22

BETWEEN SUPERDIVERSITY AND NATIONALISM

The culturalisation of everyday life in Amsterdam

Paul Mepschen and Jan Willem Duyvendak

Introduction

Following local elections in March 2011, Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte bore witness to the far-reaching transformation of political discourse in the Netherlands over the past few decades. In response to the electoral victory of his free-market, conservative-liberal party, VVD, Rutte stated: "We are going to give this beautiful country back to the Dutch, because that is our project". His words echoed an earlier promise he had made when presenting his first cabinet back in October 2010 to "give the country back to hard-working Dutchmen".[1] Rutte's statement exemplified the normalisation of exclusionary politics built on an image of "the people" – in this case, the rhetorical figure of the hardworking Dutchman. The people referred to in this political discourse do not form "a shapeless demos, but a specific ethnos, or natio" (Farris, 2017, p. 66). They are autochthonous, that is, "born from the soil" (Geschiere, 2009).

The figure of the hardworking ordinary Dutchman also plays a central role in the rhetoric of the right-wing populist Freedom Party (Partij voor de Vrijheid, PVV). Its leader and single member, Geert Wilders, has for many years claimed to represent "hardworking Dutch people" like "Henk and Ingrid". Wilders argues: "We choose for the people who don't have it easy [*die het niet cadeau krijgen*]. Not for the elite, but for Henk and Ingrid".[2] Wilders' discourse draws boundaries between "ordinary people" and pluralist elites, as well as between "white autochthones" and people of migrant background. "Henk and Ingrid", Wilders once famously said, "have to pay for Ahmed and Fatima. They have a right to a safer Netherlands that is more Dutch" (De Telegraaf, 2010). Class and cultural boundaries thus merge in a discourse that gives rise to right-wing populism and its social persona: the ordinary everyman, "originally Dutch", and assumed to be white. This representation raises important questions for the social-scientific study of difference and diversity.

In this article, we will discuss the complex relationship between superdiversity – which seems to hold the promise of a normalisation of difference as diversity becomes a fact of life while the very notion of a majoritarian culture loses significance – and the re-emergence of mainstream nativist and culturalist perspectives that impose meaning in everyday, local settings.

Superdiversity

The concept of superdiversity must, in the first place, be seen as descriptive (Wessendorf, 2014). As Meissner and Vertovec argue, the notion describes the "new multicultural condition of the 21st century" (2015, p. 542). As one of the most influential concepts that has emerged in recent years to describe the urban condition in the era of late-capitalist globalisation and mass-immigration, the concept holds the promise of making sense of the heterogeneity of urban experience today. It points to a diversification of diversity, characterising the lived reality of an increasing number of people in urban areas across the world. The concept, it is argued, provides "a lens to describe an exceptional demographic situation characterised by the multiplication of social categories within specific localities" (Wessendorf, 2014, p. 1). One of its strengths, therefore, is that it is enables scholars to move beyond the ethno-focal lens that has long been dominant in the study of migrant politics and identities. From this perspective, the term is not simply descriptive, but can also be read as *critical*: if taken seriously, it has important methodological and epistemological consequences for the study of multiculturalism, ethnic diversity, and cultural essentialism (cf. Back and Sinha, 2016).

However, as Richard Alba and Jan Willem Duyvendak (2018) suggest, scholars working with the concept of superdiversity tend to ignore majoritarian discourses and groups in the study of ethnicity and diversity. As they point out, the superdiversity lens focuses mostly on horizontal processes of living together. From that perspective, it might be true that increasingly – in superdiverse European cities – there is no such thing as a mainstream culture or a dominant ethnic group. Certainly, this is increasingly true in a demographic sense. But this approach does not take into full account the question of symbolic and institutional power – including racism. Rather than a situation in which "everybody will adapt to everyone" (Crul, 2016), we see ever stricter discursive and institutional reinforcements of particular conceptions of majoritarian national cultures – in the form of stringent immigration and integration policies for instance. These transformations at the level of public discourse and policy have important effects at the level of people's everyday lives (Mepschen, 2016).

Susanne Wessendorf, in her study of diversity in Hackney, argues that in that part of London – where she lives and works – diversity has become commonplace: "Diversity has become habitual and part of the everyday human landscape" (Wessendorf, 2014, p. 3). By focusing on what Mepschen – based on his fieldwork – calls the *culturalisation of everyday life* in an Amsterdam neighbourhood in New West, in this chapter we stress a different aspect of the condition of superdiversity. What struck Mepschen was that so few people that he spoke with exhibited any indifference to difference. The powerful emergence of autochthony in the Netherlands stands in contrast with Wessendorf's notion that in Hackney "almost everybody comes from elsewhere" (2014, p. 2). Autochthony precisely denotes a clear and powerful boundary between those who come from elsewhere and those who can claim to have been "born from the soil" and thus to be home in the nation (cf. Geschiere, 2009; Duyvendak, 2011). This boundary between the so-called "autochthonous" and "allochthonous" residents plays a key role in everyday discourse, especially among people ethnicised as autochthonous in New West.

Alterity and cultural loss

Analysis of the social and political crisis of immigrant "integration" in the Netherlands often starts with the implicit premise that Dutch autochthonous culture has always already been there. This approach takes autochthony as a neutral, sociologically unproblematic category: a distinct, cohesive "whole" that has been disrupted by "migrant cultures". Their treatises resonate with

what Willem Schinkel (2007) has called the "local hierarchisation of culture": the claim that "Dutch culture" is and should be dominant on "Dutch soil". As Duyvendak argues:

> the crisis in "feeling at home" has indeed become primarily a problem for the native-born. … After 2002, discussions about the loss of home feelings have almost invariably concerned the native Dutch, whom politicians increasingly paint as "foreigners" in their own country.
>
> *(2011, p. 95)*

The rhetorical trope of the "autochthonous" everyman (*autochtoon* in Dutch) everyman whose sense of home and place has been undermined by immigration and elite-supported multiculturalism has over the years come to play a central role in Dutch politics. The rhetorical figure of the ordinary *autochtoon* played a pivotal role in far-right imaginaries in the 1970s and 1980s (Prins, 2004), was mobilised by the Socialist Party in the early 1980s (SP, 1983), and moved from the margins to the centre of Dutch political and public discourse with the ascent of nationalist culturalism.

The discourse of autochthony – grounded in a peculiar notion of the everyman (racialised as "white") – rests on what Uitermark *et al.* (2014) have called cultural protectionism. This mobilisation of the figure of the "ordinary" person – whose resistance to immigration is framed as completely natural, as common sense – inverts the meaning of racial prejudice. "Racism now becomes the very refusal of immigrants to adopt the national lifestyle of their host country" (Lentin and Titley 2011, p. 74). In other words, the problem is no longer racism but the alleged lack of assimilation among racialised others.

How to understand the sense of cultural loss on which the politics and everyday logic of autochthony is built? Mepschen's ethnographic conversations in Amsterdam New West are instructive here. In what follows, we focus on one of his interviews conducted in the spring of 2010.[3] He interviewed Maria (53) and Dora (73), friends and neighbours in the *Louis Couperusbuurt* quarter in New West, in Dora's home.

Maria asked the interviewer why she had, "in God's name", been selected for an interview. "I know nothing about nothing" [*ik weet niks van niks*], she said. She was quite anxious about the interview and – although Paul had not suggested the topic at all – told him explicitly that she did not want to talk about "*allochtonen*". "If it is about that, I don't want to participate". She felt the issue was too sensitive and disliked the fact that it was so prevalent in her daily conversations with neighbours. Paul assured Maria that she had no obligation to talk about anything she did not want to, after which she agreed to the interview, emphasising that she would only talk to him once, that he could not mention her real name, and that the interview had to take place at her friend Dora's home.

When Paul arrived, Maria's anxiety had not abated. But Dora's mood was more or less the exact opposite of her friend's: she was relaxed and made fun of the research, which she was unable to take seriously – reflecting the cynical views of the academy that Paul often encountered during his fieldwork in New West. Like Maria, Dora had no idea why he would want to interview her. They sat at her table and Paul was offered coffee in a huge mug while Dora's small dog crawled on his lap. Before he explained his interest in the neighbourhood and his research objectives, he had taken his recording device out of his bag, put it on the table, and asked permission to record the conversation. At first both women agreed, but the mood changed when Maria noticed that Dora was going to talk about "allochtonen" after all. She anxiously asked him to turn off the recording device, which he did.[4] She demanded that Paul repeat his assurance that he was not going to use her real name, and explained why she disliked talking

about the "multicultural" aspects of her neighbourhood: "To be honest, it makes me sick, all that talk about the foreigners [*de buitenlanders*]. It's fake, it's inauthentic [*niet authentiek*]: people are either for or against". Paul did not quite understand what Maria meant, so he asked her to elaborate. Maria looked at Dora for confirmation as she explained:

> Look, people have started acting very strangely, when talking about foreigners. Don't you think so, Dora? Suddenly they are either for or against. For instance: people who would normally just walk by, these days they suddenly feel the urge to pat these foreign children [*buitenlandse kinderen*] on the head. To show something – to show that they are not against them. Very strange behaviour. *Niet authentiek!* Yes, I hate all this stupid talk about the multicultural society.

Maria was reflecting on something important: the prevalence of the debate on multiculturalism and "integration" in the public sphere and in everyday life. Paul asked: "Why do you think people act like this?"; Dora responded:

> These days everything is multi-culti. Maria is right, in the past nobody talked about that – you did not think in terms of "autochtoon-allochtoon". But, well, that was before we were flooded [*overspoeld*] [with immigrants – PM/JWD]. We used to think they were fun [*geinig*] – a black child, with different hair. You could pat them on the head, that was nice. [*Die aaide je dan lekker over de bol.*] Yes, we thought it was fun back then. But now they are of course everywhere.

The somatic aspects of cultural difference – the materiality of the bodies of culturalised others – entered Dora's discourse here. Maria was uncomfortable and did her best to steer the conversation to another topic:

> I thought we were going to talk about the demolition? Because I no longer recognise Amsterdam, and that is not just because of the foreigners. Everywhere they are demolishing and restructuring the city – it gives you a strange feeling.

It seemed that the discourse of discontent surrounding demographic change and "integration" (Mepschen, 2012) is often in fact commentary on social transformation and cultural loss in more general terms. In the discourse of many white "autochthones", migrants were represented as embodying unwanted urban change, framed as agents of (or otherwise connected to) a broader sense of cultural loss. As such, the minoritised, culturalised migrant Other became part and parcel of a more general discourse of discontent concerning "these times" that were – so to speak – passing people by.

This is how Maria's point should be understood. The fact that she no longer recognised Amsterdam, she was arguing, was not only contingent upon the proximity of cultural others. The sense of cultural loss that people commented upon when they expressed discontent with the "superdiverse" character of their neighbourhood was about more than the cultural alterity of their neighbours. Maria said:

> When I first came here to view the house – almost thirty years ago – there was a neighbour who invited me in! Who invited me in! While she did not know me at all! She showed me her house. I could hardly believe it, because in other parts of Amsterdam that was not something people did anymore. I had grown up in a neighbourhood

> in which the atmosphere had already become cold. So I had never experienced such hospitality and trust. When I came here the atmosphere was so homey, so cosy … I could not believe it.

Maria thus recalled a sense of homeliness and belonging that, in her memory, had suffused her neighbourhood. She continued:

> In the past people would sweep the sidewalk here, you know. People were enormously neat. With soap and everything! I have to say, I wasn't used to that at all when I moved in here thirty years ago. I came from a neighbourhood in which people did not do that. But I adjusted of course. So I also starting doing that. Because people here simply felt this was important. Hahaha, imagine asking your neighbours that now.

She laughed hard, and so did Dora. They agreed that the sense of collective purpose and obligation that had in their eyes characterised the recent past would be unthinkable today. In Maria's memory, this social cohesion had always been a peculiar quality of the place where she had landed: the Louis Couperusbuurt in Slotermeer, Amsterdam New West. Less a quality of "autochthonous" culture, homeliness here was construed as a matter of geographical location within the city. The Couperusbuurt was like a little village, Maria said, and should stay that way. It stood in stark contrast to other parts of Amsterdam that were in her view more anonymous and alienating. This is why she opposed the demolition plans (see Mepschen, 2012), but also why she resisted a reductionist explanation of social change and growing alienation in terms of the autochthonous–allochthonous divide and anti-multiculturalist discourse. Maria generally preferred continuity and had a palpable distaste for change:

> Why are they constantly changing everything? Why can't they leave things as they are? So many things are changing. There are so many activities now. I don't like activities at all: it only leads to unrest. You are expected to participate. … But all I want is to stroll along the lake. But what have they done? They have taken away my footpath. Because people wanted a running path. So they dumped asphalt there. If that doesn't drive you mad. … And in the past one could swim in the Sloterplas – now that's also forbidden. That has also disappeared. And everywhere small restaurants pop up. That's crazy, right? Why can't people simply eat at home?

Maria was trying to find a language to talk about transformations in the city without taking refuge in the idiom offered by the culturalist framework. She could not, however, prevent the conversation from drifting to the question of autochthony and allochthony, which was central to her friend Dora's perspective on things. Perceived transformations at the level of decency and cleanliness were discursively linked to the influx of "*allochtonen*", and for Dora, neighbours unwilling to sweep the sidewalk were construed as the allochthonous "other". Following up on this issue, she stated: "*Hun auto's houden ze wel bij*" ["They do maintain their cars"].

The use of the word "their" [*hun*] is pivotal here because it holds both social and expressive, affective meaning (Besnier, 1990, p. 419): it not only refers to a specific category – *allochtonen* – but also signifies the speaker's emotional disposition towards this category. Dora said:

> Recently one of them told me he was going to clean something, but I had misunderstood because they don't speak Dutch. That drives one crazy. That language, even when they are born here. … I really hate that. They simply do not speak Dutch at home; well, of course they are never going to learn.

What must be noted here is the unreflective, commonplace way in which Dora generalised from the particular. She referred to one of her neighbours as "one of them" and later shifted, almost unnoticeably, from the word "he" – referring to a particular neighbour – to the word "they" – referring to the category of allochtonen. The unreflective way in which the figure of the allochthonous Other emerges in everyday speech-acts is of central analytic importance. It signifies the way in which a culturalist framework – grounded in the dichotomy between autochthony and allochthony – has imposed meaning on people's everyday experience.

Interestingly, Maria countered Dora's remark, saying: "The foreigners that I know, they speak perfect Dutch. It might be true that you know some who don't speak Dutch. Fine. But the ones I know, well, their Dutch is perfect". Different perspectives on the other thus abound, but the way the conversation took shape showed that both women had become used to thinking with and through the autochthonous-allochthonous categorical divide that dominates Dutch representations of political and social life. Even if Maria did not want to talk about "allochtonen", the conversation nonetheless moved to the topic.

If language and habits in relation to public and private space were central markers of these boundaries, income and class also played a role. Falling out of character, Maria stated:

> Also, they all have a car. Sometimes I think – if my name is not going to be in the book, I might as well say what I think – that the foreigners are always represented as poor, etcetera. … But I don't know one without a car. I think many autochthones are much poorer. The foreign children all walk around in very expensive clothes.

Dora: "Yes! They all pay this from their child benefits. Because they all have loads of children. That is simply the truth".

The conversation with Dora and Maria shows how self-evident boundaries between autochthonous and allochthonous residents are marked and maintained, and how they take shape in and through different registers: somatic differences, class and income, respectability. Moreover, Dora's remark that thinking in these terms is a new phenomenon suggests that the autochthony–allochthony dichotomy is a relatively novel way of making sense of difference. While the bodily markers of difference had been there before – in the form of the "different hair" of "migrant children", for instance, suggesting a history of racialised thinking – the discourse of autochthony and allochthony appears to be a more recent phenomenon. In other words, it seems clear that the ascent of the culturalist framework as it has taken shape in recent years in the Netherlands plays a key role in how the politics of sameness and difference play out in the context of a local, pluri-ethnic, and socially diverse neighbourhood in contemporary Amsterdam.

Enacting culturalism

In October 2010, Mepschen attended a debate titled "Amsterdam between Mokum and Mekka", organised by neighbourhood residents assembled in an "intercultural" network in Slotermeer, a local initiative that had begun activities in the late 1990s but that had only gained momentum after the 9/11 attacks in the United States. The district administration, worried about the local fall-out of this global event, had taken interest in "doing something": more than ever, the feeling was that it was necessary to bring people together in "intercultural and interfaith dialogue". One year after 9/11, a revamped and now ambitious network was launched to do that. This particular evening eight years later brought together between sixty and eighty people.

As soon as he entered the building, Paul started looking around the room for familiar faces. Steven was there and Paul went to greet him. He had met Steven in March 2010, during the election campaign for the Amsterdam and New West municipality, in which he was a candidate for the ChristenUnie, a small political party of evangelical and orthodox Protestants. Steven was involved in a conversation with a number of other people, including Wart and Elsa, a couple in their fifties, who were very active locally. Paul had met them several times before. They lived in an alternative, eco-community in New West. There were also two other people involved in the conversation, whom Mepschen had not met before: a woman named Els and a man named Stefan.

After Paul was welcomed in the circle of people eating soup, the group participants continued their discussion. The topic of their debate was the dialogical axiom of the inter-cultural, inter-religious network organising the event this evening: the mission was "to let it come from two sides". Stefan passionately disagreed with that dialogical command, and his discontent was in fact why he had come to the meeting.

"It is nonsense. Because it always comes only from one side, from our side", he said. "We give, they only take. And when we offer one finger, they take the whole hand". Considering the dialogical imperative of this "inter-cultural" event, Paul mistakenly expected others around the table to protest. But Stefan's remarks proved less out of place than he had expected, at least at this point in the conversation. Indeed, the remarks were greeted with light approval, while Stefan elaborated how the changes of the neighbourhood had frustrated and angered him: "Muslims despise ordinary Western people [*gewone westerse mensen*]", he argued. "They tell us that we are perverse". He was also of the opinion that friendship with Muslims was impossible, because "they only had regard for themselves". Stefan argued he was speaking from personal experience. To Paul's surprise, Wart responded to this by saying that "yes", he thought Stefan was partly right, while also trying to be more nuanced:

> They are a bit better at thinking of themselves than we are. But you have to differentiate between groups. We suffer from Moroccans because they have failed on all accounts. Even when it comes to crime, they have failed. The Chinese, for example, they are not addressed for their lack of integration. Why not? They too have problems. They too are involved in crime; there is exploitation within their own community. They don't speak Dutch. Many of them are here illegally. But they keep it within their own community. Moroccans, however, harass us on our streets. That's why they evoke so much contention [*weerstand*].

Stefan, ignoring the more complex substance of Ward's remarks, responded: "Look, we are being despised. They think we are corrupted [*ze vinden ons verdorven*]. They came here and they immediately started to curse us".

When Paul asked Stefan what he meant and if he had personal experience with this as well, his answer was simply "Just watch television". Echoing narratives that Paul had become familiar with in the course of his fieldwork in Slotermeer, Stefan continued: "Even small children [of post-migrant background – PM] say: 'Just wait, in ten years we will be in power here'. When you hear that, you know what kind of language is used at home. Because children speak the truth".

Wart seemed to agree with this: "We should stop blaming society for the trouble with migrant youths. It all starts at home. That's where things go wrong". Els responded to that: "Yes, in the Berber culture. That's simply a backward culture [*een achterlijke cultuur*]". Wart responded further:

> There is no harmony in the family culture. It starts with marriage already. We marry first of all mostly because we love each other. But in these cultures, people don't marry out of love. They marry because they are supposed to marry. Moreover, the ten-year-old son is already boss in the home, especially because the father doesn't speak Dutch. When there is no harmony at home, the children go onto the streets. And thus a street culture develops. And that's when we are confronted with it. That is what we suffer from.

For Stefan, the call for dialogue that inspired the evening in De Bron was lost on his Muslim neighbours: they were seen by him as unwilling to enter into conversation. Dutch Muslims – or, more precisely, those perceived to be Muslim by Stefan – thus emerged here as radically different from the autochthonous self – a fundamental alterity that made dialogue an impossible dream. Moreover, Islam emerged in Stefan's narrative as a threat not only to himself, but also to the very integrity of the nation: he was convinced that Muslims' planned to take power.

Stefan's views on the alterity of migrant and Muslim citizens thus functioned as a starting point of a dialogue about the perceived otherness of post-migrant neighbours, among these "white", "autochthonous" residents of Slotermeer. Most of the participants – although not Stefan – considered themselves opponents of the nationalist populism of the likes of Geert Wilders and his PVV and tried to point this out a number of times. Wart and Els, for instance, expressed this by arguing that "you must distinguish between groups" and "you mustn't put everyone under the same umbrella". But their speech acts reproduced the culturalist interpretive frame as opposed to negating the substantialist carving up of society into discrete cultural "wholes". The cultures ascribed to ethnicised minorities become framed as explanatory of social problems of persons in minoritised groups, including behaviour construed as deviant.

Conclusion

The transformative diversification of Slotermeer, the Louis Couperusbuurt, and other urban, poly-ethnic neighbourhoods in the Netherlands is often misunderstood and misrepresented as a shift from homogeneity to heterogeneity. While this sense of rupture is politically mobilised in contemporary struggles over the future of the "multicultural" Netherlands, it is not accurate. From its beginnings in the early 1950s, New West has been a religiously and socially diverse area (Hellinga, 2005; Heijdra, 2010). Moreover, a relatively high level of socio-economic heterogeneity, owing to the influx of postcolonial migrants from Indonesia and people from the rural north, further increased the district's cultural and social diversity in the 1950s. Indeed, the sociologist Van Doorn called for an aggressive integration policy targeting rural migrants in the district as early as 1955 (Heijdra, 2010).

This is not to say that real transformations have not taken place since then: the feel, aesthetic, and phenomenology of the neighbourhoods in Amsterdam New West have all changed since the 1980s. Turkish-Dutch residents, for instance, have taken over large parts of the Slotermeer's retail trade, affecting the range of shops on the streets (Nio *et al.*, 2009). The central market in Slotermeer increasingly caters to the quarter's poorest, mostly migrant-origin residents, fueling a sense of alienation and discontent among more affluent working-class whites who now often shop elsewhere. Indeed, one of Paul Mepschen's respondents/interviewees told him he always looked forward to his weekly shopping trip to Amstelveen – a relatively white suburb on the outskirts of Amsterdam. It felt like "coming home", he said. The point is, however, that the demographic transformations of recent decades cannot simply be understood as a shift from homogeneity to heterogeneity.

In this chapter, we have argued that this "new" urban condition does not always lead to what Suzanne Wessendorf (2014) has called "commonplace diversity". For Wessendorf, the story of London's Hackney district is a positive one: "Unlike much of the current media and political debate on diversity, which tends to portray diversity as a problem, the assumption of tensions on the grounds of migration-related diversity has no grounds in Hackney" (2014, p. 3). The story of Amsterdam New West is different: while many of our interlocutors narrated a positive attitude towards diversity, its problematisation and construction as a threat to the integrity of autochthonous selves was more or less inescapable. This has everything to do with the hegemony of the culturalist framework. In Amsterdam New West, and in the Netherlands in broader terms, cultural alterity has been politicised.

In the context, Dutch people perceive and construe a landscape of alterity in everyday life, in their daily habits (Shoshan, 2016), constituting a daily practice of self and other in and through which people construe a sense of community, identity, and place for themselves. Rather than commonplace diversity, the dominance of culturalism in the Netherlands leads to a politicisation of difference – what becomes commonplace is the politics of culturalist boundary construction that constitutes lived reality.

The politics of ethno-political nationalism in the Netherlands structures how white residents in New West negotiate and discuss conflicts over their neighbourhood's future. The everyday idioms that we in our research encountered resonate – unevenly and hence not in a totalising manner – with the discourses circulated by right-wing populists in the political sphere which rest on culturalised and racialised constructions of "ordinary people" as white and autochthonous. In other words, right-wing populism in the Netherlands is grounded not only in the construction of an antagonistic relation between the people and institutional elites, but in the exclusion of racialised Others. While many autochthonous residents feel they have been rendered anachronistic – temporally and spatially displaced – right-wing populism holds the promise of recentring and demarginalising precisely those white, working- and middle-class residents who feel they have become peripheral. The rise and normalisation of culturalist, right-wing populist political discourses produce what we have called a culturalist common sense, which – rather than normalising difference and leading to a dissolution of majoritarian culture as suggested by the superdiversity thesis – leads to a reinforcement of Dutch cultural nationalism and racism.

Notes

1 For reference, see Anil Ramdas' column in this issue: www.groene.nl/artikel/hardwerkende-nederlanders (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
2 Speech by Geert Wilders (2010). Available at: www.pvv.nl/index.php/component/content/article/12-spreekteksten/2856-speech-geert-wilders-pvv-presenteert-kandidaten (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
3 When referring to interviews with Paul Mepschen, we refer to the interviewer as "Paul" – we also use first names when referring to the interviewees.
4 Because Mepschen was unable to record the interview, the quotations given below must thus be read as reconstructions, not as literal citations.

References

Alba, R. and Duyvendak, J.W. (2018) 'What about the mainstream? Assimilation in super-diverse times', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, first published online.
Back, L. and Sinha, S. (2016) 'Multicultural conviviality in the midst of racism's ruins', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 37(5), pp. 517–32.
Besnier, N. (1990) 'Language and affect', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, pp. 419–51.

Crul, M. (2016) 'Super-diversity vs. assimilation: how complex diversity in majority–minority cities challenges the assumptions of assimilation', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(1), pp. 54–68.
De Telegraaf (2010) *De PVV doet het voor Henk en Ingrid*. 23 April 2010.
Duyvendak, J.W. (2011) *The politics of home: belonging and nostalgia in Europe and the United States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Farris, S. (2017) *In the name of women's rights: the rise of femonationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Geschiere, P. (2009) *The perils of belonging: autochthony, citizenship and exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Heijdra, T. (2010) *Amsterdam Nieuw West. De geschiedenis van de Westelijke Tuinsteden*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij René de Milliano.
Hellinga, H. (2005) *Onrust in park en stad. Stedelijke vernieuwing in de Amsterdamse Westelijke Tuinsteden*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
Lentin, A. and Titley, G. (2011) *The crises of multiculturalism: racism in a neoliberal age*. London: Zed Books.
Meissner, F. and Vertovec, S. (2015) 'Comparing super-diversity', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38, pp. 541–55.
Mepschen, P. (2012) 'Gewone mensen. Populisme en het discours van verdringing in Amsterdam Nieuw West', *Sociologie*, 8(1), pp. 66–83.
Mepschen, P. (2016) 'The culturalization of everyday life: autochthony in Amsterdam New West'. In: Duyvendak, J.W., Geschiere, P. and Tonkens, E. (eds.) *The culturalization of citizenship: autochthony and belonging in a globalizing world*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 73–96.
Nio, I., Reijndorp, A. and Veldhuis, W. (2009) *Atlas Westelijke Tuinsteden. De geplande en de geleefde stad*. Amsterdam: SUN-Trancity.
Prins, B. (2004) *Voorbij de onschuld. Het debat over integratie in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Van Gennep.
Schinkel, W. (2007) *Denken in een tijd van sociale hypochondrie: Aanzet tot een theorie voorbij de maatschappij*. Kampen: Klement.
Shoshan, N. (2016) *The management of hate: nation, affect, and the governance of right-wing extremism in Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
SP (Socialist Party) (1983) *Gastarbeid en kapitaal*. Rotterdam: SP.
Uitermark, J., Mepschen, P. and Duyvendak, J.W. (2014) 'Progressive politics of exclusion: the populist framing of Islam in the Netherlands'. In: Bowen, J.R., Bertossi, C., Duyvendak, J.W. and Krook, M.L. *European states and their muslim citizens: the impact of institutions on perceptions and boundaries*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 235–55.
Wessendorf, S. (2014) *Commonplace diversity: social relations in a super-diverse context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.