The Effects of Diversity on Local Social Cohesion

Experiences of change in the Schilderswijk of The Hague

Michelle van Zanten
Master Thesis
Governance of Migration and Diversity
Dr. I.A. Glynn
26-06-2020

CONTENT

Preface 4
Introduction 5
Historiography 9
Material and Methods 11
Overview of interviews 15
Theoretical Framework & Operationalization 16
Chapter One: Historical Context 21
Chapter Two: Memories of Gezelligheid 27
Collective Identity 28
Social Capital 30
Social Safety 32
Chapter Three: Experiences of Change 35
The first memories of migrants in the neighbourhood 36
'It is no longer gezellig' 37
Attitudes towards migrants 39
Other Factors 40
Conclusion 42
Appendix I : Images 44
References 45


Haagse Markt
Paul Krugerlaan
Vaillantlaan
Groenteweg
Hoefkade
Prinsegracht
Hoge Zand
Mandela plein
Hobbema plein
Vaillant plein
Hanneman plantsoen
Helena van Doeveren plantsoen
Morgenzonlaan
Van der Kunstraat
Caland plein
Kaapse plein
Holland plein
Schalk Burger plein

Image 1

PREFACE

Growing up in the *Schilderswijk* meant that I experienced diversity and social inequality from a young age. The reality of growing up in a neighbourhood with negative neighbourhood effects is harsh. Throughout my life, I have seen underprivileged people accomplish great things, however my experiences have shown me that coming from such a disadvantaged area means you have to work much harder to achieve your goals. I therefore feel very privileged that I have the opportunity to be in the last stage of a Masters Degree, and write my thesis about the neighbourhood that has had such an influence on my life.

What continues to stand out to me is how different the experience of living in the neighbourhood has been between generations in my family. I have felt like even though there is a lot of ethnic diversity among the residents, we all have to deal with the same issues of social inequality. In general my experiences of living in a diverse neighbourhood have been positive. The negative experiences I have had come from the disadvantaged social-economic position that the neighbourhood has. My grandparents and parents used to reminisce of a time where they felt like the neighbourhood was better. With this they are referring to a time before the Schilderswijk became a majority-minority neighbourhood. This rhetoric often comes with anti-immigration sentiments. This gave me the inspiration for my subject. I wanted to know why people feel negatively towards newcomers settling into their neighbourhood.

Doing this research has been very gratifying. I want to thank all participants for sharing their stories with me, and letting me be a part of constructing their history. I also want to thank my supervisor Dr. I.A. Glynn for the constructive guidance he has given me. Dr. Glynn has been an inspiration and great mentor. Finally I want to thank Fraser Brown for editing my work.

INTRODUCTION

Adjacent to the old city centre of The Hague lies the neighbourhood called the *Schilderswijk*. When walking through the area one will notice that it has a lively and colourful atmosphere. The streets are always crowded with people speaking in different languages, and local entrepreneurs have filled the area with little shops and restaurants where you can buy food and wares from all sorts of cultures. The Schilderswijk in The Hague is a super-diverse neighbourhood. A remarkable 91.4% of the population of the Schilderswijk consists of people with a migration background. The Turkish and Moroccan migrants are the largest groups.[1] Super-diversity is a term coined to portray changing population configurations particularly arising from global migration flows over the last three decades. These changing configurations not only involve the movement of people from more varied national, ethnic, linguistic and religious backgrounds, but also the worldwide diversification of movement flows through specific migration channels, diverging patterns of gender and age, and variance in migrants' human capital.[2] The Schilderswijk used to be a working-class neighbourhood, with predominantly white native Dutch residents, who have mostly left the area over the last three decades. This study seeks to answer this question: how did the established Schilderswijk residents experience such a dramatic change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood, and what effect did this have on their perceptions of local social cohesion?

Super-diversity in the Schilderswijk is problematized by local policy makers. In the most recent policy plan, the diverse character of the district is introduced as a strength, but thereafter only the disadvantages of diversity are discussed.[3] One of the priority policy issues is the relation between ethnic diversity and social cohesion. The report shows a lack of common interfaces among residents, but also between residents, government, and non-governmental organizations. Policy makers think that distrust plays a major part in this. Tensions between population groups as a result of such things as international developments and developments in countries of origin are a constant point of attention. Besides that, the report shows that the Schilderswijk has attained a bad image due to negative media attention. The image of the district and its residents is distorted. This inhibits positive development of the neighbourhood and the residents.[4] The fact that this is a priority of policy makers in The Hague shows how important the relation between ethnic diversity and social cohesion is for the wellbeing of an area.

[1] 'Den Haag in Cijfers - 6. Demografie' <https://denhaag.incijfers.nl/jive/report?id=bevolking4&openinputs=true> [consulted 14-06-2019].
[2] Fran Meissner en Steven Vertovec, 'Comparing super-diversity', *Ethnic and Racial Studies: Comparing super-diversity* 38 (2015) 541–555.
[3] *Wijkprogramma 2016-2019: Stadsdeel Centrum, Schilderswijk* (Municipality The Hague).
[4] Ibid.

It is not surprising that this topic has been studied by many scholars, from which the majority conclude that ethnic diversity has a negative effect on social cohesion. However, the concepts and frameworks they work with vary considerably, which has led to an ongoing scientific debate.[5] There are many studies that use the term social cohesion in their research, therefore it is important to first determine the definition of social cohesion, because the term leaves room for interpretation. Many scholars use different definitions and therefore Chan et al. conducted research that provides a critical review of the ways social cohesion has been conceptualized in the literature. They conclude that 'social cohesion may be regarded as the degree of interconnectedness between individuals that is both a result and cause of public and civic life. It encompasses feelings of commitment, trust, and norms of reciprocity and is demonstrated by participation in networks and civic organizations'.[6]

The most prominent work in scientific debate about the relation between social cohesion and ethnic heterogeneity is the contentious article of Robert Putnam. He claims that ethnic diversity will increase considerably in all modern societies within several decades. According to Putnam, migration is the main cause of this development. Putnam constructs his narrative around three main points. First, migration and ethnic diversity are desirable over the long run. Second, in the medium to long term ethnic diversity will lead to the construction of encompassing identities and new forms of social solidarity. Finally, he claims that in the short term, migration and diversity will challenge social solidarity and inhibit social capital. This final point forms the core of his research and is the central idea of his paper. Putnam explores the effects of diversity on social cohesion by looking at the effects this has on social networks. He defines social capital as: 'social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness'.[7] He believes the core insights of this approach are exceptionally simple: like physical capital and human capital, social networks have value, mainly to the actors involved in a specific network. This value can be economic, for example it has been proven that during our lifetime, income is affected by the networks that we build, and it has been proven that social ties benefit our health.[8]

Putnam's findings about the relation between racial heterogeneity and inter-racial trust show a strong positive relationship between inter-racial trust and ethnic homogeneity. Meaning that the more ethnically diverse our community is, the less we trust the people in our community. Concerning racial homogeneity and intra-racial trust, where Putnam asked his participants about trust in people of the

[5] Tom van der Meer en Jochem Tolsma, 'Ethnic Diversity and Its Effects on Social Cohesion', *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 40 (2014) 459–478.
[6] Joseph Chan, Ho-Pong To and Elaine Chan, 'Reconsidering Social Cohesion: Developing a Definition and Analytical Framework for Empirical Research', *An International and Interdisciplinary Journal for Quality-of-Life Measurement* 75 (2006) 273–302.
[7] Robert D. Putnam, 'E Pluribus Unum : Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture', *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2007) 137–174 137
[8] Ibid.

respondent's own race, his findings show that in-group trust is lower in more diverse settings. This suggests that diversity does not seem to trigger in-group/out-group division, but anomie or social isolation.[9] Putnam explains this phenomenon in what he calls the 'Constrict Theory'. Putnam's thesis is that in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, residents of all ethnic backgrounds tend to 'hunker down'. He observes that in these areas social trust is lower, unselfishness and community organization is rarer, and friends are fewer. Putnam himself states that this conclusion is rather provocative. For this reason, he adds an elaborate self-reflection to this paper, with numerous objections and suggestions. The core of his self-critique lies with his methodology. [10]

In reaction to Putnam's research about the Constrict Theory, many empirical studies were conducted about the ethnic composition of communities and the social cohesion within them. Some studies confirm that ethnic diversity undermines social cohesion, while other scholars reject the claim or find a positive relation between the two. Van der Meer & Tolsma constructed an overview of ninety existing empirical studies that arose in reaction to Putnam's work. Some of these studies use different concepts, geographical areas, and definitions. Some studies lack clear, theoretical, underlying mechanisms that link social cohesion to ethnic heterogeneity.[11]

Other authors that have expressed criticism of the methodology of the previously mentioned scholars are Abascal and Baldassarri. They stated that it is misleading to argue that ethnic diversity reduces trust among people. They state that conclusions cannot be drawn from cross-sectional data, like Putnam did. Second, even if this alleged relationship existed, other analyses by ethno-racial groups show that it would be limited to members of the dominant group who come into contact with members of subordinate groups. 'Only for whites does living among out-group members – not in diverse communities per se – negatively predict trust'.[12] Given the fact that modern societies are complex, it would be wise to move beyond the outdated conceptualization of social capital that relies on mechanisms rooted in similarity and homogeneity. Abascal and Baldassarri criticise the lenses used in previous research. Among other things they state that social capital is used in different ways and that many studies fail to take into account economic conditions. A broader and more precise framework, they claim, is necessary.[13]

[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Tom van der Meer and Jochem Tolsma, 'Ethnic Diversity and Its Effects on Social Cohesion', *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 40 (2014) 459–478.
[12] Maria Abascal and Delia Baldassarri, 'Love Thy Neighbor? Ethnoracial Diversity and Trust Reexamined 1', *American Journal of Sociology* 121 (2015) 722–782. 756
[13] Ibid.

One of the works that provides such a broader and more precise framework is that of Jenissen et al.[14] They elaborate on Putnam's work on social networks, and responding works carried out by Dutch researchers. Besides that, Jenissen et al. add two other aspects to their research. First, the aspect of feelings of loss among established citizens, including migrant groups, as a result of increasing ethnic diversity, and secondly social safety. Additionally, they advocate for embedding a socio-economic lens in all aspects. They pay attention to formal and informal forms of connectedness, look at both behaviour and attitudes, and take into account the level of diversity and the size of the out-group. They analyse this at different levels, in particular the neighbourhood and the municipality.[15]

The research of Jenissen et al. is mostly based on quantitative data, and is rather descriptive about social cohesion in diverse neighbourhoods. The narrative of the inhabitants is lost in analysing data in this manner. They conclude that a lack of social cohesion in a diverse area derives partly from feelings of loss among native residents, but they do not give the story of why these residents feel this way.[16] This research will use the theoretical framework of Jenissen et al., but will dive further into the stories of the native residents by exploring their experiences of change, from a historical perspective. To do this from a historical perspective is of added value. When people experience change, they compare their current situation with a situation in the past. These experiences of change are explored through interviews with white native residents of the area. The first chapter of the analyses will provide the historical context to the stories of these residents. The second chapter paints a picture of the manner in which the residents remember the past, and the third chapter shows how these residents experienced change.

Telling the story of these residents is important because this gives more insight into why diversity might have a negative effect on the perception of social cohesion in an area. This will fill a hiatus in scientific debates on the subject, but can also give policy makers insight to mechanisms underlying the policy problem of social cohesion in a diverse neighbourhood. Additionally, telling the story of people that experience loss and change can have a social value. This research gives a voice to those that might not feel like they are being heard.

[14] Roel Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland* (Wetenschappelijke raad voor het regeringsbeleid 2018) 75–117.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.

Historiography

In her article 'Dutch Migration History', Schrover provides a well-structured Dutch historiography on migration. She explains that the literature on migration, and certainly on labour migration, bloomed after 1985. Before this studies were less analytical and often of a descriptive and policy-driven nature. From 1985 onwards the literature became more analytical and broadened its subjects. A large range of subjects have since come under renewed scrutiny: emigration, colonial migration, migration systems, refugees, regulation of migration, oral history, transnationalism, integration, and debates about costs and gains.[17]
In relation to labour migration, social networks were explored. The migration system approach, with its emphasis on the combined travel of goods, ideas and people, finds its origins in the increased interest in networks of, for example, traders in the Early Modern Period.[18] Dutch merchants created ethnic communities, through which they were connected to their countries of origin and to each other, and through which goods and people travelled, as well as mores and ideas.[19] This idea that concentrations of migrants evolved from necessity and opportunity, rather than from preference is also applied in analysing settlement of colonial and labour migrants in the Netherlands. As a rule, migration within networks has received more attention than has less visible migration outside networks.[20]

Prior to this research on the settlement of labour migrants, de Bruin explored the inter-ethnical interaction in the Schilderswijk of The Hague in her study from 2012.[21] She gives an elaborate overview of works that have been published on this neighbourhood, Dutch working-class neighbourhoods in general, and inter-ethnical interaction in the Netherlands. She states that research on the latter is mostly done in the form of policy studies commissioned by Dutch ministries. These works often conclude that geographic ethnic segregation and the limited contact between Dutch inhabitants and migrants are usually related, and problematize these phenomena.[22] The emphasis in these studies lie with neighbourhood effects, and not so much with individual characteristics of the residents. Studies that do focus on the residents are based on quantitative data, where residents were questioned by using a survey with closed questions. Based on this,

[17] Marlou Schrover, 'Dutch migration history. Looking back and moving forward', *Tijdschrift voor sociale en economische geschiedenis* 11 (2014) 219–236.
[18] Ibid.; M.R. Prak, 'J.W. Veluwenkamp, Archangel. Nederlandse ondernemers in Rusland 1550-1785', *BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review* 117 (2002) 228.
[19] Schrover, 'Dutch migration history. Looking back and moving forward'; Maartje van Gelder, 'How to influence Venetian economic policy: collective petitions of the Netherlandish merchant community in the early seventeenth century', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 24 (2009) 29–47.
[20] Schrover, 'Dutch migration history. Looking back and moving forward'; C.M. Lesger, L.A.C.J. Lucassen en M. Schrover, 'Is there life outside the migrant network?', *Annales de Démographie Historique* 2 (2002) 29–50.
[21] N.M. de Bruin, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000 (MA thesis, Leiden University, Leiden 2012).
[22] Ibid.; Mérove Gijsberts, *Uit elkaars buurt : de invloed van etnische concentratie op integratie en beeldvorming* (The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau 2005).

the researchers estimated the prevalence of interethnic contact in the Netherlands and the extent to which people were open to this. De Bruin critics this research because she feels that the design of the surveys was quite unpolished. They did little justice to differences between people and did not leave any room to answer more detailed questions such as, in which form was inter-ethnic interaction in the Netherlands established or whether it is possible that negative presumptions might result in avoiding certain groups. In addition, de Bruin recognizes that many hypotheses presented in these studies have not yet been proven. The researchers sought substantiation for assumptions from foreign literature that did not relate to their own target group.[23]

A limited number of works has been published on the social climate of old working-class neighbourhoods where migrants settled. Works that de Bruin mention are, *De ouwe garden het andere slag en de buitenlanders*, written by Guus Haest on the social developments in the *Molenwijk* of The Hague,[24] and the work of Frank Bovenkerk on mutual relations within the diverse neighbourhood *Lombok*, in Utrecht.[25] On the Schilderswijk specifically a number of works have been published that create an image of the social constructions within the area. On this subject de Bruin mentions: *Geloven in de Haagse Schilderswijk* by Aarnoutse,[26] *Kijk op de Schilderswijk* by Duyvensteijn,[27] and *De Schilderswijk in beweging* by Dolleman.[28] De Bruin warns us that the authors of the latter works are all native residents of the Schilderswijk themselves, and that these works carry a touch of nostalgia, and that this might give us a slightly subjective image of the past. Additionally, these works are based on a limited number of primary sources.[29] In 1963 there was an article published on social structures in the neighbourhood in *Sociaal Den Haag*, a magazine for social workers. This article was written by a social worker from the neighbourhood.[30] More recently Klein Kranenburg and Wim Willems explored this subject in their book: *Niks geteisem! : Het wonderbaarlijke verhaal van De Mussen.* This book focusses on the cultural centre *de Mussen*, and

[23] De Bruin, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000; Gijsberts, *Uit elkaars buurt : de invloed van etnische concentratie op integratie en beeldvorming*; Mérove Gijsberts e.a., *Maakt de buurt verschil? : de relatie tussen de etnische samenstelling van de buurt, interetnisch contact en wederzijdse beeldvorming* (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau 2010).

[24] Guus Haest, *De Ouwe Garde, het Andere Slag en de Buitenlanders : de geschiedenis van een saneringswijk* (Assen [etc.] : Van Gorcum 1989).

[25] F. Bovenkerk 1943-, *Vreemd volk, gemengde gevoelens : etnische verhoudingen in een grote stad* (Meppel [etc.] : Boom 1985); De Bruin, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000.

[26] Leuntje Aarnoutse, *Geloven in de Haagse Schilderswijk* (The Hague: De Nieuwe Haagsche 1999).

[27] John Duyvensteijn, *Kijk op de Schilderswijk: geschiedenis van een arbeiderswijk* (The Hague: Kruseman's Uitgevers Maatschappij b.v. 1984).

[28] Alida Dolleman, *De Schilderswijk in beweging*; De Bruin, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000.

[29] De Bruin, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000.

[30] E.A.M. Boersma, 'De Schildersbuurt, vergeten wijk?', *Sociaal Den Haag, tijdschrift voor Haags maatschappelijk werk* 7 243–247.

inter-ethnical interactions are only briefly mentioned as a side note.[31] Klein Kranenburg also published the book: *Samen voor ons eigen*, where he constructs a history of the culture and social structures in the neighbourhood.[32]

Besides the works of Klein Kranenburg and Willems, historical research on social structures in the neighbourhood has only been done in the last two decades. There has not been much written on the period between the substantial settlement of migrants in the 1960s and 1970s and 1990.[33] De Bruin presents her work as the first history on inter-ethnical interaction in the Schilderswijk. In her work she maps and describes these developments and relations. Because this is the first historical exploration on the subject her work stays rather descriptive. Whereas de Bruin describes what the relations between ethnic groups were, and how they developed, this research will explore how the native residents felt about it, and what effect these experiences have had on their personal lives.

Material and Methods

This research consists of a triangular methodological framework, where different methods and materials are combined to analyse social cohesion in the Schilderswijk. A historical and socio-economic context is embedded into this research. This information is predominantly derived from literature, newspapers, and documents from the municipality archives. However, the perceptions of the inhabitants of the area functioned as the core of this research. To attain more insights into the personal experiences of the inhabitants of the neighbourhood this research is based on interviews with twelve participants who have experienced the change in the ethnic makeup of the area. To ensure the anonymity of the participants the names that are used in this paper are pseudonyms. Because of the crisis concerning covid-19 some adjustments had to be made to the methodology. It was the intention to use more participants, but recruiting participants turned out to be difficult in this time. This has the outcome that the conclusion of this research is less broad. Recruiting participants was initially carried out through social media and a flyer campaign. But besides that, this research also became a project to help elderly in the neighbourhood in dealing with social isolation. By sharing their story the participants had the opportunity to have social contact, and the

[31] De Bruin, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000; Diederick Klein Kranenburg en Wim Willems, *Niks geteisem! : het wonderbaarlijke verhaal van de mussen* (The Hague: Uitgeverij de Nieuw Haagsche B.V. 2011).
[32] Diederick Klein Kranenburg, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985 (Hilversum : Verloren, 2013).
[33] De Bruin, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000.

validation of constructing their own history. The interviews were done in compliance with the health regulations of the Dutch RIVM. This meant carrying out interviews over the phone, the internet, or outside at an appropriate distance. This of course influenced the interviews. The experience of talking to someone on the phone is different from in person. A lot of non-verbal communication is lost. Because this research is based on interviews, analysing the sources was a form of oral history. Oral history is a method of qualitative interviewing that emphasizes participants' perspectives. This research involved multiple open-ended semi-structed interview sessions with different participants.

All research methods are based on philosophical assumptions about the nature of the social world and assumptions about how research should be done. There are two groups of philosophical assumptions: ontological and epistemological. An ontological position is based on assumptions about the nature of the social world and what can be known about it. Ontologically, oral history is based on the idea that research is a process, not an event. The practice of oral history assumes that meaning is not set, but rather that meaning is developed during the research process. In other words, we build meaning through the generation of an interview narrative, and the analysis and interpretation of that narrative.[34]Social knowledge does not exist separately from the research process, but is created through the process. Researchers actively participate in the knowledge-building process. Because research is a process, there is no one right way to do it. Research is seen as being fluid and adaptable. Oral history research may follow an iterative or back-and-forth model. Procedures may change during the course of research based on findings. The goals of this kind of research vary greatly, and might include exploration, description, explanation, theory building, or social action. In this case we are looking for social and personal truths. These assumptions about how research can and should proceed also create an understanding about how to study social reality. Oral history requires researchers to attend to their own position in the research process. Therefore, the method can be employed in an engaged and value laden context. Epistemologically, in oral history the researcher and participant are working together. Researchers are not conceptualized as *the* authority over knowledge production. Researchers and participants are placed on the same level during data collection.[35]

The twelve participants of this research project were all native Dutch residents of the Schilderswijk. The participants identified themselves as either male or female, with an equal share in the gender makeup of this research. The participants were between the ages of 44 and 76. They all lived in the neighbourhood for at least 28 years. None of the participants obtained a degree in higher education. The participants were consciously selected as a result of their ethnic background, and years of residency. This decision was made based on the earlier described scientific debates, and the research questions that grew from that. To explore experiences of change we need people that have experienced that change. It was not easy to find these

[34] Patricia Leavy, *Oral history* (New York, NY [etc.] : Oxford University Press 2011) 3–26.
[35] Ibid.

specific participants, because there are simply not many native Dutch residents left in the neighbourhood. However, the snowball method of recruiting participants was only sparingly used.[36] This means that most participants, with the exception of the couples and one other participant, did not know each other. This limits the bias associated with this method. However, it is important to be aware that all the participants were very young in the period they are reflecting on. It is therefore necessary to keep in mind that the data collected in the interviews are memories and not historical facts, especially because this study will try to measure feelings. Feelings change over time: history, social interactions, media and other factors all influence the way someone remembers certain events. This does not make this research less valuable, because one's memories might influence one's contemporary views and actions, but is something that has to be made explicit.

Because the process of data construction through oral history is a dialogue between researcher and participant, it is important that the researcher reflects on their own influence on the participants. In this case, I – the researcher – am a young white Dutch woman that grew up in close proximity to the residents. This resulted in an advantage when building a rapport; the fact that I came from the same area created relatability.[37] But, I am also a higher educated woman, while none of the participants were higher educated. This means that the residents might have felt a certain distrust or unrelatability towards me. To limit this disadvantage, I tried to be conscious about the manner in which I spoke, and which words I used. It is the role of the researcher to create an atmosphere in which the participants feel at ease, and free to speak.[38] Therefore I did not use technical terms or theories in interviewing the participants.

Additionally, pictures have been used to visualise the neighbourhood culture. In his book, *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence*, Burke is primarily concerned with the use of images as historical evidence. Burke wrote the book both to encourage the use of such evidence and to warn potential users of some of the possible pitfalls. The author sees a trend in the last generation or so, where historians have widened their interests considerably to include not only political events, economic trends and social structures, but also the history of mentalities, the history of everyday life, the history of material culture, the history of the body and so on. Burk emphasises that it would not have been possible for them to carry out research in these relatively new fields if they had limited themselves to traditional sources such as official documents.[39] Photographs are one of these alternative sources historians can use to create their historical narrative, but just as with traditional sources, source criticism is essential. The images used in historical research have to be placed in context. This is not always easy in the case of photographs, since

[36] M. Hennink, I. Hutter en A. Bailey, *Qualitative Research Methods* (SAGE Publications 2010) 100–102.
[37] Ibid., 124–130.
[38] Leavy, *Oral history*, 3–26.
[39] Peter Burke, *Eyewitnessing : the uses of images as historical evidence* (London : Reaktion 2001) 9–21.

the identity of the people in the pictures and the photographers is so often unknown, and the photographs themselves, originally (in many cases, at least) part of a series, have become detached from the project or the album in which they were originally displayed, to end up in archives or museums. To analyse a photograph the historian has to think about the person that created the image, when the photograph was taken, what was the goal of the photographer, and which audience the photographer had in mind. It is important not only to focus on what is in the image but also what might have been left out and why.[40] Because this research tells the personal memories and feelings residents of the Schilderswijk, pictures have an added value. It tells the story of what people wanted to remember; what was important for these individuals during that time, and how they wanted to portray themselves. Besides that, it gives a visual representation of the narrative of the people involved, which makes an abstract description more imaginable.

[40] Ibid.

Overview of interviews

Interview	Date	Name*	Communication Method	Gender	Resident in area	Age
1.1	25-04-2020	Jan	In person (partner of Truus)	Male	47 years	47
1.2	25-04-2020	Truus	In person (partner of Jan)	Female	44 years	44
2.	07-05-2020	Klaas	Telephone	Male	40 years	76
3.	06-05-2020	Jaap	Telephone	Male	42 years	74
4.	15-05-2020	Gerda	Telephone	Female	71 years	71
5.	18-05-2020	Marrie	Telephone	Female	63 years	63
6.	02-05-2020	Trees	In person	Female	28 years	52
7.	05-05-2020	Wim	In person	Male	35 years	57
8.	23-05-2020	Hans	In person	Male	55 years	75
9.	28-05-2020	Beppie	Telephone	Female	33 years	52
10.1	29-05-2020	Johan	In person (partner of Lenie)	Male	70 years	70
10.2	29-05-2020	Lenie	In person (partner of Johan)	Female	45 years	66

* Names used throughout are pseudonyms.

The research done by Jenissen et al. was commissioned by the Scientific Council for Government Policy (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid, WRR). This is an independent advisory body for government policy. The role of the WRR is to inform and advise the government on issues that are of great importance to Dutch society. The recommendations of the WRR are cross-sectoral, departmental, and multidisciplinary. In 2018 the WRR started a research project that focused on increasing ethnic diversity in The Netherlands. To gain a better empirical overview of this new reality, Jenissen et al. analysed data obtained from the System of Social Statistical Files (ssb) of the CBS. The ssb contains microdata that relates to the total population registered in the Netherlands. With this data it is possible to precisely map the presence of ethnic groups residing in the Netherlands. Analysing this data, Jenissen et al. wrote a research report on the consequences of this new diversity for social cohesion and economic growth.[41] The main question in this analysis was: to what extent does ethnic diversity connect with social capital, feelings of loss and social safety? They interpreted social capital to involve the ability of people to live and work together. Their focus on feelings of loss related to the emotional reactions of people to the loss of support, and their concentration on social safety paid particular attention to changes in social control. Jenissen et al. use the different dimensions of Van der Meer and Tolsma in handling these three aspects.[42]

This report gives us an overview of Dutch research on the correlation between ethnic diversity and social capital. Dutch research has been strongly influenced by Putnam's work. These studies focus primarily on three sub-themes of social capital: citizen participation and volunteering, general trust, and relations within the neighbourhood. The results of this study are not conclusive. Some studies show that more ethnic diversity is indeed related to less social capital, but in other research this correlation is not found. For the Dutch studies on general trust and citizen participation, the outcomes are not conclusive. Two relevant studies with somewhat comparable results are those of Tolsma et al. and Gijsberts et al.[43] In both studies, the researchers note that diversity within neighbourhoods does not have a negative impact on general trust or on citizen participation, by looking at participation in voluntary work. The same applies to the provision of informal care. In this respect, Putnam's thesis does not apply to the Netherlands. This corresponds to the finding by Van der Meer and Tolsma, that the Constrict Theory is not applicable in situations where social capital is geographically unlimited. A negative effect of ethnic diversity on social capital is mainly found

[41] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.
[42] Meer and Tolsma, 'Ethnic Diversity and Its Effects on Social Cohesion'.
[43] Jochem Tolsma, Tom Van Der Meer en Maurice Gesthuizen, 'The impact of neighbourhood and municipality characteristics on social cohesion in the Netherlands', *Acta Politica* 44 (2009) 286; Mérove Gijsberts, Tom van der Meer en Jaco Dagevos, ''Hunkering Down' in Multi-Ethnic Neighbourhoods? The Effects of Ethnic Diversity on Dimensions of Social Cohesion', *European Sociological Review* 28 (2012) 527–537.

in studies on relationships within the neighbourhood. Dutch studies show that neighbours in ethnically diverse environments have less contact with each other and that they perceive contact as less positive than residents of more homogeneous neighbourhoods. However, Dutch researchers add that the effects of ethnic diversity on contacts within a neighbourhood can mainly be explained by the fact that lower educated people and people without work live in such neighbourhoods. According to them, composition effects associated with the individual characteristics of residents are therefore more important than diversity effects. Hence researchers argue for policies that improve the socio-economic position of residents, in particular the level of education.[44] However, Jenissen et al. conclude from their own analyses that ethnic diversity and perceptions on neighbourhood cohesion are to a certain extent interrelated: the more diverse a neighbourhood is, the weaker the perceived neighbourhood cohesion. Additionally, a low socio-economic status of the neighbourhood in which one lives also leads to negative perceptions towards neighbourhood cohesion. Still, they think that the effect of ethnic diversity is more significant. The higher the proportion of residents with a non-Dutch background in a neighbourhood, the more the residents with a Dutch background perceive neighbourhood cohesion as being weaker. The same results are visible when looking into the data collected from participants with a Surinamese or Antillean background. People with a Turkish or Moroccan background, however, do not perceive a negative influence on social cohesion within their neighbourhood with an increase in ethnic diversity.[45]

Jenissen et al. find that due to the presence of people with different migrant backgrounds, the established population can experience feelings of alienation. For example, many people with a Dutch background feel that they are losing power and control to newcomers. They no longer feel at home in their country.[46] Smeekes and Mulders describe this as 'feelings of loss'. With this they mean the feeling that valuable elements and rituals from the past are lost due to undesirable developments today.[47] They can stem from institutional changes that lead to new uncertainties from some groups. For instance, the impact of globalization on people's labour market position. With this, Jenissen et al. recognize that feelings of loss as a result of the presence of people with a different migration background are often an expression of dissatisfaction with other matters, such as dissatisfaction with the income position or their own precarious position on the labour and housing market.[48]

[44] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Smeekes, A. and L. Mulder (2016) 'Verliesgevoelens in relatie tot de multi-etnische samenleving onder autochtone Nederlanders', wrr Working Paper 22, Den Haag: Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid.
[48] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.

To analyse social cohesion Jenissen et al. operationalized the three aspects they recognize as part of social cohesion. In analysing social capital they use the definition of Putnam.[49] To analyse social safety Jenissen et al. divided this concept into two sub-themes: delinquency and feelings of insecurity. They did research on this matter by conducting literature research, and additionally provided their own empirical research into the relationship between ethnic diversity, the chance to be registered as a criminal, and the degree of feelings of insecurity. From this analysis they conclude that, the chance of committing crimes increases with the level of ethnic diversity in the residential municipality. In addition, there is an independent positive relationship between ethnic diversity and ending up in the criminal statistics. For all income groups, a higher level of ethnic diversity of the residential community is associated with a higher chance of committing a crime. The chance of having feelings of insecurity is higher with a higher level of ethnic diversity in the residential area.[50]

Social Capital	Social Safety	Feelings of Loss
• General Trust • Relationships in the neighbourhood • Civic Participation	• Feelings of insecurity • Delinquency	• Culture and Identity • Control • Home

Jenissen et al. operationalize the concept of feeling of loss into three sub-themes: feelings of loss about control, feelings of loss about culture and identity, and feelings of loss about 'home'. Feelings of loss might appear in groups who have traditionally been in a dominant position but grew disillusioned and experienced alienation through their diminishing number and cultural influence. Jenissen et al. therefore think that control is about the level of influence a group has in the neighbourhood. Feelings of loss of culture can be analysed using in- and outgroup mechanisms and collective identity, and to analyse the feeling of home, Jenissen et al. use the concept constructed by Duyvendak. This concept focusses on the recognition

[49] Putnam, 'E Pluribus Unum : Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture'.
[50] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.

of social and physical landmarks. To feel at home people need landmarks they are familiar with.[51] Based on their own research Jenissen et al. conclude that residents feel less at home when ethnic diversity within a neighbourhood increases. Just as with the aspect of social capital, feelings of loss are also significantly influenced by the socio-economic deprivation of the neighbourhood in which one lives, the standardized household income, and level of education. However, the effect of ethnic diversity is also in this aspect the biggest. For people with a Surinamese, Antillean and Turkish background, their perception of feelings of home are higher when more people with their own or with a Dutch background live nearby. For people with a Moroccan of Turkish background, higher levels of diversity do not negatively influence their perception of home.[52] Due to the arrival of migrants, physical and social landmarks may change to the extent that the established residents no longer feel at home.[53]

In this research the operationalization model of Jenissen et al. is used to analyse how established Schilderswijk residents experienced change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood and what effect this had on their perceptions of local social cohesion. In analysing the data we therefore looked at markers of social capital, social safety, and feelings of loss. These markers can be found in the subthemes of each aspects.

[51] Jan Willem Duyvendak, *The politics of home : belonging and nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States* (Basingstoke [etc.] : Palgrave Macmillan 2011); Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.
[52] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.
[53] Ibid.

Image 2

CHAPTER ONE: HISTORICAL CONTEXT

This chapter provides a historical framework to the stories of the participants of this research. This information is based on literature, newspapers, and documents from the municipality archives of The Hague. This information gives structure and context to the experiences the residents describe. In the early 19th century, the invention of the steam locomotive heralded a long blooming period of this part of The Hague. The *Hollandsche Spoorstation* was officially opened in 1843, after the establishment of a railroad connection between Amsterdam and The Hague by the *Hollandsche Ijzeren Spoorwegmaatschappij*. The *Spoortweglaan*, later known as the *Stationsweg*, quickly becomes an impressive street. Contemporary writers said that the street would astonish visitors with: *'De fiksche gebouwen ter linkerzijde van de breede, doch thans nog zonnige Spoorweglaan'*.[54] At the turn of the century, the agricultural crisis, as well as the industrial revolution, set off a substantial internal migration of people in the Netherlands. A large number of people moved from rural areas to the cities. This migration caused a housing shortage in the cities. Houses were needed for the now growing working class. The Schilderswijk was built up with the motto: 'build as many houses as possible on as little land as possible'.[55] This did not benefit the quality of the houses. Hygiene facilities were not considered, and many infectious diseases were prevalent. Duijvensteijn describes the area in this time as a human warehouse.[56]

With the departure of a large part of the former residents that were mostly petty bourgeoisie, and the increase in the number of unskilled workers, the image of the Schilderswijk declined dramatically. Duijvensteijn states that this is where the impoverishment began and this was when the neighbourhood came to the attention of the sensationalist media. He sees the negative image that the media created of the neighbourhood as unsophisticated slander of the residents of the neighbourhood by the petty bourgeoisie. Duijvensteijn believes that this demonstrated the class-related nature of society. This was an attempts, in his opinion, by the petty bourgeoisie to blame the impoverished conditions in the neighbourhood on the lack of morality of the residents of the Schilderswijk, instead of seeing this as a by-product of the contemporary liberal structures. However, Duijvensteijn also sees internal mechanisms of class definition within the neighbourhood.[57]

Klein Kranenburg concludes from his research that the Schilderswijk has a history of transformations. According to him the idea of a homogeneous, stable neighbourhood, that in the 1970s was disturbed by the presence of migrant workers, is not accurate. Even prior to this period, the constant

[54] Duyvensteijn, *Kijk op de Schilderswijk: geschiedenis van een arbeiderswijk*, 12; F Allan, *De stad 's-Gravenhage en hare geschiedenis* (Amsterdam 1859) 2–5.
[55] Duyvensteijn, *Kijk op de Schilderswijk: geschiedenis van een arbeiderswijk*, 17.
[56] Ibid., 30.
[57] Ibid., 76–78.

demographic shifts caused rapid changes for a long time. During the interbellum period, the Schilderswijk was very similar to many other working-class neighbourhoods in the Netherlands. From a distance it seemed a homogeneous neighbourhood, where all residents were the same. Yet, the socio-economic differences were significant and were reflected in the fine-grained system of ranks and positions in the neighbourhood.[58]

The Schilderswijk was a transit area for many people. In the thirties, families who could afford to leave left for the new housing estates around the Zuiderpark. In the fifties the worst housing shortage was over, and the economic recovery made it possible for more residents to leave their neighbourhood behind. The empty houses were used by people who had nowhere to go. Newcomers mixed with the residents who did not want to or could not leave.[59] This turned the Schilderswijk into a refuge for those who fell on hard times. After the war, the norms in the Schilderswijk still differed per street and were identified and monitored by a group of residents. They developed a system of standards and values that sometimes did, but more often did not, match what was common in the rest of The Hague. Despite their mutual differences, a certain pattern can be discovered in this, namely that the district showed fewer features of what Klein Kranenburg describes as a: 'modern working-class neighbourhood'.[60] In their mutual relationships and in their attitude towards the outside world, many neighbouring groups developed a specific behavioural repertoire. Despite the opportunities for upward social mobility in the 1950s and 1960s, residents there underwent a process of social self-exclusion, with aberrant behaviour compared to the rest of the city. Despite the bad reputation this caused, people in the neighbourhood were proud of their collective identity and culture.[61]

The first migrant workers quietly entered the neighbourhood during the sixties.[62] After the war the economic structure of the Netherlands changed, the number of Dutch people working in the agricultural sector halved in a number of decades. By 1960 this was only 10 percent. The Netherlands tried to produce cheaply but did not invest in the renewal of machines, which created a great demand for unskilled workers. These positions initially were filled by Dutch people who were formerly employed in agriculture and returnees from the former colonies. However, with the growth of the economy, this was no longer enough. Attempts to increase the employment rate of women were widely criticized from religious actors. They found working outside the home unusual for married women. During this time the Dutch also proved

[58] Klein Kranenburg, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985, 341–350.
[59] Ibid., 117–145.
[60] Klein Kranenburg, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985. 343
[61] Ibid., 341–350.
[62] Ibid., 145–162.

unwilling to move from regions where there was less employment to work in regions where there was a high demand for labour.[63]

Recruiting workers outside the Netherlands seemed to be the best solution. Companies had to request approval from the Minister of Social Affairs and Public Health before recruiting. In this way, attempts were made to control recruitment. Unions liked the idea of temporary workers. Workers could be recruited when needed and sent back afterwards. The unions continued to have a strong negotiating position due to the continuing tightness of the labour market. Labour recruitment was presented to the public as a temporary solution. The idea of temporary migration has long been held in the public debate, but within the political debate, policy makers were already aware that this would probably not be temporary.[64] This development changed the demographic of the Schilderswijk. First the guest workers settling in the neighbourhood consisted mostly of young men who lived in shabby guest houses. Later, when families were reunited, the migrants became part of the physical space of the neighbourhood.[65] Historical sources suggest that the arrival of the newcomers was not unnoticed and triggered a response from locals. Despite the fact that Kranenburg states that overall cohesion in the neighbourhood was initially not distributed, some incidents reported in contemporary newspapers and police reports show that there was at least a certain amount of friction between the native Dutch residents and the guest workers that just arrived in the neighbourhood.[66]

On 16 July 1969, an incident occurred where the dissent of some within the neighbourhood became more apparent. Over a hundred Dutch inhabitants from the Schilderswijk attacked and plundered a Moroccan boarding house located in the neighbourhood.[67] Over fifty of the Moroccan inhabitants were chased away and forced to move. What is striking is how this incident was portrayed in the Dutch local and national media. In both left- and right-wing newspapers the emphasis lay on the 'otherness' of the Moroccans. The reports all give the reader a 'reason' for the violence that was used against 'the other'. Some of the reports do give some normative statements about the use of violence, but they all emphasize the cause of this behaviour. The social democratic paper *Het Parool* stated that the street no longer tolerated the Moroccans because of their behaviour toward local girls.[68] *Trouw* even stated that 'something must

[63] Herman Obdeijn and Marlou Schrover, *Komen en gaan: Immigratie en emigratie in Nederland vanaf 1550* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker 2008) 265–268.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Klein Kranenburg, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985, 341–350.
[66] Ibid.
[67] *Stukken Betreffende Het Optreden van de Politie Tijdens Ongeregeldheden, Waarbij Marokkaanse Gastarbeiders Door Omwonenden Uit Een Pension in de Ravesteinstraat Zijn Gejaagd* (The Hague 1969), Haags Gemeente Archief, Politie Den Haag.
[68] "Schildersbuurtbewoners vernielen inboedel Marokkanen uit pension n Den Haag gejaagd". "Het Parool". Amsterdam, 1969/06/16, p. 5. Consulted on Delpher 20-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010838444:mpeg21:p005

have happened, otherwise this (reaction) would simply not exist'.[69] The regional paper *Friese Koerier* used the headline 'viezerikken' (Dutch slang for perverts) to introduce a description of the Moroccans' behaviour that provoked the violence.[70] *De Telegraaf* reported a parliamentary debate where the question was asked what the Moroccans had done to provoke this revolt.[71] With this use of language they clearly implied that there were reasonable causes to protest against these newcomers, even with the use of violence. This is striking, because the neighbourhood had already acquired a bad name before the arrival of migrants, but the media and public opinion still held the view that this disruption was caused by the settlement of guest workers in the neighbourhood.[72]

Throughout the seventies and eighties the number of labour migrants settling in the area grew. Guest workers who came to the Netherlands often later brought acquaintances and relatives. This unregulated way of recruitment developed in a peculiar pattern in local migration history. For example, when focusing on Moroccan migration to The Hague, more than half of the Moroccan guest workers in The Hague came from only two Moroccan villages: Nador and Al-Hoceima.[73] This implies a certain relatedness between the Moroccan immigrants in The Hague, they all came from the same area and all started a new life in this Dutch city.

Newcomers arriving in the Netherlands were welcomed by their own community which made mingling with the locals much more unlikely, besides that these guest workers were initially not planning on staying so they had little incentive to adjust to the local culture. The young men arriving in the Netherlands were mostly employed by industrial companies. In The Hague this meant working in the tobacco factory or harbour. From the 1970s the economic miracle of The Netherlands lost its initial spark and underwent a deep recession. Counteracting the rising unemployment rate, the cabinet formation of Lubbers pushed through various cuts. This, combined with technological developments, made working in the industrial sector uncertain. Still the guest workers did not try to find work somewhere else. Because of the declining economy, the Netherlands became much more restrictive with their migration policy. A lot of guest workers were afraid that when they would leave the country they could never come back. By the time

[69] "Woedende bewoners van schilderswijk slaan Marokkanen pension uit". "Trouw". Meppel, 1969/06/17, p. 3. Consulted on Delpher 20-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010817917:mpeg21:p003

[70] "In Haagse schilderswijk Buurt bestormt pension voor gastarbeiders". "Friese koerier : onafhankelijk dagblad voor Friesland en aangrenzende gebieden". Heerenveen, 1969/06/16, p. 1. Consulted on Delpher 29-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010690828:mpeg21:p001

[71] "Kamervragen over Marokkanen". "De Telegraaf". Amsterdam, 1969/06/19, p. 3. Consulted on Delpher 20-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011197740:mpeg21:p003

[72] Klein Kranenburg, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985, 341–350.

[73] C.M. Fokkema and C.N. Harmsen, 'Herkomst en vestiging van de eerste generatie Marokkanen', *Demos: bulletin over bevolking en samenleving* 25 (2009) 1–4.

it became clear that there really was no room for foreign workers on the Dutch job market they already gained rights to make use of the Dutch social safety net and it would not be in their interest to leave. [74]

Before the 1980s there was no exact integration policy for guest workers. If there was a political discourse about integration this was mainly focused on post-colonial migrants such as the Surinamese and Indonesians. This integration was often called repatriation, thereby demonstrating the way the Dutch government presented the integration of post-colonial migrants. They emphasized the connection with the Netherlands by using such terms. Guest workers clearly did not have this alleged connection to the Netherlands but at this time they did not need a connection to Dutch society, as it was still assumed that these people were temporary guests.[75] When it became clear that guest workers would stay, there was a shift in the discourse about integration.

Multiculturalism is often used to describe the attitude towards migrants in the eighties, yet contemporaries did not used this term. In this period cultural integration became more important. The idea that cultural integration is a condition for economic integration grew. People needed to be happy before they could evolve themselves was the theory behind this. This increasing interest in the value of cultural integration in political discourse manifested itself in the so called 'minorities policy'. Policy makers recognized immigrants as a minority within the Netherlands and no longer as guests. Adjustments had to be made to make these people participate in Dutch society. In the 1980s, this did not mean that migrants had to fully integrate into Dutch culture but integration was meant to be happening from both sides. During this policy frame people were comfortable with the connectivity migrants had with their own culture. It was only important that they felt like they could participate in every aspect of the Dutch society. Migrant organisations were funded by the state to stimulate the participation of their own ethnic group. The term multiculturalism is therefore used to describe this decade where the progress of participating to Dutch society mainly happened within ethnic groups.[76]

This pattern was mirrored in local policy making. In the archives of the municipality, The Hague notes and agendas of city council meetings are stored. These documents give a great insight into local implementation of the different discourses on integration and what kind of effect this had on segregation in the Schilderswijk. Before the 1980s there was hardly any mention of migrants and integration. Searching through the archives to find evidence of local government involvement on this subject only led to a couple of notes about economic participation of the Surinamese and Indonesians. Because of the initial idea that the guest workers were merely seasonal employees, this is not that surprising. What is surprising is the

[74] Nadia Bouras, Het land van herkomst : perspectieven op verbondenheid met Marokko, 1960-2010 (Hilversum : Verloren, 2012) 56–60.
[75] Peter Scholten and Jan Willem Duyvendak, 'Deconstructing the Dutch multicultural model : A frame perspective on Dutch immigrant integration policymaking', *Comparative European Politics* 10 (2012) 266–282.
[76] Ibid.

sudden appearance of the subject in city council meetings. In 1980 the committee for minority problems was brought to life. This was an umbrella committee with representatives of many policy fields, such as: education, culture, sports, economics, public health etc. The main goal of this committee was to create conditions in which minorities could fully participate in the society of The Hague.[77]

Attending these city council meetings, besides the representatives of local government, were representatives of migrant organisations. Every ethnic group seems to have had their own organisation. These organisations had a lot of influence in the process of local policy making. Their suggestions on how to spend funds were mostly approved. There was a high level of enthusiasm to invest in cultural affairs. Every ethnic group had to have their own community centre in the Schilderswijk and local TV and radio programmes. Besides future plans the committee also looked back on the past. There is a lot of criticism about the lack of previous policies. There is mention of plans to put a limit on the number of migrants from one ethnic group per neighbourhood, but these plans were never realised because there was no policy or committee to work them out. The limits of this committee were really emphasized throughout these reports. The resources that were given to this committee only applied for problems that were specific to minorities. During the meetings the overall opinion was that a lot of factors withholding certain ethnical groups from truly participating in society were not specifically minority problems, thus they could not use their resources for this. Factors such as unemployment, low education and criminality were not seen as specific for minorities.[78]

In constructing this historical framework, it becomes clear that the demographic makeup of the neighbourhood has fluctuated over time. From the beginning of the last century the area has been impoverished. This impoverishment resulted in all kinds of struggles for the inhabitants, and for policy makers. With the arrival of the latest substantial group of newcomers from the 1960s onwards, the guest workers, new challenges present themselves. The problems related to social inequality become more intersectional. The current majority is not only struggling with the disadvantages of its social-economic position, but also with the public discourses about integration. The residents that participate in this research project have seen the effects of these demographic changes on their neighbourhood. In the next chapters we will see how they experienced this development.

[77] Stuurgroep Minderheden Beleid: Agenda's, Notulen En Vergaderstukken (1980), Haags Gemeente Archief, 1322-01 1-12.
[78] Ibid.

CHAPTER TWO: MEMORIES OF GEZELLIGHEID

This chapter will explore the way the participants describe their experiences and memories of the Schilderswijk before this became a majority-minority neighbourhood. When analysing change, it is implied that there is a different situation before and after an event or development. To be able to answer the question of how established residents experienced change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood, it is therefore important to first delve into the way they experienced the situation before that development. The stories that are told by the residents in this chapter relate to the 1960s and 1970s. It is important to keep in mind that these are memories, and not by definition truths. People's memories can be influenced by a variety of factors. When people experience change, like these residents had with the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood, they can be overwhelmed by unfamiliarity. This can lead to a heightened emotional investment in the past, or one's own past. Therefore, we must be aware that these memories can be affected by nostalgia. Nostalgia is commonly understood to be a condition of mourning or yearning for a past when things were better, more certain or simpler. Because this research focusses on experiences this is not so significant a problem, but we have to be aware that any change over time can create nostalgia.[79] The nostalgic feelings that the participants might experience can be caused by change in general, and not only by the arrival of migrants into their neighbourhood.

All participants were asked to describe the former Schilderswijk in their own words. What is striking is that the first answer most of the participants gave is: 'it used to be *gezellig'*.[80] *Gezelligheid* is a Dutch concept that does not have an equivalent in other languages. It is the type of word that everyone knows what it means, but there is no exact definition. Vethman completed a study on the origins and cultural meaning of this complex concept.[81] She found the first mention of the word in digitally archived papers in 1760. She calls it a cultural keyword, that is typical for Dutch culture, and that is used in all layers of Dutch society. Although the meaning of the word has changed a bit over the years, we are using the definition of our own time, because this is how the participants use this term to describe the past. In this context the word is mostly used to describe a mutual positive experience, and a form of prevailing cosiness within a limited group.[82] The way the participants describe the concept of gezelligheid corresponds with the concept of social cohesion as described by Jenissen et al.[83] Factors that came up when describing gezelligheid were:

[79] Benjamin Halligan, 'Nostalgia', in: *Encyclopedia of Consumer Culture* (2011) 1044–1046.
[80] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1' (2020); Gerda, 'Interview 4' (2020); Marrie, 'Interview 5' (2020); Trees, 'Interview 6' (2020); Hans, 'Interview 8' (2020); Beppie, 'Interview 9' (2020); Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10' (2020).
[81] Petra Vethman, *Gezellig! : hoe typisch Nederlands is gezelligheid?* (Amsterdam : Ambo/Anthos uitgevers 2019).
[82] Ibid., 15–31.
[83] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.

collective identity, belonging, solidarity, safety and social contacts. All these concepts together could be described as a neighbourhood culture.[84]

Collective Identity

As mentioned before, the Schilderswijk in literature is often referred to as a working-class neighbourhood or a *volksbuurt*.[85] It is seen as an impoverished area that has had to deal with problems associated with social inequality.[86] Klein Kranenburg recognizes a process of social self-exclusion in the area, with aberrant behaviour from the rest of the city.[87] According to Melucci,, markers of a collective identity can be found in the way people describe themselves and distinguish themselves from others as a collective.[88] The residents of the Schilderswijk that participated in this research are aware of their otherness. They compare themselves, for example, with other neighbourhoods in The Hague. The foundation of the complex mechanisms in which the residents distinguish themselves from other neighbourhoods in The Hague is based on their socio-economical position. All the participants seem to agree that the area of the Schilderswijk has structurally known more poverty than the rest of the city. They feel like people from other areas in The Hague look down on them because of that.[89] They think that people from the Schilderswijk are seen by others as 'criminals' and 'scum'.[90] Many of them mention unpleasant experiences where they felt like other people did not see them as equals. These experiences ranged from people reacting to them with weird faces to negative media coverage and institutional discrimination.[91] Johan, who used to be a plumber wanted to apply for a job in Wassenaar, which is known as a well-off area. During the job interview he had to tell them his address. The people interviewing him for the job responded with: 'oh then

[84] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[85] Klein Kranenburg, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985; Duyvensteijn, *Kijk op de Schilderswijk: geschiedenis van een arbeiderswijk*; Eildert Mulder, *De zwijgende portieken van de Haagse Schilderswijk* (Amsterdam : Bulaaq 2001); Aarnoutse, *Geloven in de Haagse Schilderswijk*.
[86] Duyvensteijn, *Kijk op de Schilderswijk: geschiedenis van een arbeiderswijk*, 72–76.
[87] Klein Kranenburg, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985, 7–15.
[88] Alberto Melucci, *Challenging codes collective action in the information age* (Cambridge 1996).
[89] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2' (2020); Jaap, 'Interview 3' (2020); Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7' (2020); Hans, 'Interview 8'; Beppie, 'Interview 9'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[90] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[91] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

you must be from the Schilderswijk'.[92] He explained that this was communicated in a very negative tone, and they instantly thanked him for coming, and did not give him the job.[93]

Some of the participants recognize that the institutional disadvantage of living in the Schilderswijk starts from the moment you are born there. They think the environment you grow up in influences your chances in life. They see a lack of distribution of quality services from the municipality to the area.[94] During one of the conversations with the residents, a married couple discussed their experiences in elementary school. Johan, was born in the neighbourhood, but his wife Lenie grew up outside of the area. She distinctly described the differences between their education. He did not have a choice in his career path, a trade was pointed out to him by a teacher and that was his future, even though his grades might have shown that he was capable of much more. At Lenie's school they advised her, based on her accomplishments, on what would be an appropriate career path for her. The couple agreed that growing up in a neighbourhood such as the Schilderswijk leads to a lot of disadvantages in life. They spoke very proudly about people from the neighbourhood that had managed to 'make something of themselves', even if they were given less chances than someone from outside the area.[95]

These experiences that the residents of the area describe can be identified as a vicious circle of socio-economic segregation and inequality. The exposure to poverty affects individual outcomes through negative neighbourhood effects. This creates a vicious circle of disadvantages, which continuously cross generations, and which leads to segregation in the municipality. There is a strong intergenerational transmission of poverty. The income and employment opportunities for children growing up in more disadvantaged areas will be negatively affected as a result of the location of their upbringing.[96] The fact that the residents experienced less opportunities in their educational path than people from different neighbourhoods shows that social inequality was a structural reality which people from this area had to live with. It differentiates them, as a collective, on a socio-economic level from the rest of the city. This stark difference is seen as one of the factors that brought the neighbourhood together as a collective. The residents describe a feeling of solidarity and support within the area. Not only at a psychological level but also in daily rituals.

Another thing that the interviewed residents see as being typical for the neighbourhood is the way people speak.[97] Even during the interviews some would apologize for the manner in which they spoke,

[92] Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[93] Ibid.
[94] Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[95] Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[96] M van Ham, T Tammaru en H.J. Janssen, 'A multi-level model of vicious circles of socio-economic segregation', in: *Divided Cities: Understanding Intra-urban Inequalities* (Paris: OECD Publishing 2018).
[97] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

because they seem to think that people from outside the neighbourhood would not understand.[98] The language used in the Schilderswijk is described as 'rough'.[99] The people in the neighbourhood use a lot of curse words and local street slang native to this particular neighbourhood.[100] Although many of the participants think this kind of language might have contributed to the bad name of the neighbourhood, they emphasise that those harsh words were not meant in a harsh way. The residents seem to like the way the people spoke to each other. It made them feel part of a collective, they could recognize if someone belonged to the neighbourhood by the way they communicated. In fact, they think it is one of the factors that made the neighbourhood 'gezellig'. People would yell at each other on the streets and give each other nicknames.[101] Nicknames were another element which the residents saw as being typical for this area. A lot of the neighbours had identical old-fashioned Dutch name like Jan, Maria, or Ruud. To avoid confusion these people were given a nickname. These names could sound disparaging for non-natives, some of the examples were: fat, dirty, and crooked, but the residents seemed to see them as pet names.[102]

Social Capital

Within the neighbourhood, people saw each other as equals, even though there were also internal economic differences. Helping and supporting each other is described as having been a significant part of their collective identity. If someone did not have the means to feed their children, the neighbours would bring over a meal, and clothes were handed down through different generations. A lot of luxury items were shared throughout the neighbourhood.[103] An evocative story from one of the participants was that residents of the area could not afford to buy a lot of music records, but everyone in the street would have one or two. Therefore, when someone had a birthday party they would collect them to have a celebration where they did not have to listen to a single song on repeat. Another good example is if neighbours could not afford a beer after work, people would pitch in a couple of cents so they could enjoy a drink together.[104] It

[98] Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'.
[99] Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[100] Hans, 'Interview 8'.
[101] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[102] Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[103] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[104] Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

Image 3

Image 4

was this communal life that brought the neighbours closer together, and made the residents feel like they belonged to something.[105] The streets played a major role in developing this collective identity. This is where communal life in the neighbourhood occurred. The participants paint a picture of a neighbourhood where everyone used to sit outside in front of their doors, drinking beer and having a laugh.[106] [image 3] It was a lively area, with small shops and cafés on every corner. After a week of hard work, people would go dancing and drinking in the cafés, where they were accepted for who they were and could get away from the negative neighbourhood effects of poverty for a moment.[107] [image 4]

Everyone knew each other, and residents could not walk through the district without people yelling their name, or offering them something to eat or drink.[108] There were extensive social networks, and children would refer to their neighbours as their aunts and uncles, and raising children was sometimes described as a group effort. The doors of the houses were always open, so people could walk in or out. A concept that kept coming up during our conversations was the string through the mailbox, nostalgically called '*het touwtje'*.[109] People would tie a string to their front door knob and hang it out of their mailbox, so everyone could get in without a key. Having social contacts was portrayed as a form of prestige. Many of the residents proudly described who, and how many people they knew and were respected by.[110]

Social Safety

These kind of rituals and close contacts created an image of safety and mutual trust. People would literally leave their door open for whoever wanted to enter their house. For some of the residents a feeling of safety and trust is crucial for 'gezelligheid'.[111] Even though people from outside the neighbourhood would see the residents of the Schilderwijk as criminals, the residents themselves claimed there was not much crime in the area. There were some 'rascals', but nothing too serious. They do acknowledge that there were some incidents every now and then involving violence or riots. But they describe these incidences as innocent and the residents did not see them as being significant or any cause for real concern. Every New Year's Eve

[105] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[106] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[107] Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'.
[108] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[109] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Beppie, 'Interview 9'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[110] Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Wim, 'Interview 7'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[111] Wim, 'Interview 7'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

there would be a Christmas tree hunt. This was a yearly battle among different streets of the neighbourhood. They would collect Christmas trees, and other flammable objects to build a fire. The objective was to build the biggest fire in the neighbourhood. The hunt for flammable objects often turned into street fights and riots. But the residents experienced this as part of the fun, almost as a kind of sport.[112] They could be friends or classmates with people from a rival street, but during the hunt that did not matter.[113] [image 5] One thing that came up during a lot of the conversations which the residents experienced as a nuisance, was the amount of drug addicts in the area. There were some halfway houses and rehabilitation centres situated in or close to the neighbourhood. This caused a lot of the public spaces to be unsafe because there were used needles lying around.[114]

With this the residents are most likely referring to the sudden wave of heroin use in the Netherlands during the 1970s. In historical literature on the use of heroin, in the Netherlands and in general, the drugs were framed as 'the hangover of the sixties'.[115] During the sixties drug use had a positive note, people were dreaming of happiness, and peace, but with the recession the atmosphere changed, and with that drug subcultures. Dutch social scientists see heroin as a representation of this depressive decade. It had a tremendous impact on lower class societies.[116] What is striking is that the participants do not emphasise this, even though it might have had as significant an effect on neighbourhood change as the change in the ethnic makeup. In the description of the memories of the participants the heroin crisis is not as vivid as the arrival of migrants. Still, the residents of the Schilderswijk express that they were proud to be part of the neighbourhood. Even if they experienced negative prejudice, they would never hide where they came from.[117] One of the participants gave a vivid description of an incident where the residents rioted against one of their neighbours. The neighbour, now referred to as 'Rinus de Wipper', which roughly translates to Rinus the Shagger, did an interview on television where he spoke poorly about the neighbourhood. He made it look like the residents were all 'scum', and were having sex in front of the windows.[118] This created a lot of conflict with his neighbours. There was a small riot, and the family was chased away from the area because they had brought shame on the neighbourhood.[119]

---

[112] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[113] Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[114] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Beppie, 'Interview 9'.
[115] G. Blok, ''We the Avant-Garde': A History from Below of Dutch Heroin Use in the 1970s', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 132 (2017) 104–125, 106.
[116] Blok, ''We the Avant-Garde': A History from Below of Dutch Heroin Use in the 1970s'.
[117] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[118] The documentary referred to: Hans koekkoek, 'Mensen van goede wil' (The Hague 1969) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zIJ7pMVgkao> [last consulted on 31 May 2020].
[119] Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

Image 5

In this chapter we have explored the memories of the residents from a time before they felt like their neighbourhood changed. A key word in describing their history is ‘gezelligheid’, a term that comes close to our definition of social cohesion. The common theme throughout the stories is the low socio-economic position of the residents in the area. This is the reason they lived in the neighbourhood, it was what differentiated them from the rest of the city, and what brought them closer together. The residents speak about the hardships associated with living in poverty, but generally experienced living in the area quite positively. The solidarity within and support from the community made them feel like they belonged to something, and they were proud to be a part of it. This image might be nostalgic, but that is an outcome of experiencing change.

CHAPTER THREE: EXPERIENCES OF CHANGE

In this chapter, we will explore the way in which the residents of the Schilderswijk that participated in this research experienced change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood, including what they think has changed as a result of this, what has stayed the same and how that has made them feel. For all of the participants these questions seem to be quite complex. On the one hand they have negative feelings towards the change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood, but on the other hand they also see some connections to their own experiences, and often can relate to the newcomers in their area. What they all agree on is that the neighbourhood has changed, due to the increasing diversity in the ethnic makeup of their neighbours.[120] When the participants were describing their memories of how the neighbourhood used to be, the three aspects of social cohesion that are used as markers were apparent. Even though the different aspects were interrelated, they could be separated into different markers. In this part of their story these aspects are more intertwined. Jenissen et al. make a clear distinction between these aspects in describing the relation between social cohesion and ethnic homogeneity. However, when the participants talk about change, the aspect of loss is embedded in all other aspects.[121]

This chapter is in a lot of ways about group formation. In the previous chapter, it became clear that the residents of the area had formed a collective identity, whereas this chapter looks at how the arrival of new groups was experienced by the former. These experiences are often described from an ethnocentric perspective. Therefore, it is crucial to be aware of in- and out-group mechanisms and biases. Functionalist sociologists believe that attitudinal and perceptual biases in favour of members of one's own group over members of other groups are the product of intergroup competition, with the purpose of saving in-group solidarity. The greater the intensity of competition between the in- and out-group, the more attractive the in-group becomes and the more the hostility towards the out-group grows.[122] It is not the objective of this research to analyse these in- and out-group biases, but to use them as a conceptual framework.

[120] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Beppie, 'Interview 9'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[121] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.
[122] Marilynn Brewer, 'In-Group Bias in the Minimal Intergroup Situation: A Cognitive-Motivational Analysis', *Psychological Bulletin* 86 (1979) 307–324.

The first memories of migrants in the neighbourhood

The residents did not experience a sudden breaking point in history where this change happened. They describe a slow process of newcomers coming into the area, and slowly leaving their mark on the neighbourhood's culture.[123] What is striking is that when the residents refer to migrants that have changed the neighbourhood they seem to speak about the Turkish and Moroccan guest workers. Post-colonial migrants, such as people with a Surinamese, Indonesian, or Caribbean background, are not seen as migrants who changed the area. It is mentioned that there were some post-colonial migrants living in the area before they experienced change, but they did not identify this as the cause of change.[124] The arrival of more guest workers into the area was seen as a push factor for the native white residents that caused many to move to different areas in the city. The residents explain that they think the Schilderswijk was attractive for guest workers because of the low house prices, but every time a 'foreigner' would move into a street this was an incentive for the native residents to leave, and every time a native resident would leave they would be replaced by someone with a migration background.[125] This process the residents experienced can be recognised as the concept of 'white flight'. White flight is the term used in literature to describe the process of migration of white residents, from urban cores to surrounding suburban areas, that results in a subsequent concentration of ethnic minorities within inner cities.[126]

The residents that participated in this research, and still live in the area, do not seem to have negative memories of the first arrival of migrants. In fact, many of them speak very positively about their first experiences with people of Turkish or Moroccan descent. They describe them as being very hospitable. In the stories told for this research there were many accounts of the residents going over to their new neighbours for dinner or tea.[127] Some of them explained that they felt like when there were just a few migrants, they would integrate into the neighbourhood's rituals and values.[128] They saw problems emerging when too many people of the same ethnic background moved to the area. They believe that too many people with the same cultural background formed their own groups, which had a negative effect on social networks in the neighbourhood. The neighbours no longer acted like a collective but were increasingly divided into separate groups with separate values and daily rituals and, as a result, the original residents lost control in

[123] Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[124] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Beppie, 'Interview 9'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[125] Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[126] Sara Denise Shreve, 'White Flight', in: *The Social History of the American Family: An Encyclopedia* (2014) 1448–1450.
[127] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[128] Trees, 'Interview 6'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

establishing what is perceived as normal in the neighbourhood. They feel like the municipality of The Hague made a mistake by allocating too many people of the same ethnic background in one area at the same time.[129] Ethnic clustering and community formation can lead to conflicts. This is still experienced as a problem by the residents of the area. The residents do feel that the local government initially tried to solve this perceived problem.[130] One of the residents once attended a meeting where a policy of mixed allocation was discussed. He states that the municipality planned to consciously divide people from all ethnic backgrounds throughout the area, but in his perspective failed to do so.[131] But even in the eighties, when the interviewed residents really started to experience high levels of diversity, the municipality actively tried to bring different cultures together. The residents speak very positively about inter-cultural events that were organized during this period. The Hajiba was one of these events. During the Hajiba there were stages and markets throughout the neighbourhood, with music, food, theatre, dance, and other cultural expressions, that represented the different cultures in the neighbourhood. A lot of the residents enjoyed getting to know their neighbours in that way. They believed that these kinds of activities were necessary to create a collective identity again.[132]

Altogether, the experience of change during the period of transition that saw the Schilderswijk transform from a white working class neighbourhood to a diverse neighbourhood is not described in a very negative way. None of the participants say that they can remember any resistance to the arrival of newcomers by the native residents. They were surprised to hear about the incident of July 1969, and could not recall this event.[133]

'It is no longer gezellig'

If the residents are generally positive about the diversity of the Schilderswijk, then why do they look upon the change of the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood negatively? It is no longer 'gezellig', is the kind of response many of the participants gave to this question.[134] As we have seen in the previous chapter, 'gezelligheid' is how the residents seem to describe social cohesion. They used to feel a sense of belonging

[129] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[130] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[131] Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[132] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[133] *Stukken Betreffende Het Optreden van de Politie Tijdens Ongeregeldheden, Waarbij Marokkaanse Gastarbeiders Door Omwonenden Uit Een Pension in de Ravesteinstraat Zijn Gejaagd*.
[134] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

in the community, partly because they were seen as outcasts of the city they lived in. The loss of social contacts as a result of people with a migration background coming into the area and local people moving away is a theme that emerged repeatedly throughout the stories of the residents. They feel like they are no longer part of the community, which had previously provided support for each other in dealing with problems related to poverty and social inequality.[135] For Marrie and Hans this was a very emotional subject to talk about.[136] When thinking about the past, and what has changed over the years, Hans broke down in tears. Through his story it becomes clear that there is an intense feeling of loss about how things used to be. He no longer has any social contacts, and he spends his days alone at home. He explains that this is so emotional for him because he used to have such a great life. He used to work in some of the neighbourhood cafés, and had built a large social network. He got so much enjoyment out of that, and the fact that he attained respect from those people. He sees the change in the ethnic makeup of the neighbourhood as one of the reasons that his life has changed. Many of his friends moved away, and he lost contact with them.[137]

Besides the social contact, many of the residents miss the atmosphere that the neighbourhood had. Life on the streets changed. The Dutch shops and cafés were replaced by Turkish and Moroccan shops and coffee houses. They not only experienced a loss in social contacts but also in a physical space where they feel like they could be themselves.[138] Some of the residents expressed that they would not enter a café or shop where there are only people from the same ethnic background present. It is not that they feel like they are not allowed or accepted, but when everyone speaks and acts differently than they are used to, they would not feel comfortable.[139] The residents appear to feel like language is an important tool in creating a cohesive community. In the previous chapter it became clear that the way that people spoke in the neighbourhood was one of the aspects that made them feel like they were part of a collective. Now some of the residents feel misunderstood by their neighbours. It is not only that a lot of their neighbours have difficulties with the Dutch language, or prefer to speak in their native tongue, but they do not understand the local slang that the native residents of Schilderswijk use. Their rough way of speaking is often misinterpreted, which can create friction between neighbours.[140]

When asked if they still feel at home in the neighbourhood, the residents gave different responses. For some of them the experience of change has been so negative that they no longer feel at home in their own neighbourhood. They no longer have any social contacts and prefer to go outside of the area for

[135] Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[136] Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'.
[137] Hans, 'Interview 8'.
[138] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[139] Trees, 'Interview 6'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[140] Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

recreational purposes or shopping.[141] Others do not feel like it is as 'gezellig' as it used to be, but they still feel like its their neighbourhood and still feel at home. These participants all seem to have the same indifferent attitude, that you should just respect everyone for who they are, and if you let them be, they will do the same for you.[142] Although all participants agree that the neighbourhood has significantly changed, some of them also see continuities. They feel like there are still a lot of social networks and support systems in place in the area, but they just feel excluded from them. The community they had in the past is no longer there because many people left, but the newcomers created their own communities. They pointed out that the native residents used to do the same. Only back in the day there was only one ethnic group.[143] Life on the streets is still described as being vibrant and lively, and it is still the physical place where communal life takes place. It is just unrecognisable from the streets where the native residents grew up.[144]

Attitudes towards migrants

According to the residents the attitude from people outside of the neighbourhood towards the inhabitants has therefore not changed over time. The Schilderswijk had a bad name in the past, and the Schilderswijk has a bad name now. Here again they point out the consequences that the socio-economic position of people in the Schilderswijk have on the reputation of the area. They feel like this has not changed. In the past it was the poor Dutch people that were considered representative of the lower levels of society, and now it is the people with a migration background.[145] There is a lot of understanding towards their new neighbours' position. They do not like that they have lost their own community, but do not blame the new residents for coming into the neighbourhood. They know how it is to inhabit a subordinate position, and they know the value of having an understanding community in the neighbourhood.[146] In their eyes people with a migration background do not only have to deal with the same struggles of social inequality they had to deal with, but have it even harder because of (institutional) racism.[147] This is striking because a lot of the memories of their collective identity were based on feelings of support and solidarity. The residents understand that their new neighbours have to deal with the same sort of issues that come with social inequality, but the feeling of collective identity is gone.

[141] Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[142] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7'.
[143] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[144] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[145] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Wim, 'Interview 7'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[146] Jan and Truus, 'Interview 1'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[147] Klaas, 'Interview 2'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.

Only Marrie and Trees explicitly spoke out against specific behaviour of people with a migration background, which they have experienced as negative for the neighbourhood. These residents referred to people with a Moroccan background. They especially disliked the manner in which the Moroccan youth behave on the streets. They see a lot of youth hanging around and think that they have different values from them. Behaviour that stands out to them is yelling, cursing, and gathering in large groups on the streets.[148] This is notable, because it is this behaviour that was described as typical for the Schilderswijk as seen in the previous chapter. In the past this was seen as 'gezellig', and part of the culture, but now that it is done outside of the in-group, this behaviour is experienced as deviant.

Other Factors

Some of the participants feel as though the change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood is not the only factor that has contributed to the change that they have experienced in their neighbourhood. In some of the interviews, the residents explained that the world has changed. They feel that it is not only their community that is no longer like it used to be, but that society has become more individual in general. They think that life has become too fast, people have so many things going on in their own lives, their work, friends and a range of hobbies, that they no longer care about their neighbours. Technology is named as one of the causes of this. People are only occupied with their phones and television nowadays.[149] These expressions suggest that the feelings of loss of a collective identity and community is not only caused by the arrival of new groups, but also by inter-generational value changes as a result of modernization. During most of the twentieth century change has come so fast that successive generations live with different values.[150] This continuous change can cause just as much nostalgia as the arrival of new groups of residents in a neighbourhood.

In this chapter we have seen how the residents of the Schilderswijk experienced the change of the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood. They felt like the arrival of new groups has had a negative influence on their lives. The biggest change they experienced was the loss of their community within the neighbourhood. A lot of the residents no longer have extensive social contacts, because many of their peers left the area. These social contacts had provided them with a feeling of support, solidarity, and belonging. Even though they recognize that a lot of the newcomers are in the same situation as they are, they no longer

[148] Marrie, 'Interview 5'; Trees, 'Interview 6'.
[149] Jaap, 'Interview 3'; Gerda, 'Interview 4'; Trees, 'Interview 6'; Hans, 'Interview 8'; Johan and Lenie, 'Interview 10'.
[150] Ronald Inglehart, *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy : the human development sequence* (2005) 94–114.

feel part of this community. However, this does not mean that there no longer is a community. They still describe social networks, and other factors they associate with ‘gezelligheid’ in the area, but they are no longer part of it, and do not recognize it as ‘gezelligheid’ anymore. Another factor that was mentioned in causing this loss of communal life can be found in modernization theories. The loss of the community made the residents either sad, or indifferent. They no longer feel in control of their neighbourhood, and they have lost their much-needed support. This almost competitive feeling for a community might have only strengthened the in-group feeling towards the out-group. What is clear is that many of the residents’ rhetoric is constructed in terms of ‘we’ and ‘them’. The aspects of loss in the perception of social cohesion is, for these residents, embedded in all other aspects that are used as markers. They do not only feel the loss of culture, identity, and home, but also of social capital, and social safety.

Image 6

CONCLUSION

How did established Schilderswijk residents experience change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood, and what effect did this have on their perceptions of local social cohesion? This thesis has searched for the answer to this question in the stories of native residents that participated in this study. It is important to stress again that this conclusion will therefore limit itself to these participants. To make broader assumptions, further research in necessary. Additionally, it is good to realize that this research is done from a diversity perspective, but other factors of change might have had influence on the residents' perspectives, such as modernization and inter-generational differences.

Overall, the native residents of the neighbourhood describe the experience of change in ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood as negative. This corresponds with the findings of Jenissen et al. that the higher the proportion of residents with a non-Dutch background in a neighbourhood, the more the residents with a Dutch background perceive neighbourhood cohesion as weaker.[151] When diving deeper into the reasons why they feel that way, this turned out to be very a complex situation. In the stories of the residents, it becomes clear that diversity in itself is not something that is seen as negative. They do not mind sharing their neighbourhood with different cultures, some of them even spoke positively about it. They do see problems when there are too many people of the same culture together. The underlying reason why this is perceived as a problem can be found in the memories of the participants of a time before migrants came. The residents reminisce of a time when they had substantial social networks and support systems in the neighbourhood. It becomes clear that this social capital and safety is so important to them because of their social-economic disadvantageous position within the society of The Hague. They needed this, in a practical manner, to support each other financially or with services, but also for their self image. People in the neighbourhood were proud to be part of this collective, and it made them feel like they belonged to something. Due to the change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood, they no longer have these social networks and support systems. They imagine that these kinds of communities still exist in the neighbourhood, but they feel excluded from them.

To measure the effect this has had on their perception of local social cohesion, this study placed their stories within the framework of Jenissen et al. The residents seem to describe social cohesion in terms of gezelligheid. When talking about gezelligheid, the aspects of social cohesion used as markers come up, such as: social capital, social trust, culture and identity. Remarkably, the distinction between these aspects is not as clear in their stories. Jenissen et al. find that due to the presence of people with different migrant backgrounds, the established population can experience feelings of alienation. For example, many people with a Dutch background feel that they are losing power and control to newcomers. They no longer feel at

[151] Jenissen e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland*.

home in their country. They describe these feelings as 'feelings of loss'. With this, they mean the feeling that valuable elements and rituals from the past are lost due to undesirable developments today.[152] In our findings these feelings of loss are however, not limited to the loss of identity, culture, and home. For our participants social capital and social safety are intertwined with their identity, because of their social-economic disadvantage in society. The feeling of loss is a clear aspect in the narrative of change, and the perception of local social cohesion, however for these residents that is primarily the loss of social capital, and social safety, which is part of their culture and identity.

Thus, the residents experienced the change in the ethnic makeup of their neighbourhood as negative due to a loss of social capital and safety, and with that their culture and identity. This has had a negative effect on their perception of social cohesion in their neighbourhood. They no longer feel part of the community. These findings are in line with the consensus of social scientists that higher levels of diversity lead to a lower perception in social cohesion. However, the underlying story is constructed on how dependent the native residents of this area are on these social networks. The negative image of diversity does not come from diversity itself, but the loss of their support system. The native residents that still live in the area are those that did not manage to leave, because they do not have the means for this. They feel left behind in a community they no longer recognize as their own. It is important to tell this story because it shows the complexity of a diverse neighbourhood. Challenges of migration and social inequality are often intertwined, and to research this as separate developments will leave out parts of the experiences and stories of the people involved. Listening more to these stories can help in generating positive change in these perceived problem areas. This research shows that there is a necessity for qualitative and grassroots research of the neighbourhood. In telling the story of its people a different image appears than is shown in the numbers. Yes, native Dutch residents have negative experiences of change, but the story behind it gives a much gentler narrative, and clues to possible solutions.

[152] Ibid.

APPENDIX I : IMAGES

Frontpage: Boekhorststraat Bioscoop Hollywood. 1960. “Schilderswijk Den Haag hoe het was.” Facebook, August 6, 2013.

Image 1: *Wijkprogramma 2016-2019: Stadsdeel Centrum, Schilderswijk* (Municipality The Hague). 3

Image 2: Jacobastraat. “Schilderswijk Den Haag hoe het was.” Facebook, October 2, 2013.

Image 3: Hobbemastraat, speelplaats bij de Houtzagerij. 1972. Source: Gemeente Archief ’s-Gravenhage.

Image 4: Zaterdag dansen in Clubhuis de Mussen. “Schilderswijk Den Haag hoe het was.” Facebook, Juli 14, 2016.

Image 5: Kerstboomverbranding op de Hoefkade in Den Haag. 1956. “Schilderswijk Den Haag hoe het was.” Facebook, January 3, 2016.

Image 6: Hoek Paralelweg. “Schilderswijk Den Haag hoe het was.” Facebook, february 11, 2015.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

‘Den Haag in Cijfers - 6. Demografie’ <https://denhaag.incijfers.nl/jive/report?id=bevolking4&openinputs=true> [Consulted 28 October 2019].

koekkoek, Hans, ‘Mensen van goede wil’ (The Hague 1969) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zIJ7pMVgkao> [Consulted 31 May 2020].

Stukken Betreffende Het Optreden van de Politie Tijdens Ongeregeldheden, Waarbij Marokkaanse Gastarbeiders Door Omwonenden Uit Een Pension in de Ravesteinstraat Zijn Gejaagd (The Hague 1969), Haags Gemeente Archief, Politie Den Haag.

Stuurgroep Minderheden Beleid: Agenda’s, Notulen En Vergaderstukken (1980), Haags Gemeente Archief, 1322-01 1-12.

Wijkprogramma 2016-2019: Stadsdeel Centrum, Schilderswijk (Municipality The Hague).

Newspapers

"In Haagse schilderswijk Buurt bestormt pension voor gastarbeiders". "Friese koerier : onafhankelijk dagblad voor Friesland en aangrenzende gebieden". Heerenveen, 1969/06/16, p. 1. Consulted on Delpher 29-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:010690828:mpeg21:p001

"Kamervragen over Marokkanen". "De Telegraaf". Amsterdam, 1969/06/19, p. 3. Consulted on Delpher 20-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ddd:011197740:mpeg21:p003

"Schildersbuurtbewoners vernielen inboedel Marokkanen uit pension n Den Haag gejaagd". "Het Parool". Amsterdam, 1969/06/16, p. 5. Consulted on Delpher 20-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010838444:mpeg21:p005

"Woedende bewoners van schilderswijk slaan Marokkanen pension uit". "Trouw". Meppel, 1969/06/17, p. 3. Consulted on Delpher 20-09-2019, http://resolver.kb.nl/resolve?urn=ABCDDD:010817917:mpeg21:p003

Secondary Sources

Aarnoutse, Leuntje, *Geloven in de Haagse Schilderswijk* (The Hague: De Nieuwe Haagsche 1999).

Abascal, Maria, en Delia Baldassarri, 'Love Thy Neighbor? Ethnoracial Diversity and Trust Reexamined 1', *American Journal of Sociology* 121 (2015) 722–782.

Allan, F, *De stad 's-Gravenhage en hare geschiedenis* (Amsterdam 1859).

Blok, G., ''We the Avant-Garde': A History from Below of Dutch Heroin Use in the 1970s', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 132 (2017) 104–125.

Boersma, E.A.M., 'De Schildersbuurt, vergeten wijk?', *Sociaal Den Haag, tijdschrift voor Haags maatschappelijk werk* 7 243–247.

Bouras, Nadia, Het land van herkomst : perspectieven op verbondenheid met Marokko, 1960-2010 (Hilversum : Verloren, 2012).

Bovenkerk, F., 1943-, *Vreemd volk, gemengde gevoelens : etnische verhoudingen in een grote stad* (Meppel [etc.] : Boom 1985).

Brewer, Marilynn, 'In-Group Bias in the Minimal Intergroup Situation: A Cognitive-Motivational Analysis', *Psychological Bulletin* 86 (1979) 307–324.

Bruin, N.M. de, Interetnisch contact in de Schilderswijk : Een onderzoek naar de omgang tussen Nederlanders en migranten in de Haagse Schilderswijk tussen 1960 en 2000 (Leiden University, Leiden 2012).

Burke, Peter, *Eyewitnessing : the uses of images as historical evidence* (London : Reaktion 2001).

Chan, Joseph, Ho-Pong To en Elaine Chan, 'Reconsidering Social Cohesion: Developing a Definition and Analytical Framework for Empirical Research', *An International and Interdisciplinary Journal for Quality-of-Life Measurement* 75 (2006) 273–302.

Dolleman, Alida, *De Schilderswijk in beweging*.

Duyvendak, Jan Willem, *The politics of home : belonging and nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States* (Basingstoke [etc.] : Palgrave Macmillan 2011).

Duyvensteijn, John, *Kijk op de Schilderswijk: geschiedenis van een arbeiderswijk* (The Hague: Kruseman's Uitgevers Maatschappij b.v. 1984).

Fokkema, C.M., en C.N. Harmsen, 'Herkomst en vestiging van de eerste generatie Marokkanen', *Demos: bulletin over bevolking en samenleving* 25 (2009) 1–4.

Gelder, Maartje van, 'How to influence Venetian economic policy: collective petitions of the Netherlandish merchant community in the early seventeenth century', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 24 (2009) 29–47.

Gijsberts, Mérove, e.a., *Maakt de buurt verschil? : de relatie tussen de etnische samenstelling van de buurt, interetnisch contact en wederzijdse beeldvorming* (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau 2010).

---, *Uit elkaars buurt : de invloed van etnische concentratie op integratie en beeldvorming* (The Hague: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau 2005).

---, Tom van der Meer en Jaco Dagevos, ''Hunkering Down' in Multi-Ethnic Neighbourhoods? The Effects of Ethnic Diversity on Dimensions of Social Cohesion', *European Sociological Review* 28 (2012) 527–537.

Haest, Guus, *De Ouwe Garde, het Andere Slag en de Buitenlanders : de geschiedenis van een saneringswijk* (Assen [etc.] : Van Gorcum 1989).

Halligan, Benjamin, 'Nostalgia', in: *Encyclopedia of Consumer Culture* (2011) 1044–1046.

Ham, M van, T Tammaru en H.J. Janssen, 'A multi-level model of vicious circles of socio-economic segregation', in: *Divided Cities: Understanding Intra-urban Inequalities* (Paris: OECD Publishing 2018).

Hennink, M., I. Hutter en A. Bailey, *Qualitative Research Methods* (SAGE Publications 2010).

Inglehart, Ronald, *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy : the human development sequence* (2005).

Jenissen, Roel, e.a., *De nieuwe verscheidenheid: Toenemende diversiteit naar herkomst in Nederland* (Wetenschappelijke raad voor het regeringsbeleid 2018) 75–117.
Jochem Tolsma, Tom Van Der Meer en Maurice Gesthuizen, 'The impact of neighbourhood and municipality characteristics on social cohesion in the Netherlands', *Acta Politica* 44 (2009) 286.
Klein Kranenburg, Diederick, 'Samen voor ons eigen' : de geschiedenis van een Nederlandse volksbuurt: de Haagse Schilderswijk 1920-1985 (Hilversum : Verloren, 2013).
---, en Wim Willems, *Niks geteisem! : het wonderbaarlijke verhaal van de mussen* (The Hague: Uitgeverij de Nieuw Haagsche B.V. 2011).
Leavy, Patricia, *Oral history* (New York, NY [etc.] : Oxford University Press 2011).
Lesger, C.M., L.A.C.J. Lucassen en M. Schrover, 'Is there life outside the migrant network?', *Annales de Démographie Historique* 2 (2002) 29–50.
Meer, Tom van der, en Jochem Tolsma, 'Ethnic Diversity and Its Effects on Social Cohesion', *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 40 (2014) 459–478.
Meissner, Fran, en Steven Vertovec, 'Comparing super-diversity', *Ethnic and Racial Studies: Comparing super-diversity* 38 (2015) 541–555.
Melucci, Alberto, *Challenging codes collective action in the information age* (Cambridge 1996).
Mulder, Eildert, *De zwijgende portieken van de Haagse Schilderswijk* (Amsterdam : Bulaaq 2001).
Obdeijn, Herman, en Marlou Schrover, *Komen en gaan: Immigratie en emigratie in Nederland vanaf 1550* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker 2008).
Prak, M.R., 'J.W. Veluwenkamp, Archangel. Nederlandse ondernemers in Rusland 1550-1785', *BMGN - Low Countries Historical Review* 117 (2002) 228.
Putnam, Robert D., 'E Pluribus Unum : Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture', *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2007) 137–174.
Scholten, Peter, en Jan Willem Duyvendak, 'Deconstructing the Dutch multicultural model : A frame perspective on Dutch immigrant integration policymaking', *Comparative European Politics* 10 (2012) 266–282.
Schrover, Marlou, 'Dutch migration history. Looking back and moving forward', *Tijdschrift voor sociale en economische geschiedenis* 11 (2014) 219–236.
Shreve, Sara Denise, 'White Flight', in: *The Social History of the American Family: An Encyclopedia* (2014) 1448–1450.
Vethman, Petra, *Gezellig! : hoe typisch Nederlands is gezelligheid?* (Amsterdam : Ambo/Anthos uitgevers 2019).