beton, 28 March 2017.

¹⁵² Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', Vers Beton, 28 March 2017.

¹⁵³ Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', Vers Beton, 28 March 2017.

as spreading to surrounding neighborhoods, concludes Hochstenbach.¹⁵⁴

Additionally, when looking at gentrification and its effects on the city as a whole instead of focusing on the position of lower incomes, one can see the risks that come with gentrification. It leads to a decline in affordability of the housing market in its whole, for all population groups. As housing prices and rent increase, larger groups of households will get in trouble. One can think here about students, starters, middle-incomes, and migrants.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', Vers Beton, 28 March 2017.

¹⁵⁵ Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', Vers Beton, 28 March 2017.

CONCLUSION

Spaces are marked with complex histories and meanings, hierarchies and exclusions. Throughout this thesis, it has become clear that geographical location is intrinsically linked with class and race, as is visible in Rotterdam. The long tradition of “securing” neighborhoods through the alienation of people with a migrant background creates spatial injustice in a city where everyone should have the same rights and access to the same spaces. Practices of exclusion and spatial injustice have been addressed in this thesis by illustrating the continuation of racial violence and coloniality in relation to the built environment throughout the past decades. The research question of this thesis was as followed: *How have certain affected racialized embodied others been excluded through racial violence in relation to the built environment in Rotterdam?*

In the first chapter the historical context of the Netherlands as postcolonial entity was introduced to show the shifting understandings of citizenship and the in/exclusion of (post)colonial migrants, where affect theory provided an understanding of how emotions are cultural practices that influence bodies and can break open the construction of national subjectivity. Including affect theory meant the encouragement of thinking about the political implications of emotions: “others” are created because individuals, thus bodies, become aligned with popular ideology which results in the racialization of citizenship. Some bodies are aligned with each other inside a community and marginalize other bodies, what happens at a conscious and non-conscious level. Key to studying affect is the notion of emotions not as private, but as socially organized. In this thesis embodied knowledge and theories around affect have been used and studied to illustrate the power of socially organized practices and embodied encounters around exclusion. Considering spreading policies and the treatment of migrants in the Netherlands, a strong connection is present between anti-migrant sentiments and organizing principles of social life.

In the second chapter, racialized housing policies in the 1970’s and 1980’s were discussed. Looking back at this discussion of spreading policies in the Netherlands in the 1970’s and 1980’s, it is clear that inclusion on the housing market turned out to be difficult. Dividers of housing had the agency to spread and place migrants where they wanted them, and were in this way able to decide where they *not* wanted them to live, which resulted in the fact that some areas and neighborhoods were closed off.

Amsterdam used a spreading policy from 1974 until 1979, which meant that per flat it was not allowed to have more than one family with a migrant background living there. It was feared that having more than one family with a migrant background could lead to complications. This policy went even further in some streets and neighborhoods: Surinamese people were not allowed at all. In the neighborhoods not closed off for people with a migrant background it was the rule that per flat with eight families, no more than one family with a migrant background was allowed to live there. Surinamese minority rights organizations and other groups resisted these practices on the base of its discriminatory and unlawful aspect. Eventually, after political debates about the spreading policy and its contradiction with international agreements around racial discrimination, the spreading policy in Amsterdam was officially erased in 1979.

Rotterdam has tried twice to get to a spreading policy: in 1972 and 1979. A spreading policy was first introduced in 1972 after riots in the Afrikaanderwijk broke out. However, the spreading policy was eliminated a year later after many protests and the decision that the spreading policy was unlawful and discriminatory. Nonetheless, policy makers from Rotterdam did not let go of this approach that in their eyes would help integrate migrants and take away tensions in certain old neighborhoods. This became clear again when in 1979 the policy note *Leegloop en Toeloop* was introduced that again discussed the necessity of spreading. This policy note stated that intolerance and aggression (and eventually discrimination) would be the result of large concentrations of migrants in certain neighborhoods. A Spreading Commission was ordered to house migrants as much as possible in areas where the amount of migrants already living there was under 16 per cent, and housing corporations agreed to cooperate. Eventually it became clear that the spreading policies turned out to have negative outcomes in terms of concentration. Because some neighborhoods were closed off for migrants, the remaining neighborhoods (mostly lower income neighborhoods) had to house large numbers of migrants.

Chapter three went into the continuation of those racialized practices in the 2000's. One can see the persistence in the belief of effectiveness of spreading with the implementation of the controversial Rotterdamwet in 2006. It was decided that the population composition should be different with the aim to create more pleasant and safer neighborhoods. It became allowed to ban unemployed people, people with alimony, and people looking for housing without a job, student loan, or pension from

disadvantaged neighborhoods - if they were living in the city for less than six years. Currently, the law is implemented in five neighborhoods and in around hundred streets. State-led processes of gentrification are a continuation of spatial arrangements as well, and often lead to repression of people of color and the suburbanization of poverty. Upgrading of neighborhoods most of the times means the facilitation of the lifestyles of white middle-class people, neglecting people of color and their wishes and demands.

This thesis has illustrated the many ways spatial boundaries are created to secure neighborhoods through state-led practices of exclusion aimed at certain racialized bodies. The lasting spatial structures of privilege and advantage have established a climate where middle-class white people and people that are perceived as “unfit” to belong to this category are cosigned to different physical and metaphorical spaces. It has become clear that the idea that certain bodies are naturally entitled to certain spaces, and others are not, is very persistent. However, these forms of discrimination against people of color have always been met with different forms of protest. To break open dominant ways of thinking it is of great importance to keep formulating critique and create counter narratives to establish new imaginaries to impact the future.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S., *Affective Economies*, Social Text 79, Vol. 22, No. 2, (2004).

Black Archives Website: <http://www.theblackarchives.nl/>.

Bolt, G., 'Over Spreidingsbeleid en Drijfzand' (2004).

Dhawan, N. & Do Mar Castro Varela, M., 'What Difference Does Difference make?": Diversity, Intersectionality and Transnational Feminist Politics.' *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies*, 2016, vol. 16, pp. 9-43.

Essed, P. & Nimako, K., 'Designs and (Co)Incidents', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* (2006).

Haraway, D., 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective,' *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988), p. 575-599.

Heilbron, M., 'Niet voor Surinamers.' *Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders*, *de Correspondent*, October 14, 2017.

Hesse-Biber, S.N., 'Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method,' in *Handbook of Feminist Research*, ed. S.N. Hesse-Biber (2011).

Hochstenbach, C., 'Inequality in the Gentrifying European City', Academic Dissertation University of Amsterdam (2017).

Hochstenbach, C., 'De Invloed van Overheid Gestuurde Gentrificatie in Rotterdam', *Vers Beton*, 28 March 2017.

Jansen, J., *Bepaalde Huisvesting. Een Geschiedenis van Opvang en Huisvesting van Immigranten in Nederland, 1945-1995* (2006).

Jones, G. R. (2012). Dutch politicians, the Dutch nation and the dynamics of postcolonial citizenship. In U. Bosma (Ed.), *Post-Colonial Immigrants and Identity Formations in the Netherlands* (pp. 27-48). (IMISCOE Research series). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Marchetti, S., 'Resentment at the Heart of Europe: Narratives by Afro-Surinamese Postcolonial Migrant Women in the Netherlands.' In *Postcolonial Transitions in Europe: Contexts, Practices and Politics*. ed. S. Ponzanesi & G. Colpani.

Martina, E. A., 'Bitter', March 25, 2014, Website: <https://processedlives.wordpress.com/2014/03/25/bitter/#more-1790>.

Martina, E. A., 'Liveability and the Black Squat Movement,' October 12, 2016. Website: <https://processedlives.wordpress.com/>.

Mohamud, M., 'Help, Rotterdam Wordt Gekoloniseerd door Yuppen', *Vers Beton*, 28 November 2016.

Pedwell., C. & A. Whitehead, 'Affecting Feminism: Questions of Feeling in Feminist Theory,' *Feminist Theory* (2012).

Roseval, H. & B. Douglas, 'Uitspraak Kortgeding is Geen Groen Licht voor Gemeente Rotterdam' in *Span'noe 2. Aktueel: Spreidingsbeleid in Rotterdam* (1981). Informatieblad Voor en Over Surinamers in Nederland.

Soja, E. W., 'The City and Spatial Justice' (2009).

'VVD-plan om criminaliteit in probleemwijken harder te straffen valt slecht in Den Haag', *Omroep West*, September 19, 2018.

Wekker, G., *White Innocence* (2016). Duke University Press.

Zwartboek. "Gesloten Wijken," Overleggroep Pensions. February, 1978.

