Profound Coziness: Affective Citizenship and the Failure to enact Community in a Dutch Urban Neighborhood

Mandy de Wilde

1. Introduction

It is a late summer evening in the neighborhood of Slotermeer on the outskirts of Amsterdam. On a piece of lawn next to a small community center, a white party tent and a barbecue reveal that something is about to happen here tonight. In the distance, the bell of tram 13 rings as it makes its daily way over the main thoroughfare in the neighborhood. Named after a former mayor of Amsterdam, the long lane reaches out to the traffic "ring" that separates suburban Slotermeer from the inner city districts of Amsterdam. However, the inner city of Amsterdam is not the destination of most residents tonight. They are gathering in the community center, called "Our House," to attend a gathering concerning their own neighborhood.

As I arrive, I see the current "neighborhood mayors" Dirk, Klaas and Jan[1] standing outside the entrance of the community center. I have met them several times before when attending public meetings in Slotermeer. They are usually inclined to take the floor, often at the cost of other, less articulate citizens, such as (post)migrants and women. Tonight, however, they do not perform their role as neighborhood mayors. Close to the entrance of the community center, they lean against the wall in a demonstrative manner. They chat with one another and with some of the residents entering the building, while ignoring others. They will remain outside even after tonight's collective gathering has begun.

One of the people that do enter is Sander, the inspired policy practitioner, who, together with a couple of colleagues, is responsible for the organization of these gatherings. He is hopeful and excited about this evening, as tonight will see the installation of the *Neighborhood Circle* as part of a community building-policy program. He sees the network as his "baby": for over three months now, he has been trying to inspire and get residents excited about his "dreams" for the neighborhood.

Sounds of laughter, music and buzz fill up the community center. In the small hall, there are no grey office tables, paper stacks, interruption microphones or aldermen behind lecterns, but colorful tablecloths, yellow flowers, balloons, waxing lights, and Sander and his colleagues mingling, laughing and chit-chatting with residents. There is a cozy, informal atmosphere. Sander starts the gathering with a rousing speech, telling residents how "touched" he is to see the enthusiasm among people in the neighborhood and that it is of upmost importance to invest this same

---

[1] The name of the community participation-program is an invented name. Also, the names used in this chapter are not the real names of the respondents in order to protect their privacy.

enthusiasm and energy within Neighbourhood Circle Tonight offers a chance to network, to get to know each other and to offer room for "spontaneous and imaginative encounters" during the festive barbecue.

At the festive closure of the evening, Sander offers those volunteers who have already helped to give life to Neighborhood Circle a gift: a pink "Arabic-inspired teapot" that a Dutch warehouse introduced to its collection during the Eid-al-Fitr, the festivities marking the end of the Islamic Ramadan. The teapot symbolizes the message that Neighborhood Circle tries to convey: out of different cultures, something new and beautiful can be constructed. Everybody applauds and loud music coming out of the stereo takes over the hall. It is time for the "after-meeting," already announced on the invitation. Some women push the chairs away and start to dance on world music. Noortje and Rinda, two older ladies and long-time volunteers, who had critically fired questions at Sander and his colleagues during the meeting, look at the scene with a disapproving look. Yet, Ferda, a young mother and fresh volunteer, mentions that she thinks it is a "cozy evening" and enjoys herself. Together with her friend Yildiz, she rhythmically starts to move to the sound of the music. There is laughter, singing and shouts and the volume of the music is turned up a bit more.

Noortje and Rinda leave. It has started to rain outside and tram 13 still makes its way through the neighborhood. Neighborhood mayors Dirk, Klaas and Jan have left. When I take my bike and leave as well, I think about something that Sander shared with me earlier on, when I asked him if he was satisfied with the way the evening was turning out:

> "It is a cozy way of coming together, but I do try to give some profundity to the coziness. A sort of profundity at least."

"Coziness." A word I have heard many times from the mouth of Sander, his colleagues, but also from residents. But what is "profound coziness"? In this chapter, I will show that, in Slotermeer, "affective citizenship" (Fortier 2010; De Wilde 2013) is brought into being through creating a warm sense of sociability during collective gatherings. An ethnographic view of these gatherings offers an insight in the dynamics of affective citizenship and how it affects residents and social relations in the neighborhood. I will show how this government strategy has intended, but also unintended consequences. Where some residents feel included in the coziness, others feel excluded.

The reinvention of a localized sense of community – the cozy atmosphere described above – is not a local phenomenon. It has been part of urban governance approaches in deprived urban neighborhoods in Western Europe, such as the United Kingdom (see Lawles et al. 2010; MacLeavy 2009; Forrest and Kearns 2001), Spain (see Pares et al. 2012), Germany (see Haus and Klausen 2011) and the Netherlands (see Van Kempen and Bolt 2009; De Wilde et al. 2014). In this chapter, I develop an understanding of affective citizenship, both as a governmental strategy and as a subject-position enacted by some citizens (but not by others). The focus is on how the affective subject is understood, addressed and utilized as

a resource in a community participation-program. I will argue that Neighborhood Circle can be seen as governmental technology aimed at creating affective relations between residents. I analyze how and which citizen subject-positions emerge from it. The concluding section argues that affective citizenship recognizes some emotions, and public conduct arising from it, more than others. In doing so, it disregards certain enactments of community, excludes a certain type of citizenship from the public domain and reinforces boundaries between residents.

2. Governing Through Emotions

Research has shown that the last two decades has seen a shift of responsibilities from governments to citizens and an activation of citizens on many levels such as health care, social assistance, employment and the neighborhood in Western European welfare states (Clarke and Newman, 1997; Newman 2005; Newman and Clarke 2009; Newman and Tonkens 2011)). One outcome of this process has been the rise of voluntarism and, more particular, a reframing of the citizen as moral subject of responsible communities. Nowadays, a good citizen is a “communitarian citizen” (Etzioni 1998; Putnam 2000, 2004): a citizen who feels a sense of belonging and loyalty to her community, identifies with its members and actively engages with and contributes to its wellbeing.

The development of activation policies are the result of various developments: among others, a rise of neoliberal policy-making, the declining capacities of welfare states and a growing distance between citizens and their governments. Within the context of urban governance and the management of social issues in deprived urban neighborhoods, local governments seek to engage and utilize the local community as answer and antidote to the poor cohesive state of these local communities (Uitermark 2014; Bull and Jones 2006; Lowndes and Wilson 2001; Maloney et al. 2000). A state that is mainly due to the ongoing transformations in Western European urban neighborhoods as a result of macro processes such as globalization and immigration. Yet, as communities are considered important tools in all kinds of governmental plans, the character of these plans simultaneously suggests communities are frail constructs, or even absent entities. It is possible, though, to imagine a neighborhood as a community and turn it into “a productive myth” (Uitermark 2014, p. 10; Anderson 1991) if enough people identify with and participate in it. This explains why local governments try to build communities, and have residents identify, actively engage and participate in them – such as Neighborhood Circle in Slotermeer.

Governmentality-inspired scholars have critically intervened in the contemporary debate on communitarian citizenship and the way community involvement has become regarded as best practice in policy programs. They argue that the community has become a highly instrumental tool wielded by national and local governments (Marinetto 2003). Rose (1999, p. 176) calls this “government through community” and talks about a politics of subjectification as governments

try to activate people by acting upon their personal commitments, social relations and individual responsibilities to a community. This is done through carefully addressing, crafting and utilizing individuals as subjects in practices of subjectification. Those practices encourage and provoke "certain ways of conduct which increase the health, wealth and happiness" (Isin 2004, p. 220) of both people and the community they are thought to belong to.

Furthermore, Rose argues that, with this communitarian turn, practices of subjectification have become increasingly more affective as a community can be seen as "a moral field" and "a space of *emotional relationships* through which *individual identities* are constructed through their bonds to *micro-cultures* of values and meanings" (Rose 1999, p. 172 emphasis in original). This raises the question how governments address people as individuals with emotional bonds of affinity to other people and how they try to influence them to assemble these bonds in a new way. In this chapter, I will show how governments utilize and mobilize emotions as a productive force for community involvement through the governmental technique of "affective citizenship."

The term "affective citizenship" has been used in other studies to reveal how the governmental recognition and encouragement of emotions and intimate relationships have long been part of the very way in which citizenship itself is constructed. Mookherjee (2005) analyzes the former within the sphere of national citizenship and shows how affection and loyalty are used as emotional brick stones in a process of nation building. As national governments acknowledge citizens and ask them to be compassionate and empathetic to others in the other collectivities, they interpellate certain emotions. Focusing on issues of gender, sexuality, religion and race, Johnson (2010, p. 495) uses the concept to analyze which intimate relationships between citizens in their everyday, private life are recognized by governments, how they are stimulated to feel about others and themselves in the public sphere and how this culminates to a "politics of affect" that influences who receives full citizenship rights. Fortier (2010, p. 17) has used the term to provide a detailed analysis of how British government strategies for fostering community cohesion involve forms of "governing through affect" and attempt to influence citizens' feelings about the local community they live in. She shows how strategies deployed in view of achieving community cohesion operate through the cultivation of a certain register of emotions that defines good citizenship (see also Fortier 2007).

Anthropologist Andrea Muehlebach (2012, p. 44) has specified this process by showing how exactly emotions are utilized and mobilized as a productive force in volunteerism and activation policies. She shows how politicians and policy practitioners in the Northern-Italian welfare state draw upon an "affective register" of pride, empathy and compassion in order to make citizens care for others in their community and act upon those feelings by becoming involved in voluntary activities. All these studies show how governments acknowledge, influence and utilize citizens' emotions and the affective relations through which citizen identities are formed.

I use the term affective citizenship in relation to enacting community and see it as twofold. It refers to the way governments address citizens as an affective subject: as individuals with emotional bonds of affinity to other people and how they try to influence citizens to assemble these bonds in a new way. At the same time, affective citizenship refers to an affective subject-position itself: that is, a relational state of being that arises from and consists of all sorts of emotions such as compassion, affection, pride, hope, fear, anger etcetera. From this state of being, people act out their citizenship duties by forging affective relations through meaningful interactions with others. These interactions and relations enact community.

3. Methods: Policy Analysis and Ethnographic Fieldwork

This paper is based on data gathered in an ethnographic project in which I participated in a diverse range of practices of a community participation-program in Slotermeer. To allow for a critical analysis of this program, the social policy context in which it took place and the dynamics it entailed, I will analyze two categories of empirical material gathered over a period of two years.

First, I made use of policy documents and communication material from the local government of Amsterdam, the district government of Amsterdam New-West, interviews with policy practitioners and administrators working in the neighborhood and field notes from neighborhood meetings. An analysis of this material allows for an examination of the way the district government framed the ongoing neighborhood regeneration of Slotermeer and the community participation-campaign. Second, I made use of research material from participant observation in the field. The empirical data draws from field notes taken during voluntary activities, and interviews, conversations and email correspondence with volunteers. An analysis of this material allows for a critical evaluation of how the idea of "community" is framed in discourse and enacted in (policy) practice.

4. A Community Participation-Program in Slotermeer

Slotermeer, a neighborhood part of the suburban district of Amsterdam New-West, meets the typical image of a deprived urban neighborhood as an arena were social problems are concentrated. Its population is impoverished – e.g. high levels of unemployment and lagging emancipation – it deals with deteriorating public space and faces petty crime and other safety issues. Furthermore, Slotermeer is a multi-ethnic neighborhood. In 2010, 59 percent of residents in Slotermeer were qualified as "non-Western migrants," of which most were of Turkish, Moroccan and Surinamese decent.[2] In Dutch public and political debate, neighborhoods such

---

[2] Source: Gemeente Amsterdam, Dienst Onderzoek + Statistiek. 2010. *Staat van de wijk 3. Geuzenveld-Slotermeer.*

as Slotermeer are regarded as stages where the discontents of Dutch multicultural society are most manifest (Duyvendak 2011; Uitermark and Duyvendak 2008): there are tense ethnic relations and a growing unease among autochthonous residents. Due to these social problems, Slotermeer has been at the forefront of both national and local policy interventionism.

In 2007, the district administration implemented a "bottom-up renewal strategy," called *Neighborhood Management*. This management-approach aimed at "improving the general image," "enhancing social cohesion" and working upon the "community wide-functions" of Slotermeer (POSEIDON 2006, p. 10).[3] To do so, the district government developed a community participation-program that would build upon the "self-organizing potential of the local community," addressing it as *Neighborhood Circle*.

The simple definition of Neighborhood Circle given in policy documents qualified it as "a structural network where (public) organizations, the urban district civil service and local residents work together on the development of the community." Through Neighborhood Circle, residents are going to be able to organize all kinds of voluntary activities in the neighborhood such as coffee mornings, handicraft workshops and other activities in the community center, a street party or a neighborhood festival. It was supported by the district government with a budget, an office space and other organizational support. However, in practice, the Neighborhood Circle turned out to be much more than a simple network. The policy techniques used to develop the Neighborhood Circle reveal the amount of work that had to be done in the process.

First, although Slotermeer met the typical image of a deprived urban neighborhood, the Neighborhood Circle -campaign hardly ever mentioned neighborhood problems, but instead invited residents to share their "wishes" and "dreams" for Slotermeer. In district newspapers, visual material and other communication material evoked an image of Slotermeer as a beautiful, harmonious place in which residents could count on and would take care of each other. The slogans – "together we can do more, TOGETHERsloterMORE!"[4] – logos and images that adjoined the campaign were meant to entice identification and attachment to an image of the neighborhood as a wonderful, multicultural community. As Sander would say:

> "I want to give them [residents] the feeling that this is a wonderful neighborhood. […] And that they can contribute to that."

Second, the introduction of the Neighborhood Management converged with the appointment and education of a team of policy practitioners who were instructed

---

[3] This management-approach originated from a pilot-project called Partnership on Socio-Economic and Integrated Development of Deprived Neighborhoods (POSEIDON), which had been implemented and carried out in an adjacent neighborhood in the district. It was an experiment on working with a bottom-up renewal strategy in several deprived neighborhoods in European cities. It was evaluated as successful and introduced to the neighborhood of Slotermeer in 2007.

[4] In Dutch, "meer" means "lake," which gave Slotermeer its name as there is a lake in the district. However, in this call, another meaning of "meer" is used, as it also means "more."

to work according to the principles of a new “innovative work method.” This work method was called the “personal approach:” it was a way of working that advocated “good social relations in the participation process,” paid much attention to create “a safe and pleasant environment and cultural events as linkages between residents” and put a “focus not only directed towards content (ratio) but also towards relations (emotions).” In order to adhere to these values, policy practitioners were offered several “involvement techniques” to work with. These techniques are supposed to help relieve restrictions to participation. One of those techniques was “psychological access:” “the unspoken messages and ‘cultural codes’ and the feelings residents have that tell them whether to feel welcome or not.”

Karen, a practitioner, translated these techniques into her vision of Neighborhood Circle. In order for it to function properly, a mental and emotional transformation was necessary among residents of Slotermeer:

> “Some of them do voluntarily help out their family members. But they don’t see that as a voluntary activity, because it is family, it’s close. It’s that family atmosphere, that feeling, that we try to link to the neighborhood.”

Third, qualified as the most effective aspect of the Neighborhood Circle -campaign, were collective gatherings where policy practitioners, volunteers and other residents came together to brainstorm ideas, activities and projects benefiting the neighborhood. The gatherings took on a more informal character. The efforts of Sander and his colleagues, meant to create “a cozy atmosphere,” originated from the assumption that the conduct and feelings of residents could change if their interactions changed. During these gatherings, volunteers who had organized something for their neighbors were put in the spotlight, asked to share their stories – and, most importantly, their feelings of affection – in the hope it would ignite similar feelings among other residents and inspire them to undertake voluntary activities in Slotermeer. As such, these volunteers were presented and celebrated as the “good” citizens of the neighborhood community.

The notions of coziness, intimacy and informality were referred to more often by practitioners of the Neighborhood Management-team. They could be seen as a sort of “feeling rules” (Hochschild 2003): implicit directions that guided residents how they should feel in certain situations, or with regard to certain issues and the way they should express and act upon those feelings. These three aspects of Neighborhood Circle – branding the neighborhood as a community, addressing residents through a personal work method and organizing cozy gatherings – can be seen as affective interventions. Through these interventions, new subject-citizen positions are made. Yet, these subject-positions are very specific and only some residents feel at home in them. I will now turn to the residents who were targeted by these policy interventions. How did they respond to the invitation to become an affective citizen?

5. The Respected Citizen

"Love goes through the stomach, that's the saying, isn't?" Khadija, a volunteer who organizes weekly coffee mornings for women in the community center, is queuing next to a buffet table at a gathering and shares with me why she appreciates the presence of a buffet at every gathering. Present at most gatherings is a table with food and drinks and there is a moment reserved for indulging in some tasty food together. Together, we chit-chat some more about the food and Khadija explains what is likely in the stuffing of the pastry snacks on the table. The food is usually prepared by a female volunteer who prepares something from her own gastronomical tradition: sometimes these are pastry snacks from the Moroccan kitchen, at other times it might be Turkish soup and sweets or Surinamese treats. This evening, chairman Bert, opens the meeting with a request for an applause for Samira, the woman who has prepared the delicious buffet. For Khadija, these moments of eating together provide a nice opportunity to reach out to others:

> "I like to see people eating cozily together. It is important […] in my culture. It doesn't matter where you're from, whether you're Muslim or Christian or I don't know what."

Eating together – and other activities related to food – is an important aspect of the affective citizenship that policy practitioners try to provoke among residents. In Slotermeer's community centers, there are numerous cooking clubs for women and children, dinners for lonely elderly, coffee mornings for women and neighborhood barbecues and dinners organized around cultural holidays (such as Christmas and Ramadan). All this is made possible by the voluntary engagement of residents, the organizational help of policy practitioners and the financial support of the district government.

The majority of residents organizing voluntary activities around food are, as Khadija and Samira, female volunteers – usually mothers – from diverse cultural backgrounds. Most of the female volunteers have lived in Slotermeer for quite some years, yet they have not been actively participating in the neighborhood due to unequal access to resources and opportunities (see Martin 2002, for an elaborate explanation of the poor role of women in neighborhood participation). The affective interventions accompanying the implementation of the Neighborhood Circle finally offer them an opportunity to partake in the public sphere of the (imagined) community. They may not be neighborhood mayors who publicly call politicians and aldermen to the stand through the discursive power of words, but they are qualified as "kitchen princesses" who are able to bring residents together over a tasty meal and have them engage in conversation by investing their cooking talents. According to Karen, eating together has a "bonding function." Surely, if love goes through the stomach, then feelings of affection and respect will also go through there?

As such, activities organized around food are seen as encouraging interactions and crafting relations between residents. Quincy, a policy practitioner, emphasizes that any form of meaningful interaction starts with a conversation:

> "Fear and nasty emotions will be released if you don't talk to each other. Because then people don't know each other […]. They might only talk about minor things, but at least they talk, and they will talk about how they feel about those things."

That food was regarded and felt about as such was already guided by Sander who, in his role of chairman at most of the gatherings, introduced the buffet as delicious "multicultural" snacks and made them part of a short narrative on Slotermeer as a "rainbow pallet" of diversities and cultures. The activities and interactions that made up the Neighborhood Circle turned the neighborhood into a "colorful mosaic of people." Qualifying the food as "multicultural" – and praising seemingly insignificant small scale activities around food – policy practitioners employ the sensory experience of tasting and eating to invoke positive emotions such as curiosity, respect and affection. Opening up to each other's gastronomical traditions is meant to help residents become acquainted and learn more about each other's rich culture. As such, it helps policy practitioners to accentuate and emphasize positive aspects of the everyday, multicultural reality in Slotermeer and reframe the stereotypical negative image of a multi-ethnic neighborhood. Female volunteers such as Khadija and Samira are key figures in this process as cooking is a typical everyday practice that lays bare the hidden strengths of mostly (post)migrant women.

However, it is not only the sensory experience of cooking, tasting and eating that triggers (post)migrant women into an affective subject-position qualified as "good." They also appear sensitive to the cozy atmosphere during these gatherings and the personal, intimate interaction with policy practitioners. They feel part of "something warm" as Esra, a volunteer who organizes handicraft workshops for women, describes her experience. The personal approach of Sander and his colleagues, the decorations, the ways of talking and doing create an atmosphere that women enjoy and feel at home in. Ozlem, another volunteer, explains:

> "When I go home after a gathering I no longer feel that I'm Ozlem, I'm not just a mother. […] I meet my neighbors and I see what's happening here and I can contribute to that. It doesn't have to be that serious […] it can also be in a fun way."

During gatherings, the atmosphere is playful and devoid of a sense of hierarchy. The affective interventions during the gatherings bring about laughter, animated talk and jokes. During one gathering, some (post)migrant women tease practitioner Paul who sits at their table and brainstorms good ideas for the neighborhood with them. The women decide that they want to start a teahouse for women, as (post)migrant men already have the coffeehouses in the neighborhood to themselves. Paul says that, as a man, he feels excluded, acts as if he is upset and

pretends he wants to leave the table. The women laugh, one of them playfully puts an arm around his shoulder and says they will make an exception for him, because he is so special. “We will need a waiter,” another woman jokingly adds to the conversation. They laugh again and brainstorm further.

The women tend to talk about policy practitioners in personal accounts. They idolize Sander as “he is so wonderful” and “he is always there for us.” Cyril, a volunteer, calls policy practitioner Rosanna “a sweetheart” because she is always so enthusiastic and helpful:

> “Rosanna is such a busy bee. Last week, she helped out with the preparations of our festival. Mind you, it was during the weekend! […] She’s so enthusiastic, sometimes even more than we are! It’s just contagious, it makes me enthusiastic about things and then I think about starting something new, even though I actually don’t have the time for that at the moment.”

Wilma, a policy practitioner, is seen as “part of our women’s family” by Khadija. Wilma believed in Khadija from the start and gave her the confidence to “do something good for the neighborhood.” The affective interventions that, in a subtle and sometimes direct way, guide residents into positive feelings and interactions with their neighbors, resonate with Khadija’s feelings of affection and compassion for (post)migrant women in the neighborhood who have to deal with loneliness and other lagging empowerment issues. She, of course, has been aware of this – through her contacts with other women – but it was Wilma who specifically addressed her during a visit to the community center:

> “Wilma told us that there were still so many women who have never been to school, are still not able to leave the house and have no outlet or possibilities. I felt really sad about that because I have made some steps in my life, but other women are not there yet. But that doesn’t mean that they are not important or that they should not be part of this neighborhood. I guess she told us to cherish our position and do something in return.”

With the encouragement from Wilma, Khadija acted upon her feelings and organized a coffee morning meant for “women of all cultures” to have a place “to laugh, forget, talk and gather information on everything that concerns women in the neighborhood.” Sander and other policy practitioners did not spare any occasion in which they could share their feelings of pride about the dedication and commitment women as Khadija, Samira and Ozlem displayed for the neighborhood.

Concluding, female volunteers feel recognized and seen in their enactment of community. The affective interventions resonate with sensitive and relational aspects to human interaction they value: positive feedback, warmth, touch, eating together and celebrating. In addition, the call upon positive emotions such as affection, compassion and respect is expressed in the importance they attach to soft, female values. Subsequently, the personal and public recognition of policy practi-

tioners gives them a feeling of pride: finally, they are also able to participate and become included into the public sphere of the community as respected citizens.

However, when the district government and policy practitioners invite "active residents, initiative takers and volunteers" to become active in Neighborhood Circle, other residents than (post)migrant women feel that this is directly addressed to them, as they feel a strong attachment to the neighborhood and have been engaged in all sort of voluntary practices for many years.

6. The Resentful Citizen

> "In the past, my daughter played here. The playground was also used by the primary school. Back then, there was still supervision. Ten years ago, the place started to deteriorate slowly. We founded a playground-association in order to stop the deterioration and managed to collect [thousands of euro] to buy new play sets and prevent the playground from closing. We rented the ground for a symbolic amount from the district government and signed a contract with them. I supervised the playground, opened it in the morning and closed it in the evening. We were open every day. That went well for years."

A resident who takes up the invitation to become engaged in Neighborhood Circle is Dirk, a retired widower who has moved to Slotermeer over forty years ago. He has been a volunteer for over twenty years now: apart from guarding the playground, he teaches computer lessons to elderly in the community center, is a chairman of a neighborhood committee and member of the Residential Platform of Slotermeer. He considers himself somewhat of a "nosey parker" as he likes to keep a close eye on what happens in his quarter, but also on political issues concerning the neighborhood. Klaas, who introduces himself as a resident "of the first hour," organizes small concerts for residents in the elderly home. He has been an active volunteer in Slotermeer for over decades as well, among others as chairman of another neighborhood committee, and sees it as his "duty" to participate. When the Neighborhood Circle -call for volunteers came, he was initially delighted that the district government wants to support "our community."

However, when these autochthonous volunteers attend the installation gathering of the Neighborhood Circle, they appear to be somewhat surprised by the cozy, informal atmosphere. Confronted with the food and its qualification as multicultural, Dirk expresses a mix of disappointment and frustration. He wonders out loud why "our food [is] not good enough?" Why is there no cheese or liverwurst, for example? With "our food" he refers to food he identifies as Dutch. While policy practitioners appreciate food and eating together as a practice that crafts and encourages affective relations between people, it appears to have the opposite effect on Dirk. In this particular context, Dirk does not experience eating together as a binding ritual. However, he does recognize the importance of voluntary activities organized around cooking and eating. His neighbor Piet has just volunteered

to start a cooking club and he praises him for that. However, when I talk to Piet about the Neighborhood Circle -gathering, he expresses himself equally negative about the snacks presented at the gathering:

> "What on earth is there to celebrate? […] That they can cook something nice? Or they are able to organize a coffee morning as well? Well, congratulations! But you know, as a man, I'm not welcome, because those mornings are only for women. And they [policy practitioners] approve of that. So, I can't visit the community center, because every Wednesday morning they are […] chit-chatting, drinking coffee and doing nothing at the expense of our community money. That's not something to celebrate, that's just sad."

How do Dirk and Piet's feelings of discontent relate to the affective interventions of policy practitioners who try to celebrate and invoke positive feelings about something that, to Piet, is "just sad"? Their equally negative remarks about the decoration and festive atmosphere in the gatherings provide a frame of reference. The cozy, informal atmosphere during gatherings appears to interpellate negative emotions already present among autochthonous volunteers and their sensitivity to cultural alterity is shaped by more than the affective interventions they are subjected within the Neighborhood Circle-program.

Dirk, Klaas and Piet belong to a core group of autochthonous volunteers that have organized voluntary activities in the community center, have kept a close eye on issues concerning the public environment or have interfered collectively with social policy and political issues through neighborhood committees for over many years. In 2010, amidst the diversities of cultures and ethnicities living in Slotermeer, a minority of 32 per cent of residents living in Slotermeer were qualified as native Dutch – most of them 50-plus. Autochthonous volunteers identified strongly with the native Dutch population that had been shrinking over the past decades at the expense of a growing multi-ethnic population. Between 2000 and 2010, the share of non-Western migrants had grown with 16 percent in Slotermeer.[5] The public image of these residents is that they are trapped in deprived, multicultural neighborhoods due to a lack of economical or other opportunities and are unable to move out. However, having moved into Slotermeer decades ago, when it was still a well-regarded district, volunteers such as Klaas, Jan and Piet expressed a strong sense of belonging to other autochthonous volunteers and certain parks, squares and public places in the neighborhood, which motivated, and still motivates, them to feel concerned, engaged and become voluntary active.

The affective interventions not only address and intervene in their corroded feeling of home but also in their ability to publicly express this feeling through voluntary activities. Their feelings of disappointment, frustration and anger aroused by the affective interventions only increase a feeling of resentment to-

---

[5] Gemeente Amsterdam, Dienst Onderzoek + Statistiek. 2010. *Staat van de Wijk 3, Geuzenveld-Slotermeer.*

wards (post)migrant women. It offers (post)migrant women the opportunity to be publicly praised as the ideal affective subject, and also frames a multicultural coziness as an ideal format for the imagined neighborhood community. Autochthonous volunteers resent the public recognition for the cooking skills, compassion and heart-warming activities of women, as they feel it comes at the expense of recognition of their own engagement and efforts "for years on end."

The expression "for years on end" was used more often by autochthonous volunteers. The words expressed a feeling of not being recognized for all those years of dedication, commitment and expression of voice in neighborhood matters. For autochthonous volunteers, publicly enacting community is also about important neighborhood issues such as safety, deterioration of public space and other livability issues, and not solely about cozy and fun things. In the past, citizenship was about influence and criticism on social policy and district politics and not about every day, informal activities and "professional multi-nonsense." That has all been "ruined" by the district government and policy practitioners who "are dancing to the tunes" of migrants in the neighborhood. Autochthonous volunteers primarily see that other residents are having a good time with practitioners and they feel neglected and excluded from this enactment of community.

As such, these volunteers actively resist against a multicultural, warm sense of sociability: it is not an atmosphere they feel at home in. It explains why Sander, when he gives examples of voluntary activities in Slotermeer and refers to the heart-warming enthusiasm with which some women have volunteered to become "playground mothers" and take care of the children of the playground, is interrupted by Dirk, who asks why "nobody seems to care" for his playground, as it is "something I've been concerned with for a long time now." The playground is in a deteriorated state and needs more serious support from the district government in order to keep it open. More superficial coziness and festive gatherings such as these are not going to help.

These feelings of resentment are noticed by Karen, a policy practitioner. However, she explains that the goal of Neighborhood Circle is also to make it more inclusive for new residents:

> "The active core of these residents is still present. But it has changed. Four years ago, […] there were primarily white, older men participating and they managed to keep the rest out. The introduction of a different policy has changed this. Now we see more young people, Turkish and Moroccans participating."

It appears that Karen is hesitant to relate to feelings of discontent among Dirk and other autochthonous volunteers. This lack of recognition is felt by these volunteers, and they actively protest against it. As such, their resentment towards (post)migrant women and policy practitioners can be understood within the context of the affective interventions and the competition for recognition, instead of a direct rejection of the women themselves. It explains why Dirk, Klaas and Jan re-

fuse to enter the community center during the installation gathering of Neighborhood Circle . They are not only standing outside, they feel left outside as well.

The type of citizenship that native Dutch volunteers are accustomed to and feel at home in is based on a republican citizenship ideal in which rational and discursive competences are valued. They want to be consulted by politicians and be able to express their voice in neighborhood issues. What belongs to the public sphere in the new affective citizenship ideal – a certain public conduct based on positive emotions – excludes their engagement, which originates from both positive and negative emotions. Consequently, affective interventions end up privatizing their negative emotions as it takes away a public stage to express and act upon them publicly and collectively.

7. Conclusion: Feelings of Inclusion and Exclusion

An ethnographic insight into practices, motives and emotions of residents and policy practitioners when enacting community in Slotermeer shows how affective citizenship can be understood as a governmental strategy, how residents are affected by it and how it (re)enacts boundaries between residents and between residents and policy practitioners (as representatives of a district government) in practices of subjectification.

Through a reinvention of a localized sense of community, pressing neighborhood issues – lagging emancipation, deterioration of public space and other expressions of urban marginality – are framed as being a result of “relational poverty” (Muehlebach 2012, p. 38) instead of socio-economic poverty. The evocation of a certain affective subject-position in a community participation-program transforms the public sphere as it creates new forms of participation and recognition and sees the emergence of a respected and resentful citizen. This points to some promising and problematic aspects of this phenomenon.

One the one hand, there is the respected citizen embodied by (post)migrant women who feel proud to finally be able to participate. Recognized and respected by policy practitioners, the respected citizen is mobilized as a member of the public who can regenerate the neighborhood with their sensibilities and small, delicate talents. For women to feel at home in an affective citizen-subject position is not remarkable. The emotional appeal and emphasis on meaningful interactions and informal sensitivities brings forth the value of social and personal relations. It resonates well with soft, feminine values such as empathy, affection and collaborative spirit. In addition, through emphasizing the power of informal, intimate practices such as cooking, the private, intimate domain of the kitchen is brought out into the public. Once again, the personal is made political, albeit in a different manner than feminists intended when first using the slogan (Lister 1997). The traditional female domain is imbued with new meaning and simultaneously gives new meaning to the associational and public sphere of the community (Martin 2002; Buckingham et al. 2006). The focus on relational and emotional aspects ap-

peals to a new group of residents, which points to the emancipatory potential of affective citizenship.

On the other hand, there is the resentful citizen embodied by autochthonous volunteers who feel unrecognized by policy practitioners, publicly displaced by (post)migrant women and unable to "politicize" neighborhood matters as they used to do. Affective citizenship is a governmental strategy that appears to appreciate certain emotions and civic values, but which fails to recognize alternative feelings of discontent that give rise to oppositional voices or antagonistic interactions. As such, it excludes other forms of public conduct and citizenship – for instance, republican citizenship (see Van Gunsteren 1998) – from the public sphere of the community. It is good to have fun, warm neighborly contact; it is bad to critically voice neighborhood problems. When George Marcus (2002 in: Johnson 2010, p. 506) claimed that "the solution to good citizenship is located in our capacity to feel," he also acknowledged the mobilizing force of negative emotions. The resentful feelings of autochthonous volunteers, which can be seen to emerge at least partly from the affective interventions of Neighborhood Circle, underscores the importance of Marcus' argument.

The case study of Slotermeer underscores the argument of Fortier (2010, p. 27), who states that the governmental strategy of affective citizenship becomes "organized around an economy of feelings: the design, circulation and distribution of legitimate feelings for and within the community delineate the codes of conduct of the good affective citizen and establishes a differential value in the currency of feelings." In Slotermeer, the result is a public sphere in which some emotions are recognized more than others. The reactions of those who feel excluded from this public sphere underscore the argument of governmentality-critics, who have warned against attributing to governmentality a coherence that it lacks and assuming the success of governmental projects in achieving the desired aims (see Clarke 2010; Larner 2005). Clarke et al. (2007, p. 33) state that governing is "a profoundly uneven and incomplete process in which subjects succumb, sign up, or comply but may also resist or prove recalcitrant and troublesome." A focus on governing through the whimsical nature of emotions teaches us just how delicate the process of assembling an affective citizen can be. It brings forth negative emotions as well and leaves a sense of fellow feeling and community far away. In Slotermeer, we see that affective citizenship does not so much bring a neighborhood community into being but does exactly the opposite; it provokes feelings of inclusion and exclusion among different groups of volunteers. In the end, the previous outsiders finally feel established, and the previously established feel like outsiders (cf. Elias [1976] 2005).

8. References

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Blokland, Talja. 2003. *Urban Bond:. Social Relationships in an Inner City Neighbourhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buckingham, Susan, Elodie Marandet, Fiona Smith, Emma Wainwright, and Marilyn Diosi. 2006. "The Liminality of Training Spaces: Places of Private/Public Transitions." *Geoforum* 37(6):895–905.

Bull, Anna Cento and Brian Jones. 2006. "Governance and Social Capital in Urban Regeneration: A Comparison Between Bristol and Naples." *Urban Studies* 43(4):767–786.

Clarke, John. 2010. "Enrolling Ordinary People: Governmental Strategies and the Avoidance of Politics?" *Citizenship Studies* 14(6):637–650.

Clarke, John and Janet Newman. 1997. *The Managerial State: Power, Politics and Ideology in the Remaking of Social Welfare*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

Clarke, John; Janet Newman, and Louise Westmarland. 2007. "Creating Citizens-Consumers? Public Service Reform and (Un)Willing Selves." pp. 125–145 in *On Willing Selves: Neoliberal Politics and the Challenge of Neuroscience*, edited by Sabine Maasen and Barbara Stutter. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillian.

De Wilde, Mandy. 2013. "Een gevoelige kwestie of een gevoelskwestie? Affectief burgerschap in de wijk in historisch perspectief." pp. 24-43 in *Als meedoen pijn doet. Affectief burgerschap in de wijk, edited* by Evelien Tonkens and Mandy de Wilde. Amsterdam: Van Gennep.

De Wilde, Mandy; Menno Hurenkamp, and Evelien Tonkens. 2014. "Flexible Relations, Frail Contacts and Failing Demands: How Community Groups and Local Institutions Interact in Local Governance in the Netherlands." *Urban Studies* 51.16: 3365 – 3383

Duyvendak, Jan Willem. 2011. *The Politics of Home: Belonging and Nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Elias, Norbert. [1976] 2005. *Gevestigden en Buitenstaanders: Spanningen en Machtsverhoudingen Tussen Twee Arbeidersbuurten*. Amsterdam: Boom.

Etzioni, Amitai. 1998. *The New Golden Rule: Community And Morality In a Democratic Society*. New York: Basic Books.

Forrest, Ray, & Ade Kearns. 2001. “Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood.” *Urban studies*, 38(12): 2125-2143.

Fortier, Anne-Marie. 2010. “Proximity by Design? Affective Citizenship and the Management of Unease.” *Citizenship Studies* 14(1):17–30.
—. 2007. “Too Close for Comfort: Loving thy Neighbor and the Management of Multicultural Intimacies.” *Environment and Planning D* 25(1):104–119.

Haus, Michael and Jan Erling-Klausen. 2011. “Urban Leadership and Community Involvement: Ingredients for Good Governance?” *Urban Affairs Review* 47(2):256–279.

Hochschild, Arlie. 2003. *The Commercialization of Intimate Life: Notes from Home and Work*. Berkeley, London: University of California Press.

Isin, Engin. 2004. “The Neurotic Citizen.” *Citizenship Studies* 8(3):217–235.

Johnson, Carol. 2010. “The Politics of Affective Citizenship: From Blair to Obama.” *Citizenship Studies* 14(5):495–509.

Larner, Wendy. 2005. “Neoliberalism in (Regional) Theory and Practice: The stronger Communities Action Fund in New Zealand.” *Geographical Research* 43(1):9–18.

Lawless, Paul; Mike Foden, Ian Wilson and Christina Beatty. 2010. “Understanding Area-Based Regeneration: The New Deal for Communities Programme in England.” *Urban Studies* 47(2):257–275.

Lister, Ruth. 1997. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.

Lowndes, Vivien and David Wilson. 2001. “Social Capital and Local Governance: Exploring the Institutional Design Variable.” *Political Studies* 49(4):629–647.

MacLeavy, Julie. 2009. “(Re)Analysing Community Empowerment: Rationalities and Technologies of Government in Bristols’ New Deal for Communities.” *Urban Studies* 46(4):849–875.

Maloney, William, Graham Smith, and Gerry Stoker. 2000. “Social Capital and Urban Governance: Adding a More Contextualized Top Down Perspective.” *Political Studies*, 48(4):802–840.

Marcus, George. 2002. *The Sentimental Citizen: Emotion in Democratic Politics*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Marinetto, Michael. 2003. "Who Wants to Be an Active Citizen? The Politics and Practice of Community Involvement." *Sociology* 37(1):103–120.

Martin, Deborah. 2002. "Constructing the 'Neighborhood Sphere': Gender and Community Organizing." *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 9(4):333–350.

Mookherjee, Monica. 2005. "Affective Citizenship: Feminism, Postcolonialism and the Politics of Recognition." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 8(1):31–35.

Muehlebach, Anadrea. 2012. *The Moral Neoliberal: Welfare and Citizenship in Italy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Newman, Janet, ed. 2005. *Remaking Governance: Peoples, Politics and the Public Sphere*. Polity: The Policy Press.

Newman, Janer and Evelien Tonkens. 2011. *Participation, Responsibility and Choice: Summoning the Active Citizen in Western European Welfare States*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

POSEIDON Partnership on Socio-Economic and Integrated Development of Neighbourhoods (2006) *Neighbourhood Management Guide*.

Putnam, R. 2004. *Better Together. Restoring the American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
—. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rose, Nicolas. 2000. "Community, Citizenship, and the Third Way." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43:1396–1411.
—1999. *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
—. 1996. "The Death of the Social? Re-Figuring the Territory of Government." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 25(3):327–356.

Uitermark, Justus. 2014. "Integration and Control: The Governing of Urban Marginality in Western Europe." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(4):1418-1436.

—. 2003 "'Social Mixing' and the Management of Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods: The Dutch Policy of Urban Restructuring Revisited." *Urban Studies* 40(3):531–549.

Uitermark, Justus and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2008. "Citizen Participation in a Mediated Age: Neighborhood Governance in the Netherlands." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32(1):114–134.

Van Gunsteren, Herman 1998. *A Theory of Citizenship: Organizing Plurality in Contemporary Democracies*. Boulder: Westview Press.

van Kempen, Ronald and Gideon Bolt 2009. "Social cohesion, social mix, and urban policies in the Netherlands." *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment 24*(4): 457-475.