Urban migration histories

Schrover, M.L.J.C.; Caponio, T.; Scholten, P.; Zapata, B.R.

3
URBAN MIGRATION HISTORIES

Marlou Schrover

Introduction

This chapter investigates the relationship between space and community from a historical perspective. The assumption that the extent of concentration amongst immigrants can be used as a measure for integration goes back to the 1920s and the days of the Chicago School, when spatial distance was first used as a measure for social distance. Assimilation was judged by looking at the dispersion of immigrants over neighbourhoods (Gordon, 1964; Schrover and van Lottum, 2007). Many authors continue to adhere to this idea (South *et al.*, 2005). The reasoning is also reversed: if dispersion means assimilation, then concentration should be an indication of ethnic community formation and non-integration (Hwang, 1991; Soja, 1989; Furnée, 2001; Gunn, 2001). The relationship between space and community has been rephrased in recent decades, but the underlying assumption has remained the same (Zecker, 2004). The effect of immigrants' spatial concentration is usually framed in negative terms: restrictive networks result in less access to work and support. Wacquant (1998) calls this organisational desertification. If immigrant communities are class homogeneous, spatial concentrations may, however, be mistaken for a measure of ethnicity, when in fact they are a manifestation of class (Wischermann, 2002; Gibb, 2002; Schrover *et al.*, 2007).

Several authors have pointed out that the literature on space and community is too American and denies or ignores the role of states and the importance of social housing in Western European welfare states (van Kempen and Seule Oezuekren, 1998). The literature emphasises choice and denies the importance of employers, municipal and national governments, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs; in this case, mostly immigrant support organisations). This chapter looks at urban migration histories and analyses the role of employers, municipal and national governments, and NGOs in transforming cities. It asks when, how and why the local setting was relevant to urban migration histories. Examples are taken from the guest worker migration regime in the Netherlands (1950s to 1980s). The chapter shows that there were three scenarios, which largely sprang from the urban housing opportunity structure. In line with the local turn approach, this chapter focuses on three cities: Arnhem in the east, Utrecht in the middle and IJmuiden in the west of the Netherlands.

Opportunity structures for housing

Until the second half of the nineteenth century, Dutch towns were restricted in their spatial growth by walls and moats, which were crossed by a few bridges only. Growth happened within the towns, which became more densely populated over time. Neighbourhoods in Dutch towns were not class homogeneous: large town houses for the rich, fronting on the canals or main roads, stood next to houses for the poor in the side streets and back alleys. The poor and the rich occupied the same space and could rub shoulders in the streets, although in reality they did not. In the second half of the nineteenth century, city walls were demolished and the number of bridges increased. Rings of new neighbourhoods were built around the city centres. In these nineteenth-century expansions, large houses were situated on the main streets and smaller houses in the side streets, as had been the case in the older city centres. The 1901 Housing Law led to large-scale slum clearance, mostly in the city centres, and the construction of more new neighbourhoods on the town's outskirts. In large cities, it led to a building frenzy, and the construction of three- or four-storey apartment buildings, with multiple families sharing a stairwell.

During the Second World War, 100,000 houses were destroyed. Couples who had postponed their marriage wanted to marry soon after the war and a baby boom was expected. In addition, about 300,000 people came to the Netherlands from the (former) Dutch East Indies (Indonesia). Housing became the key social and political issue. With 10 million people, the Netherlands was considered to be full. The Netherlands planned to annex part of Germany (originally 10,000 km^2) to compensate for war damages and to find "living space" in the east. The plan was not executed, but it was discussed extensively in the press (Schrover, 2015). In the post-war years, the housing shortage was considered to be public enemy number one. It remained the most important issue in Dutch elections for decades after the war (Jansen, 2006). The housing shortage was a reason why the Dutch government encouraged and financed the emigration of 400,000 Dutch to overseas destinations like Australia and Canada (Schrover and van Faassen, 2010).

In the 1960s, cities grew by annexing neighbouring villages, and building large-scale new suburban neighbourhoods. Employers found that it was difficult to make Dutch families move to regions with labour shortages. Demka, a large steel factory in the Dutch town Utrecht, took an option on 100 newly built apartments, and used this in its advertising campaigns, trying to attract Dutch workers from elsewhere, but to no avail (Schrover *et al.*, 2008). The Dutch coal mines needed large numbers of workers, but Dutch families were reluctant to move to the mining region in the province Limburg, because there were no family houses. The mines started to hire foreign men – Poles and Italians – and housed them collectively in so-called bachelor buildings. Other industries started to press for permission to hire foreign single men as well.

Important to this story about urban migration histories is the fact that many Dutch rented rather than owned their houses. This remained so until the late 1990s. In the beginning of the 1980s, there were, for instance, 84,000 houses in Utrecht, of which 20,000 were owned by housing corporations and 18,000 by the city council. From 1973 onwards, corporations and the city council had a joint housing policy, which meant they together allocated the houses available for rent (Bovenkerk *et al.*, 1985). This joint policy did not make it easier to find a house; rather the opposite. The Dutch housing market was extremely closed. Families looking to rent were put on a waiting list, and remained on it for years. Networks and knowledge of the allocation system helped if you wanted to jump the queue. Subsidies on rent made neighbourhoods class-diverse: poor and middle-class families could rent the same type of houses, because the low-income family got subsidies to pay the rent (van Kempen and van Weesep, 1997).

Of importance to this story about urban migration histories is also the so-called 5 per cent rule: 5 per cent of the housing stock over which the government had a say had to be let to people repatriating from the (former) colonies and refugees, such as the Hungarians in 1956, or the Vietnamese refugees in the 1970s. The 5 per cent rule did not apply to labour migrants. The rule led to the dispersal of post-colonial migrants and refugees across the Netherlands, except in two cases. In the first place, there were the 12,500 migrants who came in 1951 from the Moluccan Islands in Indonesia. They were not given regular housing, but were put in camps – including former Nazi concentration camps – because the assumption was that their stay was temporary and they would return to the Moluccan Islands. Second, there were 300,000 migrants from the (former) Dutch colony Surinam, who came to the Netherlands in around 1975, on the eve of Surinam's independence. The Hindu-Surinamese (descendants of indentured workers from Asia) among them largely moved to The Hague, while the Afro-Surinamese (descendants of enslaved workers), concentrated in the Amsterdam neighbourhood called the Bijlmer. The concentration in the Bijlmer was abnormal for Dutch standards. The Bijlmer was originally built as a middle-class neighbourhood with very large high-rise buildings. The Amsterdam middle class did not find the neighbourhood attractive, because it was badly connected to other neighbourhoods and to the Amsterdam city centre, and lacked facilities, such as shops. The result was that many of the apartments stood empty precisely at the moment when the number of migrants from Surinam increased. By allocating them to the Bijlmer, authorities could easily comply with the 5 per cent rule. The Bijlmer never was an American type of ghetto, but it was the closest the Netherlands got to it. References to American ghettoisation were common in the media, and were used to describe the scenario as one to be avoided (Quispel, 2010).

Guest worker migration

After the Second World War, there were labour shortages in mining and the steel industry in the UK, Belgium, West Germany, France, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. These sectors were key to post-war reconstruction. In addition, there were shortages in other sectors such as shipbuilding and the textile industry (Obdeijn and Schrover, 2008, p. 265). When employers failed to find workers within their own countries, they threatened to move their businesses abroad. In response, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Sweden, Denmark, West Germany and the Netherlands allowed the recruitment of temporary workers in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Turkey and Morocco. Within the guest worker migration programmes of north-western Europe (which ran from the 1950s until the mid-1970s), 8 million work permits were issued (Constant and Zimmermann, 2012). Authorities in many north-western European countries feared a return of pre-war unemployment, and were thus hesitant to allow permanent immigration. In 1963, Dutch trade unions strongly opposed recruitment of guest workers, despite a shortage of 100,000 workers. They feared the temporary workers would not leave if the economy went into recession. Employers pointed out that a move of the industries abroad would mean a loss of jobs for Dutch workers. Authorities were sensitive to the trade union fears, and used family reunification restrictions and housing policies to emphasise and ensure the temporariness of guest worker migration.

Dutch policy makers originally called the guest workers "international commuters". In 1967, they estimated that less than 8 per cent of them would stay permanently (Wentholt, 1967). Long after assumptions regarding return had been proven wrong, factory owners and government authorities still emphasised the temporariness of guest worker migration in order to placate the trade unions. Employers had to ask permission for recruitment. The foreign workers were given a permit for two years, and could be sent back if they were no longer needed after this term

expired (Roosblad, 2002, pp. 42–4). Guest worker migration was different from earlier and later migrations: it was class homogeneous (only unskilled workers), the sex ratio was skewed (80 per cent were men), the guest workers were single or left their families behind, and their migration was highly organised via bilateral treaties between countries of origin and settlement.[1] Recruitment was expensive and time-consuming, and therefore employers sought to reduce costs by delegating recruitment to the guest workers they had already recruited (Obdeijn and Schrover, 2008, pp. 283–4). It led to concentrations: Turks in the Dutch town IJmuiden, for instance, came from Emirdağ, while Turks in the Schilderswijk in The Hague came from Elazığ. In some cases, clusters of migrants were connected by family ties, and old neighbours before migration became new neighbours after migration. This clustering was the result of choices made by the recruiting employers, and not by the migrants (Brouwers-Kleywegt *et al.*, 1976; van Elteren, 1986; Beukenhorst *et al.*, 1987; Beukenhorst and Pennings, 1989; Tinnemans, 1991; Lindo and Pennings, 1992; Tinnemans, 1994; Mak, 2000; Olfers, 2004; van der Horst, 2005; van Os, 2006; Schrover *et al.*, 2008).

When the guest worker migration regime ended in the mid-1970s, guest workers feared (correctly) that they would not be able to return to the Netherlands if they left. The economic crisis, which was the reason for stopping guest worker recruitment, also hit the countries of origin, and migrants did not want to return to their countries of origin in the midst of an economic crisis. Furthermore, some of the countries of origin – especially Turkey and Morocco – were affected by severe political instability. An important reason for not returning was, furthermore, housing in the country of recruitment, as will be discussed in the next section.

Collective housing or not?

A condition of the recruitment, specified in the bilateral treaties, was that companies had to provide housing. As has been said, guest workers had to be single or could not bring their families, if they were married. Dutch ministries, however, did not agree amongst each other on this policy. The minister of Social Affairs considered the recruitment of guest workers crucial to economic growth, and feared The Netherlands would be less attractive (compared to, for instance, Germany) if guest workers in neighbouring countries could bring their families while those in the Netherlands could not (Bonjour and Schrover, 2015). The ministry of Justice opposed family reunification because it thought the arrival of women and children would lead to permanent settlement (Bonjour, 2009, pp. 54–64). From 1960 onwards, family reunification was allowed for migrants from some countries if the guest worker had worked in the Netherlands for two years, had a labour contract for another year and had housing suitable for a family. Spanish guest workers, who made up the largest contingent of foreign workers in the Netherlands in the 1960s, however, ignored these rules (Bonjour and Schrover, 2015). In January 1962, civil servants from the ministry of Justice found out that a number of Spanish wives had joined their husbands before the two-year waiting period was over. In September 1962, the ministry of Justice decided to deport 17 Spanish women who were living with their husbands in the Dutch town Utrecht. This led to extensive debates in newspapers (see, for instance: *Algemeen Handelsblad*, 1962a–c; *Het Parool*, 1962a; 1962b; *Het Vrije Volk*, 1962a–d; *De Tijd/De Maasbode* 1962a; 1962b; *De Volkskrant* 1962a–g; *Limburgsch Dagblad*, 1962; *De Waarheid*, 1962; *Trouw*, 1962). Some papers wrote that a precedent would be created if women were allowed to stay. There were only a few hundred Spanish women in the Netherlands at that point in time, but there were 3,000 Spanish men, and 2,000 of them were married. If these women were allowed to stay, many others would follow, newspapers warned (*De Tijd/De Maasbode*, 1962a). *De Telegraaf* (1962b) a populist liberal newspaper, presented even larger numbers: there were

2,850 Italian and 3,250 Spanish guest workers in the Netherlands, half of whom were married. The housing shortage would increase if they all brought their families. The Catholic newspaper *De Tijd/De Maasbode* (1962a), however, wrote that when Dutch authorities encouraged and organised the emigration of Dutch people to overseas destinations, they had argued that Dutch men could only succeed in their new country if women supported and companied them. What was considered to be a healthy principle for the Dutch emigrants apparently did not apply to Spanish guest workers, the newspaper said. It called on authorities to be more humane. *Het Vrije Volk* (1962b), a leading social democratic newspaper, under the heading "Spanish furies", quoted the women: "If we go back, we will take our husbands". The Dutch landlady of Spanish workers said: "It is not that they do not trust their husbands, but if you know how many Dutch girls call here seeking a date with the Spanish men […] this explains the anger of the women" (Het Vrije Volk, 1962b). De Tijd/De Maasbode (1962a) said employers feared that the Spanish men would leave with the women. According to De Telegraaf (1962a) the original plan was to deport the "Spanish beauties" by "brute force", but since this would affect the working capacity of the men, they had been allowed to stay. According to the minister of Justice, the housing shortage made it impossible to allow more migrants in, but the restrictions on immigration also served to protect families against intolerable housing conditions (De Telegraaf, 1962b).

In 1965, housing of guest workers became a major issue in the press. Guest worker migration was called "an invasion" of the working-class neighbourhoods (Mamadouh, 2012). Newspapers referred to guest worker housing as Bedouin camps (Soetens, 2008). Initially, most guest workers had been single, or they came without their families, as policy makers had planned (Schrover, 2006). Housing by the employers took three forms: the casa system, large scale collective housing and dispersed housing.

The so-called casa system was favoured by, for instance, the large textile firm AKU in the Dutch town Arnhem (van der Hoeven and Schrover, 2013). The firm's director thought it was unwise to give the money for housing directly to the workers, because they would waste it, and go dancing. Finding it difficult to find housing for their foreign workers (also because of severe war-time destruction), the firm bought stately – but somewhat dilapidated – mansions and converted them into boarding houses. The firm housed the workers according to nationality. The first house was renamed Casa d'Italia and could accommodate 15 Italian workers, plus a Dutch-Italian married couple, whom the workers called *papi* or *padre*, and *mami* or *madre*. A barrack was built in the garden to accommodate an additional 15 workers, and later the total number of guests was increased to 40. The lodgers were provided with Italian newspapers and Italian food. The house was not very cosy, but according to the director, Italians cared more for their clothes than for their accommodation. Dutch girls thought the Italian workers were attractive, and hung around the house, whereupon the *padre* interfered. The firm's management was pleased: this was the way to control the workers, and protect the firm's name and the city's young daughters. Because the first house was considered a success, AKU bought Casa II, followed by Casa Nostra, Casa Castagna, Casa Erica and Casa Il Pavone. All houses had a *padre* and *madre*.

Guest workers in these casas could receive girls as guests, but only under close supervision. The patrons also checked if the workers were really ill when they called in sick, and went with them to the doctor. The workers were forbidden to play cards late into the night, because it made them useless at work the next day. Timers were installed in the recreation room, which switched off the light when it was time for bed, according to the *padre*. The guest workers complained that it was very difficult to refuse to work extra shifts in the factory, because they were pressured by both the employer and the *padre*. Italian workers went into town, until shopkeepers complained that they stood in front of their shop windows, deterring shoppers. The *padre*

assured the shopkeepers that he would keep the workers in the grounds of the house in the future.

Employers were – within the framework of the bilateral treaties – responsible for providing their guest workers with recreational activities. Authorities enforced this obligation more strongly after riots occurred in 1961 between Italian and Spanish guest workers and young Dutch workers in the textile region Twente. Newspapers wrote that the "boys" were fighting over "girls". Dance halls put up signs that said "No Italians". They were painfully similar to the "No Jews" signs, which had dominated Dutch streets during the Nazi occupation. The guest workers complained about bad food and bad housing, and 22 Italians and 110 Spaniards returned to their countries of origin. Overall, reports showed that the guest workers in the Netherlands were not happy (Tinnemans, 1994, pp. 33–6; Mak, 2000). Firms decided to invest more in recreational activities. Within the casa system, they delegated this responsibility to the *madre* and *padre*. The casas organised football and table tennis matches, and movie nights, all for the guest workers only. Originally, the employers paid for these activities, but when the factories closed down, municipalities took over and the activities moved away from the casas (Penninx and Schrover, 2001, pp. 43–4; Jansen, 2006; Schrover *et al.*, 2008). The national government fully subsidised these activities from 1975 onwards. The activities pushed out initiatives by the migrants themselves (Schrover, 2010). The casa system ended when workers increasingly started to look for housing elsewhere, when they married or were joined by their wives, and – most importantly – when the factories closed and stopped providing this type of housing.

Second, there was large-scale collective housing, favoured by big firms like the steel factory Hoogovens in IJmuiden. In 1947, Hoogovens built a camp that could house 240 workers (van Elteren, 1986, p. 324). From 1961 onwards, Hoogovens started to house its workers in large passenger ships – renamed the Arosa Sun and the Casa Marina – which were moored near the factory. The Arosa Sun could sleep 800 to 900 workers (van Elteren, 1986, p. 728). The ships were called "botels" (a contraction of "boat" and "hotel"). Other large companies similarly built barracks, large bachelor lodgings and camps, usually very isolated from urban centres (Jansen, 2006, p. 102; van Os, 2006). In 1961, Hoogovens was confronted with the so-called spaghetti riots, during which workers protested against their food. Eighteen guest workers were fired on the spot for subordination. An investigation showed that the revolt was also a protest against the isolated location of their housing. A Spanish and an Italian cook were hired, but the problem of the isolation or segregation was not solved (van Elteren, 1986, p. 855).

The third form of housing – dispersed housing – was preferred by, for instance, the Demka steel factory in Utrecht. The directorate felt their demand for foreign workers was too unstable to develop a large site, as Hoogovens had done, or buy houses, as the AKU had done. Furthermore, in Utrecht there were many firms which were recruiting guest workers, and workers frequently moved between factories. The factory therefore accommodated workers with two or three per landlady. A personnel manager cycled from one location to another to inspect the accommodations. The Demka took its workers on their first day to a Spanish restaurant in Utrecht, where they were told "from today on it is going to be Dutch food only". The personnel manager said: "We were not bringing people to China, where they eat dead rats, it was normal, European" (Schrover *et al.*, 2008). Brochures were printed for the landladies informing them that they should not assume that their guests would appreciate their cooking. Immigrant support organisations arranged cooking classes for landladies, where they could learn to cook Turkish and Italian food. The Information Bureau for Food published a brochure with suggestions for landladies about what to cook for Spanish and Italian guest workers: Spanish workers would not appreciate red food, such as beetroots, the brochure explained. Recipes were for ten people, and ingredients that were hard to get in the Netherlands were replaced by alternatives.

In 1969, additional brochures were published – and distributed for free – with titles such as "What Moroccans like".

Since the workers were not housed centrally in Utrecht, employers delegated their responsibility to provide recreational activities from the start of recruitment to the Catholic Church. The guest workers were surprised that they were not invited to join factory activities. Like all large factories in the Netherlands, the Demka had several clubs for its workers, including a marching band. The guest workers could have joined these organisations, but they were not invited to do so. The Catholic Church had a lot of experience in organising recreational activities for young men and women. Since the first guest workers – from Portugal, Spain and Italy – were Catholic, the factories' choice was logical. After successfully organising Christmas, Easter and *Befana*[2] parties, the Catholic Church took it upon itself to organise a sugar feast for Turkish and Moroccan workers, but it miscalculated the date of the end of fast, and nobody came to the party. In the 1970s, the church's activities were transferred to other organisations, which developed initiatives *for* the guest workers, and not *by* them (Schrover *et al.*, 2008). The Utrecht trajectory was different from that of the casa system and the collective housing, but the effect was the same: the housing and recreational requirement of the bilateral treaties pushed out and delayed the self-organisation of the guest workers, and encouraged concentrations and ties among guest workers.

Strict rules, lack of privacy, cramped space, food they did not like and a lack of choice led many guest workers to look for alternative housing, not arranged by their employers. Already in 1965, the Utrecht city council reported that guest workers were moving out of the housing employers had arranged to lesser and cheaper accommodations, which provided them with a bit more freedom. Guest workers who had not been recruited, but came to the Netherlands spontaneously, also moved into these types of housing. These accommodations were in the Utrecht city centre, where large bourgeois houses were converted into guest worker accommodation, and in the nineteenth-century expansions surrounding the cities, where houses were bought up and converted into – what were called – guest worker warehouses. In 1965, there were 11 guest worker warehouses on the Oudegracht in Utrecht, which is one of the main streets in the city centre. In adjacent streets, there were several others. The social democrat high-circulation daily newspaper *Het Vrije Volk* wrote in 1965 that at Oudegracht 234, 80 guest workers were housed, mainly Spaniards and Moroccans (van Vlerken, 1990, p. 33). Slum landlords profited from the fact that others were not willing to let rooms to foreigners, the communist paper *De Waarheid* (1965) added. After Oudegracht 234 had been cleared and closed, it looked as if it had been under army attack, according to a local Utrecht newspaper (Het Utrechts Nieuwsblad, 1965).

In 1965, the Utrecht municipality took stock of the housing situation of guest workers, and reported on 287 accommodations. Guest workers slept in sheds, basements and overcrowded rooms, which were extremely dirty and a fire hazard. There were 2,226 beds in the 287 houses (7.6 on average per house). Most of the accommodations had one or two beds, but there were some accommodations that housed 50 to 82 workers, all of them in the city centre. In one of the houses, a worker slept in a pigeon coop. At night, the workers sat around a tape recorder or record player, and sadly listed to the music from their country of origins. The neighbours complained about noise and a rat plague. Dutch newspapers published endlessly about bad housing conditions.

The Utrecht municipal government drafted new guidelines for accommodations with more than ten guest workers (Schrover *et al.*, 2008). Owners had to inform the authorities, but none of them complied. The police started to inspect the larger accommodations every six weeks.[3] The large boarding houses were also easy prey for the police, who were trying to find workers who had come to the Netherlands without a work permit. The police raided boarding houses

in the early hours of the morning, looking for illegal immigrants. A raid in 1972 led to the deportation of 400 Moroccans, two-thirds of whom did not have a valid permit (van Eijl, 2012). Distrust and frustration among the guest workers increased.

In 1966, the Utrecht city council closed down several of the large guest worker "warehouses" and instructed the employers to find new accommodations. Shortly afterwards, the municipality panicked. Large numbers of Turks and Moroccans arrived, and tens of new accommodations opened their doors. In Tilburg, a textile town in the South, the arrival of so-called spontaneous migrants, or "strays", led to a similar panic. Civil authorities talked about atrocities, and a Turkish "invasion". Employers, however, said they preferred "strays" because official procedures were too long and too costly (van Eijl, 2012). Furthermore, they did not have to house the "strays".

The Utrecht city council, in response to increases, asked the ministry of Justice to reduce the number of new arrivals. The ministry promised to keep the numbers down for the next six months.[4] The city council emphasised, again, that it was not responsible for housing guest workers.[5] Furthermore, if it closed too many accommodations, people would be made homeless and the problem would become larger rather than smaller. In 1969, a new blacklist was drafted, which pointed out there still were severe housing shortages and that guest workers were living under appalling conditions.[6] Urban renovation projects usually meant the houses became too expensive, whereupon the guest worker families moved again. In Utrecht's old workers' neighbourhoods, the percentage of guest workers increased to 20 per cent (Bovenkerk *et al.*, 1985, p. 40). There were constantly large numbers of guest workers in some neighbourhoods. The population was highly fluid and, as a result, the percentages remained the same, while faces changed continuously. Locals complained that their new neighbours did not know it was their turn to clean the joint stairwell.

In 1969, the popular TV news show VARA's *Achter het Nieuws* paid attention to guest worker housing. The journalists spoke to one of the owners of a boarding house. He said his guests were ungrateful. He was civilising them, while they were used to nothing. They did not know about chairs, and ruined them in no time. They did not know what a toilet was. According to authorities, the problem was that the guest workers had no organisations that could voice their complaints. Local people came out in support. On one day in 1979, 26 houses in Utrecht were taken over by squatters, who were members of the so-called Nomad Committee. The committee, which consisted of Dutch youngsters, worked especially for Turkish guest workers. Turkish families moved into the housing the squatters had occupied for them, but they were evicted the very same day. The actions were not effective for finding housing: the aim was to draw attention to the bad housing situation of the guest workers. The Utrecht alderman in charge of housing promised that 15 per cent of the houses would be allocated to guest workers, and registration forms would be translated into Turkish and Moroccan (Dettingmeijer, 1978, p. 12).

In the 1970s, local house owners in the old city centre and adjacent neighbourhoods sold their property fearing (rightly) town reconstruction (Heurneman and van Santen, 2002, p. 141). Large-scale urban renewal projects were started in the 1970s, but they were frequently not completed. The original population had left, but the houses had not yet been demolished. These were the houses guest workers and squatters occupied. Speculators bought properties, split them up and sold them to guest workers, while inflation drove up mortgages. The communist paper *De Waarheid* (1972) wrote that the Dutch profited a great deal from selling or letting houses to guest workers.

Migrants from Turkey started to work as realtors, and helped their compatriots to buy houses. The guest workers bought houses at high prices in bad neighbourhoods because family housing was a requirement for family reunification. A family could not live in an attic, on a "botel" or

in a camp. In order to get a house from a housing cooperation, a candidate had to be on a waiting list for years (Bovenkerk *et al.*, 1985, p. 49). Many of the guest workers from Morocco and Turkey had large families, by Dutch standards. According to the rules of the housing cooperation, a family with six children needed a house with seven bedrooms. These large houses rarely became available. When they did, guest workers turned down the offer because the rent was too high. They were unaware that they could get subsidies. After they had turned down an offer, they again moved to the bottom of the list. This hopeless situation drove them to buy houses in bad, impoverished neighbourhoods. These guest workers were called 'emergency buyers' (Bouras, 2012). At the end of the 1970s, the housing market crashed and, in the 1980s, house prices were far below the price guest workers had paid. The municipality declared some houses uninhabitable. This was also the moment when the guest workers became unemployed, and the type of work for which they had been recruited disappeared from Dutch society forever (textile and shoe industry, shipbuilding, mining and steel industry). When they could no longer pay their mortgage, the house was sold by the bank and the guest workers were left in debt.

Riots

The guest workers' attempts to find housing led to riots. In 1969, there were severe riots in the Schilderswijk, in The Hague, and in 1972 in the Afrikaanderbuurt, in Rotterdam. In the literature, these riots are always labelled an exception (Adang *et al.*, 2010; Bovenkerk *et al.*, 1985, p. 10; Polderman, 2007). In reality, they were not. In September 1980, for instance, there were housing riots in the Huygensstraat in Utrecht's Dichterswijk, in protest against the arrival of more foreigners (Bovenkerk *et al.*, 1985, pp. 13–18).

The riots were severe. In the night of Sunday 15/Monday 16 June 1969, 200 locals from the Schilderwijk in The Hague attacked a house in which 50 Moroccan guest workers lived. The rioters forced their way into the house and smashed the furniture. The occupants fled to the roof and threw roof titles at the assailants (Het Vrije Volk, 1969). According to the locals, 60 to 70 Moroccans lived in the building (De Volkskrant, 1969). They changed their clothes without closing the curtains (there were no curtains to close) and whistled at Dutch girls who passed by (De Telegraaf, 1969a). The landlady responded that many men – also non-migrant men – whistled at girls (De Telegraaf, 1969b). After the riots, all 50 boarders left the neighbourhood, and two members of Parliament called for an investigation (Bouras, 2012; De Telegraaf, 1969c).

The riots in the Afrikaanderbuurt in Rotterdam lasted longer. Already a year before the 1972 riots – in June 1971 – the local action committee, Pro-Guest Workers, had warned that there might be race riots in the Afrikaanderbuurt (De Bokx, 1993). According to some people, the committee more or less encouraged the riots, in order to make clear how serious the housing situation was (Polderman, 2007, p. 262; Nieuwe Leidsche Courant, 1972b). The riots in the Afrikaanderwijk lasted seven days (van Donselaar and Wagenaar, 2007, p. 4; De Telegraaf 1972a–h; Het Vaderland, 1972a–g; Trouw, 1972a-g; NRC, 1972a–l). They started when a Turkish man bought a house and wanted to evict the Dutch woman and her three children who lived in it. The buyer was not aware of Dutch rules regarding tenant protection. When he evicted the Dutch woman and her children, Dutch neighbours protested. They threw the furniture of their Turkish neighbours out onto the street from the second-floor windows (NRC, 1972b; 1972c). They renamed the street (Paarlstraat) as Holland Street and posted notices in windows that read "For Dutch only". A Turk pulled a knife, and 500 Dutch locals threatened to lynch the Turks. Turkish, Spanish and Moroccan families fled from the neighbourhood, while they were yelled at and called names by Dutch locals (Leidsch Dagblad, 1972; Het

Vaderland, 1972e). The locals told the press that their neighbourhood had been taken over by Turks, who harassed young Dutch girls. Dutch newspapers wrote that the authorities were doing too little to stop the riots (Het Vaderland, 1972c).

Turkish women and children appealed to the Turkish consul for help. The Turkish newspapers *Hürriyet* and *Milliyet* wrote about the riots. The Rotterdam mayor offered to compensate the Turks for the damage (Nieuwe Leidsche Courant, 1972b). Turks fled to the roof of a house, and bombarded the Dutch rioters with roof tiles (Het Vrije Volk, 1972a; Het Vaderland, 1972e; NRC, 1972b). The extreme right-wing party *Nederlandse Volksunie*, run by Joop Glimmerveen, distributed racist pamphlets, which shocked many people (van Donselaar and Wagenaar, 2007; De Groene Amsterdammer, 1972; De Volkskrant, 1972a–g; Het Vaderland, 1972a–g; Het Vrije Volk, 1972a, b; NRC, 1972a–k; Trouw, 1972 a–g). The *Haagse Post*, a monthly journal, wrote about "Pogrommerdam" and *Televizier Magazine* (quoted in Polderman 2007, p. 266) said that in Rotterdam the riots were not a repeat of *Kristallnacht*, but still were very similar. The Dutch name abroad had been damaged and British television crews were filming in the Afrikaanderwijk. British, Turkish and French newspapers wrote in a surprised tone about the riots in the tolerant Netherlands (Lewis, 1972; articles in the Turkish press were quoted in Het Vaderland, 1972d). "Dutch surprised by race clashes", was the headline of *The Guardian* (Norton-Taylor, 1972). A journalist of *The New York Times* wrote he was "shocked and startled" (Lewis, 1972). "Dutch image of tolerance shattered", wrote *The Washington Post* (1972). The members of the municipal council, however, called the rioters "riot tourists" and youngsters who did not know what they were doing (Polderman, 2007, p. 269). The comparison with the *Kristallnacht* was "overdone", a newspaper added (Leeuwarder Courant, 1972). The Turkish minister of Labour, A.R. Uzuner, visited the Netherlands and said it would be good if the Dutch built specific quarters for the Turks, isolating them from the rest of Dutch society (Nieuwe Leidsche Courant, 1972c). About 300 boarding houses were closed in Rotterdam (Nieuwe Leidsche Courant, 1972a). The immediate results of the riots were quota measures, which restricted the number of guest workers per neighbourhood (Nieuwe Leidsche Courant, 1972d). In its 1977 election programme, the PvdA (the Labour Party) said concentrations of guest workers in certain neighbourhoods should be avoided (Verkiezingsprogramma's, 1977).[7]

Some political parties made housing and concentrations their key issues. In 1982, the extreme right-wing party *Centrum Partij* (CP; led by Hans Janmaat) profited at the elections from the problematisation of the housing issue, and got into the Dutch Parliament. In its programme, it combined a large number of issues: Were readers not fed up with the daily traffic jams? Were they not fed up with standing in line for a house, a job, a spot on the beach, a place on the camping site or a parking space? The housing shortage should be solved, the party wrote in its programme. The Netherlands was full, so how could the government allow more people to come? The party suggested there was a conspiracy: Authorities wanted large parts of the Netherlands to become ghettos, they wanted a housing crisis, more violence and inter-ethnic tensions.[8] Why authorities would want these is not clear from the party's statements. The CP said it was the only party which dared to say what was wrong with the Netherlands: it was too full, and the economy was taking a turn for the worse. Problems were pollution, housing shortages, unemployment, corruption, misuse of social security, dumping of poisonous waste, drug trade, illegal restaurants, illegal slaughtering, illegal work, speculation on the housing market, squatters, riots and plundering. The Netherlands should be a "liveable" country, and now it was not, the party claimed.[9] The term "liveable", which has a strong link to housing issues, was later copied by other parties. The CP combined three issues, which were mentioned in most polls as sources of annoyance in the Netherlands: 36 per cent of the Dutch population thought ethnic minorities were a problem, 57 per cent thought traffic jams were, and 75 per cent said it was

housing.[10] The riots did not make housing the key issue – it already was before the riots started – but they did make sure housing and migration issues remained firmly linked, and it enforced the idea of segregated community formation.

Conclusion

This chapter asked when, how and why the local setting was relevant to urban migration histories, and how this relates to the relationship between space and community. Government policies, and especially the 5 per cent rule, led to the dispersal of refugees and part of the post-colonial migrants until the mid-1970s. Concentrations became more common because of guest worker migration. As this chapter showed, the bilateral treaties made employers responsible for housing their workers and thus the employers were shaping urban migration histories. This chapter discussed three scenarios in guest worker housing: the casa system in Arnhem, large-scale collective housing in IJmuiden and dispersed housing in Utrecht. The casa system and collective housing created highly isolated and inward looking islands of immigrants. Employers offered on-site recreation and support, and squeezed out the initiatives for immigrant self-organisation. The centralised housing thus, on one hand, enforced ties between the guest workers, while on the other hand it repressed or delayed immigrant organising. Dispersed housing in Utrecht did not make it possible to offer on-site recreation, but the employers delegated their task of providing recreational support to non-immigrant organisations, and the result was similar to the cases of collective housing and the casa system. National and local authorities, employers and housing corporations played a large role in explaining why spatial concentrations occurred. The results of spatial concentrations were negative, and social networks were restricted. Networks were also restricted because the guest workers were lower class, and because they became unemployed shortly after concentrations occurred. Organisational activities, first by the employers, then on behalf of the employers, and after that by organisations *for* migrants, squeezed out activities *by* migrants. The fact that the guest workers were lower class meant that there were few people who could take a leadership role. This delayed immigrant organising by a whole generation. The end of the guest worker migration regime meant the end of employers' support for recreational activities. This coincided with the collapse and disappearance of the industries that had recruited guest workers. In all three scenarios, the guest workers became emergency buyers shortly before they became unemployed. The concentrations of guest workers that occurred, towards the end of the guest worker migration regime, were not the result of choices the migrants made. Urban housing infrastructures left them very few choices: if they wanted to bring their families, they had to have family housing, and if they wanted to have family housing, they had to buy (rather than rent). Since the guest workers were all unskilled workers, incomes were low, and thus they could only buy in impoverished neighbourhoods. Concentrations resulted in severe housing riots, which were instrumental in creating and problematising a connection between space and ethnic community formation.

The local turn approach, taken in this chapter, showed that local housing opportunity structures were relevant (for instance, the restricted possibilities in war-damaged Arnhem), but so was the nature of the industry (for instance, the unstable demand for workers in the case of Demka in Utrecht), as well as the interaction between the two (a large number of industries in the same town). The local setting was relevant, as were the rules regarding housing and recruitment, and the activities of organisations.

Notes

1 The Netherlands concluded treaties with Italy (in 1949 for mining only and in 1960 for all sectors), followed by treaties with Spain (1961), Greece (1962), Portugal (1963), Turkey (1964) and Morocco (1969).
2 The holiday commonly called *Befana* is a Catholic holiday celebrating the Three Wise Men.
3 Utrecht Archive, Archive municipal government 1813–1969 no. 22722.
4 Utrecht Archive, Archive municipal government 1813–1969 no. 22815, Letter to the Minister of Justice.
5 Utrecht Archive, Archive municipal government 1813–1969 no. 22815, Questions J.M. Donia-Brugman.
6 Utrecht Archive, Archive municipal government 1813–1969 no. 22816.
7 http://pubnpp.eldoc.ub.rug.nl.
8 Homeland Security archive, Party Program De Nationale Centrum Partij 1980. Available online: http://stichtingargus.nl/bvd/index2.htm.
9 Homeland Security archive, Pamphlet Centrum Partij 1980. Available online: http://stichtingargus.nl/bvd/index2.htm.
10 Homeland Security Quarterly review 1538.691 1981 anti-democratic movements; Pamphlet CP 1982. Available online: http://stichtingargus.nl/bvd/index2.htm.

References

Adang, O., Quint, H. and van der Wal, R. (2010) *Zijn wij anders? Waarom Nederland geen grootschalige etnische rellen heeft*. Apeldoorn: Stapel & de Koning.

Algemeen Handelsblad (1962a) '20 Spaanse vrouwen moeten ons land verlaten', 25 September, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

Algemeen Handelsblad (1962b) 'Geruchten bleken onjuist. Nog geen beslissing over Spaanse vrouwen', 8 October, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

Algemeen Handelsblad (1962c) 'Regering laat vrouwen toe van buitenlandse arbeiders. Mits bereid te werken in sociale sector', 27 October, p. 23. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

Beukenhorst, D.J. and Pennings, T. (1989) *Survey Italianen*. Amsterdam: Antropologisch Sociologisch Centrum.

Beukenhorst, D.J., Schneider, M., Tappeiner, I. and Vermeulen, H. (1987) *Italianen in Nederland. Arbeidsmigranten en hun kinderen*. Amsterdam: Antropologisch Sociologisch Centrum.

Bonjour, S. (2009) *Grens en gezin. Beleidsvorming inzake gezinsmigratie in Nederland, 1955–2005*. Amsterdam: Aksant.

Bonjour, S. and Schrover, M. (2015) 'Public debate and policymaking on family migration in the Netherlands, 1960–1995', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 4(19), pp. 1475–94.

Bouras, N. (2012) *Het Land van Herkomst. Perspectieven op verbondenheid met Marokko, 1960–2010*. Hilversum: Verloren.

Bovenkerk, F., Bruins, K., Brunt, L. and Wouters, H. (1985) *Vreemd volk, gemengde gevoelens. Etnische verhoudingen in een grote stad*. Meppel: Boom.

Brouwers-Kleywegt, H., Marinelli, C. and Nuijten-Edelbroek, E. (1976) *Italianen in Nederland. Een onderzoek naar de mate van integratie van Italiaanse werknemers in Nederland*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit.

Constant, A.F. and Zimmermann, K.F. (2012) 'The dynamics of repeat migration: a Markov chain analysis', *International Migration Review*, 46(2), pp. 362–88.

de Bokx, M. (1993) *In Rotterdam broeit een rassenrel: de rellen in de Afrikaanderwijk en de pers*. Rotterdam: Erasmus Universiteit.

De Groene Amsterdammer (1972) 'De stenen vliegen door de ruiten', 15 August, p. 2.

De Telegraaf (1962a) 'Spaanse vrouwen blijven', 6 October, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

De Telegraaf (1962b) 'Toelatingsbeleid Spaanse vrouwen verruimd', 27 October, p. 15. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

De Telegraaf (1965) 'Liever huizen dan een vereniging', 27 January, p. 2. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

De Telegraaf (1969a) 'Marokkanen na bestorming pension allen verhuisd', 17 June, p. 7. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

De Telegraaf (1969b) 'Pensionhoudster: "Politie durft hier niet op te treden"', 17 June, p. 7. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1969c) 'Kamervragen over Marokkanen', 19 June, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972a) 'Rotterdammers bestormen leeg Turks pension', 11 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972b) 'Rellen voor Maasstad nog Turks koffiedik', 12 August, p. 7. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972c) 'Weer chaos in Rotterdam. Turken slaan hard terug', 12 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972d) 'Verzetsgroepen over tot aanval. Hulp voor de Turken', 14 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972e) 'Gastarbeiders in steden niet op 'n kluitje', 15 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972f) 'Huurgeschil leidde tot een volksoproer in de Maasstad', 10 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972g) 'De gastarbeider is een kwetsbaar mens', 16 August, p. 5. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Telegraaf (1972h) 'Maatregelen tegen "mensenpakhuizen" in Rotterdam', 17 August, p. 5. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Tijd/De Maasbode (1962a) 'Spaanse vrouwen moeten Nederland verlaten', 26 September, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Tijd/De Maasbode (1962b) 'Ruimere toelating Spaanse vrouwen bepleit', 29 October, p. 2. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Tijd/De Maasbode (1965) 'Beraad gevraagd over uitwijzing Spaanse vrouwen', 12 January, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1962a) 'Spaanse vrouwen terug', 1 January, p. 4. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1962b) 'Spaanse vrouwen kwamen terug', 8 October, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1962c) 'Spanjaarden weten niet meer waar ze aan toe zijn', 9 October, p. 5. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1962d) 'Werkgeversverbonden: Spaanse vrouwen niet wegsturen', 29 October, p. 4. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1962e) 'Spaanse arbeiders', 31 October, p. 12. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1962f) 'Spaanse vrouwen in Limburg moeilijk plaatsbaar', 31 October, p. 9. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1962g) 'Kinderloze Spaansen naar huis terug', 23 November, p. 7. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1969) 'Buurt vernielt huis vol Marokkanen', 17 June, p. 5.
De Volkskrant (1972a) 'Buurt gaat tekeer tegen Turken', 11 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1972b) 'Oude wijk opnieuw onrustig', 11 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1972c) 'Rellen vooral pesten van politie. Groep Turken slaat terug', 14 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1972d) 'Turk kan Nederlanders overbieden', 15 August, p. 7. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1972e) 'Na rellen in Rotterdam. Aantal Turken is hele bezit kwijt', 16 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1972f) 'Minister Uzuner: Turken onvoldoende beschermd bij rellen', 23 August, p. 7. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Volkskrant (1972g) 'Volgens burgemeester: "Rel in Rotterdam wel degelijk rassenkwestie"', 18 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Waarheid (1962) 'Spaanse vrouwen moeten hun man verlaten', 26 September, p. 4. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).

De Waarheid (1965) 'Arbeiderspakhuis hoeft niet te worden ontruimd', 27 July. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
De Waarheid (1972) 'Regeringspolitiek en huizenspeculanten maken wijk onleefbaar Schokkende tonelen in Rotterdamse Afrikaanderbuurt', 11 August. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Dettingmeijer, R. (1978) 'Turks Nomadenkomite kraakt massaal', *Motief, tijdschrift voor wie ten dienste staat van buitenlanders*, 4(7), p. 12.
Furnée, J.H. (2001) 'Bourgeois strategies of distinction. Leisure and the transformation of urban space: The Hague 1850–1890'. In: Gunn, S. and Morris, R.J. (eds.) *Identities in space: contested terrains in the western city since 1850*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 204–27.
Gibb, A. (2002) 'Industrialization and demographic change: a case study of Glasgow, 1801–1914'. In: Lawton, R. and Lee, R. (eds.) *Population and society in Western European port-cities, c. 1650–1939*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, pp. 37–72.
Gordon, M.M. (1964) *Assimilation in American life: the role of race, religion, and national origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Gunn, S. (2001) 'The spatial turn: changing histories of space and place'. In: Gunn, S. and Morris, R.J. (eds.) *Identities in space: contested terrains in the western city since 1850*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 1–14.
Het Parool (1962a) 'Visum verstreken Vrouwen van Spaanse arbeiders uitgewezen', 25 September, p. 7. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Parool (1962b) 'Enkele Spaanse vrouwen mogen wellicht blijven', 4 October, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Utrechts Nieuwsblad (1965) 'Huisvesting Utrechters lijdt onder komst buitenlanders', 23 December, p. 2. Available at: http://publiek.collecties.hetutrechtsarchief.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vaderland (1972a) 'Turken vallen in ongenade', 11 August, p. 6. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vaderland (1972b) 'Achter Turken en Rotterdammers schuilen de sjacheraars', 12 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vaderland (1972c) 'Felle botsingen tussen Turken en een menigte toeschouwers. Rotterdam in teken van rellen', 15 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vaderland (1972d) 'Politie deed goed werk', 18 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vaderland (1972e) 'Wijkbewoners halen Turks pension leeg', 11 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vaderland (1972f) 'Turken geven hun huizen niet prijs', 14 August, p. 6. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vadereland (1972g) 'Turkse ambassadeur vraagt bescherming voor zijn landgenoten', 15 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vrije Volk (1962a) 'Minister wijst twintig Spaanse vrouwen uit', 26 September, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vrije Volk (1962b) 'Spaanse vrouwenfurie: "Wij terug, dan ook onze mannen"', 27 September, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vrije Volk (1962c) 'Minister Klompé: Spaanse vrouwen NIET laten blijven', 1 November, p. 6. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vrije Volk (1962d) 'Aantal Spaanse vrouwen moet Nederland uit', 22 November. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vrije Volk (1969) 'Bewoners dak op gejaagd. Schildersbuurt belegert pension met Marokkanen', 16 June, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vrije Volk (1972a) 'Buurt neem wraak na huurrel met Turken', 10 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Het Vrije Volk (1972b) ''t Wordt hier Belfast', 10 August, p. 15. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Heurneman, M. and van Santen, B. (2002) *De Utrechtse wijken: Overvecht*. Utrecht: SPOU/Het Utrechts Archief.
Hwang, S-S. (1991) 'Ethnic enclosure or ethnic competition: ethnic identification among Hispanics in Texas', *Sociological Quarterly*, 32(3), pp. 469–76.
Jansen, J. (2006) *Bepaalde huisvesting. Een geschiedenis van opvang en huisvesting van immigranten in Nederland, 1945–1995*. Leiden/Amsterdam: Aksant.

Leeuwarder Courant (1972) 'Turken weten hoe wij zijn, maar weet de paus het ook?', 15 August. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Leidsch Dagblad (1972) 'Rotterdamse buurt koelde woede op Turkse arbeiders', 11 August, p. 7.
Lewis, F. (1972) 'Dutch troubled by hints of bias in fights with Turkish workers', *New York Times*, 8 September, p. 2.
Limburgsch Dagblad (1962) 'Nederl. justitie beslist: Spanjaarden moeten hun vrouwen naar Spanje terugsturen', 26 September, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Lindo, F. and Pennings, T. (1992) *Zuideuropeanen in Nederland. Portugezen, Spanjaarden, Italianen, Grieken en Joegoslaven. Verkenning van hun positie en inventarisatie van onderzoek*. Amsterdam/Rijswijk: Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur.
Mak, G. (2000) *Sporen van verplaatsing. Honderd jaar nieuwkomers in Overijssel*. Kampen: IJsselacademie.
Mamadouh, V. (2012) 'The scaling of the "invasion": a geopolitics of immigration narratives in France and The Netherlands', *Geopolitics*, 17(2), pp. 377–401.
Nieuwe Leidsche Courant (1972a) 'Nog eens 200 pensions dicht in Rotterdam', 13 January, p. 5.
Nieuwe Leidsche Courant (1972b) 'Gemeente vergoedt schade van Turken', 18 August.
Nieuwe Leidsche Courant (1972c) ' "Het was geen rassenrel", meent Turkse minister', 23 August, p. 5.
Nieuwe Leidsche Courant (1972d) 'Paul Kraemer: "De woede over 5 procent is wat hypocriet" ', 7 October, p. 13.
Norton-Taylor, R. (1972) 'Dutch surprised by race clashes', *The Guardian*, 16 August.
NRC Handelsblad (1972a) 'Vraag om onderzoek naar oorzaak rel Marokkaans pension', 18 June, p. 2. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972b) 'Vechtpartij over ontruiming pand', 10 August, p. 2. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972c) 'Politie bewust passief bij anti-Turkse rel in Rotterdam', 11 August, p. 12. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972d) 'Gesprek met Biesheuvel', 11 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972e) 'Anti-Turkse rel loopt uit de hand na kraking', 11 August, p. 12. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972f) 'Onlusten noodzaken straffer pensionbeleid', 12 August, p. 12, Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972g) 'Times verhaal over Rotterdam', 12 August, p. 12. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972h) 'Nog onrustig in Rotterdam', 12 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972i) 'Oude wijken: snel eisen inwilligen', 14 August, p. 8. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972j) 'Turken mengen zich in slag tussen politie en relmakers', 14 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972k) 'Ministers zeggen steun toe, Turkse regering vraagt hulp', 15 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
NRC (1972l) 'Pers in Turkije gematigd', 15 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Obdeijn, H. and Schrover, M. (2008) *Komen en gaan. Immigratie en emigratie in Nederland vanaf 1550*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
Olfers, S.K. (2004) *Arbeidsmigrant of vluchteling? Achtergronden van de Spaanse migratie naar Nederland, 1960–1980*. Amsterdam: Centrum voor de Geschiedenis van Migranten.
Penninx, R. and Schrover, M. (2001) *Bastion of bindmiddel? De organisatie van migranten in historisch perspectief*. Amsterdam: Instituut voor Migratie- en Etnische Studies.
Polderman, C. (2007) ' "Deze nood breekt elke wet". Het antwoord van de lokale politiek op de Rotterdamse Turkenrellen van 1972', *Holland Historisch Tijdschrift*, 39(4), pp. 257–75.
Quispel, C. (2010) ' "Toekomst te huur". Migratie, etniciteit en stigmatisering: de Robert Taylor Homes in Chicago en de Bijlmermeer in Amsterdam', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis*, 7(1), pp. 88–109.
Roosblad, J. (2002) *Vakbonden, immigranten en migranten in Nederland 1960–1996*. Amsterdam: Aksant.
Schrover, M. (2006) 'Hetzelfde en toch een beetje anders'. In: Strouken, I. (ed.) *Werken, werken, werken. Migratie en lokale geschiedenis*. Utrecht: NCV, pp. 11–17.

Schrover, M. (2010) 'Pillarization, multiculturalism and cultural freezing: Dutch migration history and the enforcement of essentialist ideas', *BMGN-Low Countries Historical Review*, 125(2/3), pp. 329–54.
Schrover, M. (2015) 'The deportation of Germans from the Netherlands 1946–1952', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 33(3), pp. 264–71.
Schrover, M. and van Faassen, M. (2010) 'Invisibility and selectivity: introduction to the special issue on Dutch overseas emigration in the nineteenth and twentieth century', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis*, 7(2), pp. 3–31.
Schrover, M. and van Lottum, J. (2007) 'Spatial concentrations and communities of immigrants in the Netherlands 1800–1900', *Continuity and Change*, 22(2), pp. 215–52.
Schrover, M., ten Broeke, J. and Rommes, R. (2008) *Migranten bij de Demka-staalfabrieken in Utrecht (1915–1983)*. Utrecht: Het Utrechts Archief/Matrijs.
Schrover, M., van der Leun, J. and Quispel, C. (2007) 'Niches, labour market segregation, ethnicity and gender', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(4), pp. 529–40.
Soetens, N.W. (2008) *Gastarbeiders, wat heeft het hun gebracht? Autobiografisch verslag over het Aktiekomitee Pro Gastarbeiders*. Rotterdam: Historisch Museum van Rotterdam.
Soja, E. (1989) *Postmodern geographies: the reassertion of space in critical social theory*. London: Verso.
South, S.J., Crowder, K. and Chavez, E. (2005) 'Migration and special assimilation among U.S. Latinos: classical versus segmented trajectories', *Demography*, 42(3), pp. 497–521.
The Washington Post (1972) 'Dutch image of tolerance shattered', 20 August, p. 8.
Tinnemans, W. (ed.) (1991) *L'Italianità. De Italiaanse gemeenschap in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Spinhuis.
Tinnemans, W. (1994) *Een gouden armband. Een geschiedenis van mediterrane immigranten in Nederland (1945–1994)*. Utrecht: Nederlands Centrum Buitenlanders.
Trouw (1962) 'Buitenlanders', 1 November, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Trouw (1972a) 'Turken in Rotterdam slaan terug', 4 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Trouw (1972b) 'Vechtpartijen met Turken duren voort', 11 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Trouw (1972c) 'Rotterdamse jeugd gaat door met rellen', 15 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Trouw (1972d) 'Sinds onlusten in Rotterdam 62 arrestaties', 16 August, p. 3. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Trouw (1972e) 'Ravage in Afrikaanderbuurt', 16 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Trouw (1972f) 'Woningmaatregel voor Rotterdam', 17 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
Trouw (1972g) 'Gemeente vergoedt schade van Turken', 18 August, p. 1. Available at: www.delpher.nl (Accessed: 20 December 2017).
van der Hoeven, I. and Schrover, M. (2013) 'Een zorgzame of bemoeizuchtige werkgever? De AKU en haar Italianen', *Jaarboek Gelre*, 65, pp. 185–214.
van der Horst, E. (2005) *Deventer blik. Geschiedenis van arbeidsmigranten in een Nederlandse industriestad (1945–2000)*. Kampen: IJsselacademie.
van Donselaar, J. and Wagenaar, W. (2007) *Monitor racisme en extremisme racistisch en extreemrechts geweld in 2006*. Leiden: Anne Frank Stichting/Universiteit Leiden.
van Eijl, C. (2012) *Tussenland. Illegaal in Nederland 1945–2000*. Hilversum: Verloren.
van Elteren, M.C.M. (1986) *Staal en arbeid. Een sociaal historische studie naar industriële accommodatieprocessen onder arbeiders en het desbetreffende beleid bij Hoogovens IJmuiden, 1924–1966*. Leiden: Brill.
van Kempen R. and Seule Oezuekren, A. (1998) 'Ethnic segregation in cities: new forms and explanations in a dynamic world', *Urban Studies*, 35(10), pp. 1631–56.
van Kempen, R. and van Weesep, J. (1997) 'Segregation, housing and ethnicity in Dutch citles', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 88(2), pp. 188–95.
van Os, G. (2006) *'"Ik kwam met een koffer van karton". Spanjaarden in Zuidoost-Brabant 1961–2006*. Alphen aan de Maas: Veerhuis.
van Vlerken, S. (1990) *De droom voorbij. 25 jaar buitenlanders in Utrecht*. Utrecht: Centrum Buitenlanders Midden Nederland.
Verkiezingsprogramma's, Bijeengebracht en van een register voorzien door Prof. Dr. I. Lipschits (1977) Den Haag: SDU.

Wacquant, L.J.D. (1998) 'Negative social capital: state breakdown and social destitution in America's urban core', *Netherlands Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 13(1), pp. 25–40.
Wentholt, R. (1967) 'Maatschappelijke achtergronden en factoren'. In: Wentholt, R. *Buitenlandse gastarbeiders in Nederland. Een veelzijdige benadering van een complex vraagstuk*. Leiden: Spruyt, pp. 83–118.
Wischermann, C. (2002) 'Changes in population development, urban structures and living conditions in nineteenth century Hamburg'. In: Lawton, R. and Lee, R. (eds.) *Population and society in Western European port-cities, c. 1650–1939*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, pp. 270–304.
Zecker, R. (2004) 'Where everybody goes to meet everybody else: the translocal creation of a Slovak immigrant community', *The Journal of Social History*, 38(2), pp. 423–53.