# Fighting for Political Influence: The Tactics of the Dutch Bijlmer Squatters' movement, 1974-1976

*Thomas van Gaalen, Radboud University*

## Introduction

On August 20, 1974, a group of unexpected visitors entered the city hall of Amsterdam. They were the *Bijlmerkrakers* ('Bijlmer squatters'), a collective of Surinamese-Dutch squatters who had occupied a flat in the Bijlmer, one of Amsterdam's newly built suburbs. Their spokesperson, Just Maatrijk, stepped up to the front desk and requested an audience with mayor Ivo Samkalden.[1] His request was declined, and Samkalden refused to show up. But rather than walking out, Maatrijk and his companions sat down on the floor. The squatters raised placards and protest signs. They sang, clapped, and shouted. "We do not ask for preferential treatment," Maatrijk called. "We want social justice!"[2] In spite of the arrival of riot police, the protestors remained seated, repeating their primary accusation: Amsterdam and the Netherlands had broken their promises.[3]

Samkalden's playing field—institutional politics—has been studied thoroughly in works on the histories of decolonization and migration in the Netherlands.[4] But the case of the Bijlmerkrakers demonstrates that these histories were also lived and practiced outside conference rooms and parliaments—and, in this case, just outside the mayor's office. A movement which has largely been overlooked in Dutch histories of decolonization and of post-war squatting, the Bijlmerkrakers exemplify that politically marginalized Surinamese Dutch citizens in the Netherlands actively and fiercely participated in struggles over belonging, citizenship, and decolonization at a local level. This article highlights what tactics, ideas and strategies this group of Creole Surinamese migrants employed to respond to the political exclusion they faced in post-war Europe, and to influence Dutch decolonization, migration and housing politics.

Integrating recent developments in history from below with social movement studies and the historiography of migration, belonging and decolonization in the Netherlands, this article mobilizes recent reinterpretations of the Gramscian concept of political voicelessness to determine the social limitations imposed on the Bijlmerkrakers.[5] I connect this approach to Charles Tilly's notion of the contentious repertoire—the full set of tactics that is available to a movement in a given context—to interpret and contextualize which tactics the squatters employed over time to respond to, and resist, these limitations.[6]

The article argues that, between 1974–1975, the squatters broadened

the little room for political influence available to them by tapping into existing repertoires of struggle and by reworking these into a contextually specific mix of squatting tactics, civil rights strategies, and practices of coalition building. Doing so allowed the group to challenge exclusive and colonial conceptions of Dutch citizenship. Surinamese Dutch migrants excluded from the realm of representational institutional politics were thus able to improve their situation by building alternative pathways to political influence.

Understanding the dynamic political strategies and experiences through which these actors navigated the context of post-war decolonization historicizes scholarly work on contemporary migrant squatters in the Netherlands, and complements top-down histories of decolonial politics in the country.[7] Postcolonial migrations, demonstrates Guno Jones, sparked the post-war "Dutch political class," as well as Dutch media, to negotiate and redefine notions of Dutch citizenship.[8] Through the case of the Bijlmerkrakers, I argue that marginalized (post)colonial migrants in the Netherlands actively partook in these negotiations and employed an array of contentious tactics to do so. The article takes a recent statement by Jones as its starting point:

> Ask not what dominant conceptions of citizenship can tell about the lives of the colonized—ask what the lived experiences and perspectives of the colonized reveal about the unacknowledged and violent (and often silenced) formative shadows of modern citizenship.[9]

Picking up on this suggestion and extending it into a postcolonial context, this article charts how actors with reduced access to political means partook in political struggles over citizenship and migration.

In the following section, I first operationalize the core concepts of this article—in particular, political voicelessness and the contentious repertoire. Then, the article sketches the historical context of Surinamese decolonization and uses the concept of voicelessness to pinpoint the position that the Bijlmerkrakers inhibited within this context. Subsequently, the article analyzes the Bijlmerkrakers' initial protest tactics and argues that these were a mix of Dutch squatters' repertoires and civil rights tactics. Through these mixed tactics, the Bijlmerkrakers could specifically and forcefully appeal to their status as Dutch citizens in the face of a municipality that failed to recognize them as such. With the municipality repeatedly refusing their demands, the next section shows how the squatters leaned towards adversarial tactics, and openly challenged exclusive and racist conceptions of 'Dutchness.' Finally, I argue that the squatters strengthened their collective coherence and constructed crucial support networks that acknowledged their belonging to the Netherlands by invoking solidarity along four (overlapping) lines: Surinamese diasporic identity, anticolonial and Black Power identities, socialist identity, and squatters' identity. Reworking circulating repertoires into a specific amalgamation of tactics, the squatters challenged their exclusion from

institutional politics and exposed and confronted the exclusive, colonial connotations of Dutchness that had informed their marginalization.

**Voice(lessness) and Contention**

This article works from Antonio Gramsci's notion of the "subaltern," or the politically voiceless—a concept that became central to post-war studies of neglected 'common' people and working classes.[10] To understand Gramsci's idea of the 'voiceless,' it is central to also deal with the meaning of *voice*. What does it mean to have a political 'voice'—and what does it mean to lack one? For Gramsci, voicelessness meant displacement and exclusion from the socio-economic institutions through which society was structured and through which the means of production were distributed.[11] As Homi Bhabha argues in his postcolonial work on subalternity, the ruling positions of those who *do* have a voice—in other words, a say in the distribution of property and power—are always dependent on the existence of social groups that are more voiceless, or subaltern.[12]

In recent years, historians such as Karen Lauwers, Marnix Beyen and Willibald Steinmetz have zoomed in on this relational and codependent link between those with a 'voice' and those in a position of 'voicelessness,' taking it as the basis of a flexible and contingent framework of "scales of subalternity."[13] This framework refrains from strict distinctions between absolute power and absolute powerlessness. Integrating Gramsci, postcolonial subaltern studies and intersectional theory, it instead emphasizes that 'voice' and 'voicelessness' come in many shapes and guises, and vary over time and from setting to setting.[14] This framework accounts for the ways historical actors with varying, shifting degrees of subalternity and political influence have engaged in negotiations over influence and representation.[15] How, this scholarship asks, do those that lack a voice in one sphere attempt to make their concerns heard via other means, or through indirect influence?[16]

This article frames the Bijlmerkrakers' struggle with the Amsterdam municipality as such a negotiation. For this particular case study, it defines political voicelessness, with Gramsci, as *exclusion from the political means* able to tackle one's direct needs and problems. As a group of working-class migrants subjected to severe discrimination and marginalization upon their arrival in the Netherlands, the political influence of the Bijlmerkrakers was significantly curtailed.

But this does not mean the squatters were fully and unambiguously 'voiceless.' Since they were Dutch citizens, the squatters could, officially, vote, and they had access to Dutch social services.[17] Still, upon their arrival in Amsterdam, they were forced to stay in illegal, unregistered, ramshackle pensions, and, while there, received no help from Dutch social services, local organizations, or political parties.[18] In other words, in spite of having *some* political influence, the migrants were harshly excluded from the processes of decision-making that could tackle their basic housing needs. They thus inhibited a low position on the "scales of subalternity" directly related to their dire situation.

To (re)gain political influence, then, the Bijlmerkrakers were forced to resort to tactics and strategies located firmly outside the realm of institutional political decision-making—or, in other words, in places where their 'voice' could take up more room. Throughout this article, Charles Tilly's concept of the *contentious repertoire* functions as a conceptual lens to capture the specific tactics and tools they employed. The contentious repertoire represents the set of tactics and methods employed by a movement—a loosely organized group of actors which formulates and pursues a shared political goal—in a particular context.[19] Some of the tactics in a contentious repertoire might be appropriated, or adopted and adapted, from other movements.[20] The contentious repertoire is, in short, contextually specific and emerges from an interplay of a movement's goals, their position in society, the tactics and strategies circulating in that society at large, and sheer chance.[21]

Connecting social movement studies to recent histories from below, this article casts the contentious repertoire as an organic, evolving set of tactics that is intricately entangled with, and emerges from, the particular type and degree of subalternity of a given group. Moreover, using the concept of the contentious repertoire to bring the breadth of actions, tactics and activities practiced by the Bijlmerkrakers into clearer view, this article takes cue from critical race and gender studies scholar Philomena Essed, whose emphasis on the activities of migrants and refugees has provided an invaluable response to scholarship that renders migrants and refugees "passive victims of violence and disaster, or […] mere recipients of relief aid."[22]

To reconstruct the tactics and tools that the Bijlmerkrakers employed on the ground level, products through which the squatters voiced their concerns are analyzed. These sources—which include pamphlets, publications and protest song lyric sheets—were retrieved via the International Institute for Social History's archival collections on Amsterdam squatting histories.[23] Additionally, pamphlets, newspaper clippings and song recordings made digitally available by The Black Archives are used.[24] However, various contentious tactics—such as chants, sit-ins, and blockades—are embodied practices, and are underrepresented in textual sources produced by movements themselves. To reconstruct these, the article analyzes press coverage from historical publications and newspapers.[25]

**From Suriname to the Gliphoeve: Decolonization and Migration**

The root of the Bijlmerkrakers' struggles lies in post-war Surinamese-Dutch relations. In the years following the Second World War, the Dutch colony of Suriname pursued decolonization with increasing urgency. In an effort to appease the Surinamese decolonial movement, Dutch administrations granted every Surinamese citizen Dutch citizenship in 1954.[26] As a result, Surinamese citizens could freely enter the Netherlands, and Surinamese migration to the Netherlands increased.[27] Over the 1960s, increased Surinamese migration sparked media discourse over the sup-

posed 'criminality' and 'adjustment problems' of Surinamese Dutch citizens.[28] Their very presence, argues Jones, was increasingly cast as a "social problem."[29]

By the early 1970s, Dutch discourse on the decolonization of Suriname had become intertwined with discourse on migration. In Surinamese-Dutch negotiations over independence, curtailing Surinamese migration to the Netherlands became an increasingly central theme.[30] Surinamese independence would likely mean that Surinamese people would no longer be eligible for Dutch citizenship and would lose the right to enter and live in the Netherlands. For some politicians, therefore, independence was a potential way to curtail migration.[31]

All the while, migration increased. Between 1973 and 1975, 68,000 Surinamese migrants arrived in the Netherlands.[32] Political divisions between various Surinamese decolonization movements, as well as escalating tensions between Hindostanis and Creoles in Suriname, made moving to the Netherlands an increasingly attractive option.[33] Expecting harsher restrictions, many Surinamese migrants took their chance and crossed the Atlantic.[34]

In 1973, a centre-left cabinet led by the Dutch Labour Party came to power in the Netherlands. Around the same time, a pro-independence cabinet led by the National Party of Suriname (NPK) started governing Suriname.[35] These two social-democratic cabinets came to an agreement: Suriname would be independent by 1975.[36] This decision had an important effect on migration. The Dutch Labour cabinet refused to reveal whether it would impose stricter migration policies, a move that Jones considers a strategy to prevent a surge of last-minute Surinamese migrations to the Netherlands.[37] Nevertheless, the amount of Surinamese migrants went through the roof. Many Surinamese citizens decided to make use of their Dutch citizenship before it was too late, and in 1975, 40,000 people migrated from Suriname to the Netherlands.[38]

The Dutch state responded anxiously. The Labour Party quickly introduced a spreading policy (*spreidingsbeleid*), which would divide migrants across neighbourhoods to prevent the formation of US-style ghettos.[39] These spreading policies became a central part of Dutch *opvangbeleid*—or reception policy—which refers to the set of official procedures for receiving, administrating and housing refugees or migrants.[40] The main effect of these policies, however, was the systematic exclusion of non-white migrants from most Amsterdam neighbourhoods.[41]

Throughout Dutch media and political discourse on migration, new definitions of citizenship had started to emerge. In the early 1960s, Dutch politicians viewed the Surinamese as Dutch colonial citizens. The Surinamese had long been labeled colonial subjects—and because of this, Dutch politics saw them as different from inhabitants of the Netherlands—but they were citizens nonetheless.[42] By the early 1970s, however, a stricter separation between Surinamese and Dutch 'people' had been constructed.[43] Surinamese migrants were now labeled *allochtoon*. This new political term, in its literal Dutch meaning, referred to something non-native or emerging from a different soil, and distinguished Surinamese migrants from white

Dutch *autochtoon* natives.[44] Dutch citizenship, in other words, was reimagined along strict spatial demarcations and ethnic identities.

By 1973, many newly arrived Surinamese Dutch citizens were forced to move into ramshackle pensions that were silently tolerated by Dutch administrations. Interviews with inhabitants of these pensions from the early 1970s testify that conditions were harsh. Toilets malfunctioned, electricity and water supplies were unreliable, and up to twenty people would live in single rooms with no windows and a small hatch instead of a door.[45] There were few legal ways out. To realize its "spreading policies," the social-democratic municipality of Amsterdam made agreements with property management companies to close neighbourhoods to Surinamese migrants. Many estate agents, meanwhile, refused to engage with Surinamese migrants on their own behalf.[46] Some migrants repeatedly contacted the municipality to protest their substandard housing situation, but to no avail.[47] In this particular context, then, a situation of *political voicelessness* was imposed on the migrants. Though they were legally Dutch citizens, their right to vote, or to Dutch social services and housing standards, failed to aid the migrants in obtaining adequate housing.

A few miles away, the Bijlmer, an ambitious new housing project, remained largely uninhabited.[48] The project failed to attract its intended audience of young white middle-class families, who were put off by the Bijlmer's lack of public transport and shops.[49] When some of the neighbourhood's housing companies started renting out apartments to Surinamese migrants instead, many of the other companies feared that these new inhabitants would drive away their remaining white customers. The companies thus decided to stop accepting non-white tenants altogether.[50]

A collective of Surinamese migrants, fed up with their living conditions and their exclusion from the housing market, took matters into their own hands. In the night of June 28, 1974, the group broke into the 80 empty apartments—out of a total 100—of the Gliphoeve I flat building, and moved into the Bijlmer overnight.[51] Most of the squatters were young Creoles—a subsection of the Surinamese population among which radical pro-independence sentiments were particularly prevalent—and the group included mostly newlyweds and young families from the pensions.[52] Around 90 families participated in the action.[53] They hung banners from the balconies and decorated their windows with placards and posters.[54] On the morning that followed the action, several Amsterdam squatter groups joined forces with *Landelijk Overleg van Surinaamse Organisaties in Nederland* (National Consultation of Surinamese Organizations in the Netherlands, LOSON), an umbrella network of left-wing Surinamese Dutch organizations, at Amsterdam's Museum square. Together, they hosted a solidarity demonstration and celebration of the squatting actions.[55]

The Bijlmerkrakers immediately drew the scrutiny of Dutch media, as well as the Amsterdam municipality. After Labour Party mayor Samkalden refused to negotiate with the squatters and called for their eviction, the Bijlmerkrakers set up

protest campaigns to highlight and criticize the living conditions of Surinamese migrants, as well as Dutch housing problems in general.[56] The next section addresses which tactics the squatters utilized, and from which sources they took inspiration in constructing their contentious repertoire. The section also shows how these tactics related, and responded, to the specific forms of voicelessness the squatters had experienced.

**Living is a Right. Working with the Squatters Next Door**

In a 1974 interview with Surinamese Dutch newspaper *De Rode Ster*, an anonymous Bijlmerkraker stressed the terrible living conditions of many Surinamese migrants and emphasized that the Amsterdam municipality was the true culprit.[57] In the end, she asserted, it was the responsibility of Dutch administrations to resolve housing problems for their citizens: "It is absurd to blame this [housing] shortage on the 'overpopulation' of the cities. If there is a shortage of houses, new houses should be built for the population. But this does not happen!"[58]

This quote captures an outlook that was fundamental to the Bijlmerkrakers. The squatter emphasizes the responsibilities of Dutch political rulers toward their 'population.' As Dutch citizens, the Bijlmerkrakers *were* a part of this population and, therefore, had a legal right to the country's social securities. By using the general term 'population' to cover the issues faced by Surinamese migrants, the squatter thus defied the divergence between white *autochtoon* Dutch citizens and non-white *allochtoon* citizens that had become increasingly prevalent in the political discourse of the time.[59] Surinamese migrants were as much a part of the population as anyone else, her comments suggest, and their right to housing should not be the subject of discussion.

A similar line of argumentation resurfaces throughout the protest slogans and media appearances used by the squatters right after their occupation of the Gliphoeve flats. As Dutch citizens, the Bijlmerkrakers argued via their banners, pamphlets, and newspaper interviews, they should not be denied the fundamental right to housing—and in the absence of government support, they claimed this fundamental right for themselves.[60] Squatting, then, held two functions for the Bijlmerkrakers. First, it offered an immediate way out of the housing crisis experienced by the squatters. In the night of June 28, the squatters had replaced their crammed, damp pensions with decent apartments. Secondly, squatting was a heavily symbolic move. It allowed the Bijlmerkrakers to point out the Dutch administration's failure to provide its own citizens with adequate housing and emphasized the squatters' need for this last illegal resort.

A rousing pamphlet by LOSON exemplifies the Bijlmerkrakers' stance toward municipal policy—or rather, municipal "misgovernment"—and framed the group's actions as having relevance for Amsterdam housing issues in general: "No evictions! The Bijlmerkrakers call for support. From the Bijlmermeer to Jordaan (e.g. pension de Tijdsgeest) and Nieuwmarkt, inhabitants are threatened

to be removed from their homes. End this misgovernment by the municipality and the landlords. Living is a right, not a favor."[61] This final sentence underscores the issue at the heart of the squatting actions: exclusion from the basic rights that ought to come with Dutch citizenship.

But the tactic of squatting also helped obtain political leverage. Now the squatters had claimed the apartments as their own, they were suddenly in the spotlight of Dutch media. And while mayor Samkalden could easily refuse the large quantities of letters the group had sent from their pensions, he was now forced to acknowledge the squatters' existence, and to reflect on their actions in public.[62] Squatting, then, functioned as an alternative—if unconventional—route to enforce access to institutional politics.[63]

In an interview with newspaper *De Tijd* following the occupation of the flats, Maatrijk revealed that gaining access to meetings with the municipality was indeed a key goal for the squatters.[64] Maatrijk considered the squatters ready for a conversation with Samkalden, and underscored they would be reasonable conversation partners: "We will be weighing what the municipality of Amsterdam and the housing corporations want."[65]

The Bijlmerkrakers were not the only collective on the block using the contentious tactic of squatting. Since the late 1960s, various squatters' collectives had been active in Amsterdam. *Aktie'70* ('Action'70'), a left-wing committee affiliated with the countercultural environmental anarcho-socialists of the *Kabouterbeweging* ('gnome movement'), had pioneered the use of squatting as a tactic to exert pressure on policymakers.[66] For Aktie'70, squatting was one of many tactics in a repertoire that urged for revised municipal housing policies.[67] By 1971, emergent radical left-wing squatters' groups—such as SJ ("Socialist Youth")—saw squatting as a form of self-organization that could be an outright alternative to municipal politics.[68] Locally organized groups emerged across Amsterdam and grew into a sizable squatters' network.[69]

The Bijlmerkrakers benefited from the existence of this scene and, with it, the availability of an elaborate squatting repertoire. Encounters with local squatters, argue several former Bijlmerkrakers in the 2017 radio documentary 'Gliphoeve,' inspired them to use squatting tactics for their own ends.[70] Pamphlets reveal that the Bijlmerkrakers co-organized its June 29 demonstrations with other squatters' organizations—in particular with Aktiegroep Nieuwmarkt, a squatters' action group that had been protesting the evictions of squatters in the Amsterdam neighbourhood Nieuwmarktbuurt.[71]

Adapting the locally accessible repertoires of the Amsterdam squatters' scene, then, helped the Bijlmerkrakers defy the voicelessness imposed on them. As for Aktie'70 and SJ, squatting functioned as a means of obtaining leverage and pressuring institutional politics. But in contrast to the radical anti-authoritarian stance of the SJ, which used squatting to advocate an anarchist-influenced system of politics over municipal politics, the Bijlmerkrakers explicitly pushed

for a dialogue with Mayor Samkalden. And in contrast to the organizers of Aktie'70, for whom squatting was one of many projects alongside participation in municipal elections and founding communal farms, the Bijlmerkrakers had to do with their newly acquired leverage. With evictions looming and with little access to other political tools, the Bijlmerkrakers' best bet was convincing Samkalden to provide better housing.[72] The squatters, like many subaltern groups deprived of "basic needs," were thus, to use the words of historian Eduardo Elena, forced "to engage with state gatekeepers who [control] the provisioning of infrastructure."[73]

But Maatrijk also made clear that the movements' willingness to engage in dialogue should not be mistaken for a willingness to compromise. "The Surinamers," he argued in *De Tijd,* "will not bow down this time. We will not let them get us, like they got the Turks in Rotterdam's Afrikaanderbuurt."[74] Here, Maatrijk referred to the 1972 riots in the Afrikaanderbuurt, which broke out after a Turkish Dutch home-owner evicted a white tenant. In response, white labourers attacked the shops, homes, and cafes of Turkish Dutch labourers. Subsequently, Turkish migrants took to the streets and clashed with the police. The result was a week of upheaval and violence that resulted in the removal of various Turkish inhabitants.[75] This time, Maatrijk suggested, migrants would win.

The messages of the many protest banners that the squatters hung from their flats and carried during marches echoed Maatrijk, and bridged defiance and pragmatism. "Den Uyl, Samkalden, we demand a good reception policy for Surinamese and Antilleans," so stated a sign addressed to the mayor and the Dutch prime minister.[76] "Stop undemocratic spreading policies in favour of better, affordable houses," read another.[77] These slogans showcase that the squatters explicitly challenged the Dutch government's exclusive housing policy and its increasingly strict division between *allochtonen* and *autochtonen*. Apart from emphasizing that Surinamese migrants belonged to a general Dutch "population," then, and thereby *implicitly* problematizing divisive political discourse, the squatters also *explicitly* critiqued the active marginalization of non-white citizens and migrants, such as "Turks," "Surinamese and Antilleans."[78]

**A Foot in the Door. Adapting a Civil Rights Repertoire**

The occupation of the Gliphoeve flat, the June 29 march, and the squatters' subsequent media appearances failed to convince Samkalden. The mayor refused to deliberate with the squatters.[79] In response, the Bijlmerkrakers started employing another protest tool—the sit-in. On August 20, a group of squatters led by Maatrijk entered the municipal hall of Amsterdam and refused to leave the building until securing a meeting with Samkalden.[80] Nearly 100 families participated in the action.[81] Press photographs testify to the group's diversity. They show men and women of all ages as they sit side by side and chant in unison. A young man in a beret and a colourful shirt stands next to a man in a dark suit who pushes a

pram. An older woman with an umbrella—grey curls, light jacket—accompanies them.[82]

The squatters' display of nonviolent protest was cut short by the arrival of riot police. In a wave of blue, officers—helmets, truncheons, shields, accompanied by angrily barking dogs—came pouring in. The protesters remained stoic. Slowly but steadily, however, they were coerced to leave the building. By the time the protesters were outside, press photographers had arrived at the scene, and the action was covered in local papers. The sit-in seemed to pay off—on August 21, the squatters were granted an audience with Samkalden and started to engage in talks.[83]

The nonviolent tactics the Bijlmerkrakers employed, their emphasis on the moral obligations of their higher-ranking adversaries, and their attempts to negotiate with institutional politicians differ from the repertoires of their squatting contemporaries. In 1974, squatters' collectives such as the *Amsterdamse Aktie Partij*—an offshoot of Aktie'70—refused to negotiate with politicians, focused on building local, autonomous communes, and engaged in violent clashes with the police to defend their houses.[84] The tactics employed by the Bijlmerkrakers, in contrast, were reminiscent of the US American civil rights movement repertoire. By securing legal and political reforms to counter the oppression of African Americans in the United States, the civil rights movement popularized the use of nonviolent tactics, such as the mass march and the sit-in, to challenge authorities with superior powers.[85]

That these tactics found their way into the Bijlmerkrakers' repertoire is far from surprising. By 1974, the repertoire of the civil rights repertoire had been adopted across the world. In Amsterdam, the Kabouterpartij, as well as various student organizations and left-wing collectives, had staged sit-in protests across the 1960s.[86] The key to the popularity of the civil rights repertoire was its efficacy against adversaries with greater access to political power.[87]

Radical squatters' collectives, such as SJ and AAP, also faced marginalization through evictions, police intimidation, and lack of municipal aid.[88] But their struggles differed from those of the Bijlmerkrakers in a key aspect: while most members of the SJ and AAP fell into the category of *autochtoon* and were seen and treated as self-evidently Dutch in political and media discourse, the Bijlmerkrakers faced exclusive definitions of citizenship that distinguished them, and set them back, from white citizens born within the national borders of the Netherlands.[89] White squatters, in other words, self-evidently belonged in the Netherlands. To many Dutch media and politicians, the Bijlmerkrakers did not.

For the Bijlmerkrakers, then, resisting the municipality was not only an issue of housing. Housing problems, in the case of the Bijlmerkrakers, intricately intertwined with struggles over belonging, or, with Marco Antonsich, attempts to renegotiate the political "boundary discourses and practices which separate 'us' from 'them.'"[90] Rather than actively constructing barricades and fighting po-

lice—tactics that emphasize opposition to, and difference from, authorities—the Bijlmerkrakers thus engaged with the Dutch institutions that had normalized and institutionalized exclusive conceptions of citizenship, and they demanded being let in. And for these purposes, the civil rights repertoire was an accessible and useful toolkit.

The negotiations between Samkalden and the squatters would, however, prove to be a long and difficult process. At the first meeting, Samkalden proposed that he would be willing to have a talk with the city's housing corporations—if the squatters would first leave their flats.[91] The squatters refused.[92] Samkalden cut off the negotiations.[93]

Following their failed first meeting with the mayor, the squatters resorted to their earlier tactics. They staged marches and new sit-in actions. After the squatters disrupted a municipal meeting by continuously chanting 'no evictions,' forcing Samkalden to cancel the meeting halfway through, they were finally granted a second audience.[94] This strategy exemplifies the cyclical approach of nonviolent tactics. As media scholar Lara Shalson shows, nonviolent protesters often engage in the performance of endurance.[95] They repeatedly expose their bodies to adversaries that dispose of the means to harm, remove and oppress them, thus forcing their opponents to choose between violent engagement—which, in a political climate shaped by mass media, might significantly harm these opponents' reputations—or offering the protesters a seat at the table. With each failed attempt at securing the latter, nonviolent protesters can return to square one, and serve their opponents the same choice.[96]

Maatrijk's uncompromising stance towards the municipality and his continued references to the violent riots in the Afrikaanderbuurt exemplified another tactic characteristic of the civil rights repertoire.[97] By referring to the slumbering potential of violent resistance, Maatrijk, like civil rights leaders such as Martin Luther King, underscored the urgency of reform by pointing to the possibility of a more violent and explosive outcome.[98]

The second meeting the squatters managed to enforce through nonviolent tactics was more successful. The squatters finally realized some of their direct aims through institutional politics: the municipality agreed to provide adequate housing. 'Agreement reached,' a headline in *De Tijd* ran. "Squatting action has been halted under the condition that a solution will be found for all those involved within fourteen days."[99] Maatrijk expressed he was 'reasonably content,' but hoped that, above all, this agreement would spur the municipality to deal with housing issues in "a structural manner."[100] Maatrijk further admitted that the agreement was, in his view, not optimal, as he desired more thorough solutions to the general challenges posed by immigration and the presence of Surinamese migrants.[101] In other words: although the squatters had realized a solution to their housing problems, their exclusion from the Dutch notions of citizenship that had informed immigration and housing policies remained unsolved.

**Depleted Repertoires. The Limits of Nonviolent Tactics**

Towards the end of August, 1974, the municipality of Amsterdam violated its agreement. It announced evictions, and retracted its promise to help the squatters find new homes. The protesters returned to the city hall, and again proclaimed that Samkalden had broken his promises. This time, Samkalden had the police immediately remove the squatters.[102] 'I will not be forced!' fumed Samkalden in a press statement.[103]

As they saw their chances at a productive negotiation dwindle, the Bijlmerkrakers struck an increasingly harsh tone, indicating a departure from strictly nonviolent pressure tactics. A month earlier, Maatrijk had only addressed the issue of racism very hesitantly. 'Discrimination may not be the right term,' Maatrijk had reluctantly responded after *De Tijd* had asked him if he accused the Dutch of racial discrimination, "but let's just say that there is an issue of bad selection here."[104] Furthermore, Maatrijk assured, the Bijlmerkrakers in no way blamed the Dutch themselves. Rather, the squatters intended to challenge a faulty and disembodied "system."[105]

These reluctant comments contrast remarkably to Maatrijk's rhetoric towards the end of August. The municipality, Maatrijk now argued, practiced "colonial actions."[106] If police were to carry out the evictions, warned Maatrijk, a long war of "bloody resistance" would erupt.[107] He predicted that "there [would] be family members of police officers who will never forget these actions," since the squatters would move 'well into the realm of violence' in their search for solutions.[108] A repeated imposition of voicelessness, then, pushed the Bijlmerkrakers toward a breaking point, after which repertoires of violence were seen as increasingly appropriate.

But although the squatters rhetorically toyed with violent tactics, the Bijlmerkrakers' subsequent actions still kept to the collective's nonviolent protest repertoire. The squatters announced more sit-in actions, set up a petition, and, in interviews, emphasized that they wanted to avoid the spilling of blood.[109] However, they now openly condemned the municipality as discriminatory and decried the presence of racism in Dutch society at large. The municipality, a pamphlet argued, followed an "unreasonable, racist policy […] that appeals to racist sentiments in this society."[110] Rather than renegotiating notions of Dutch citizenship through dialogue with political institutions, the squatters now took an increasingly adversarial stance toward the municipality.

The squatters' adversary approach paid off. Although they failed to secure another meeting with the mayor, the Bijlmerkrakers attracted the support of the Amsterdam radical left, as well as housing organizations. A collective of left-wing organizations, spearheaded by the Politieke Partij Radicalen (Radical Political Party, PPR), a party associated with the Dutch New Left, published an open letter demanding to call off the evictions.[111] Plenix, a community organization in the Bijlmer, said they were "shocked by the authoritarian actions" of the municipality.[112] Community group Zuidoostlab accused Samkalden of refusing to engage in open con-

versation and took judicial steps against the municipality of Amsterdam for violating democratic principles.[113] Housing corporations Ons Belang and Zomers Buiten—two organizations that had refused their services to non-white buyers just months prior—now announced they were willing to offer contracts to the squatters, and expressed disapproval with the municipality. Even the municipality's own communication department released a statement declaring that the mayor's decisions were impossible to justify.[114]

The squatters finally managed to realize a direct solution to their housing problems through a last tool—one that relied on the country's legal institutions. In January 1975, the squatters requested an official check of several pensions across Amsterdam. Under media scrutiny, the municipality gave in, and unsurprisingly, all pensions failed to meet minimal housing standards.[115] According to Dutch Surinamese newspaper *Wrokoman:*

> […] the squatters have coerced the municipality of Amsterdam into allowing more than seventy people to stay in their houses. Nobody needs to return to dirty pensions anymore. The municipality has been forced to reject these ramshackle barracks as valid shelters.[116]

As a result, the squatters were permitted to stay in the Gliphoeve flat.[117] On the one hand, the disqualification of the pensions thus helped the squatters in achieving their direct goal: acquiring adequate housing. At the same time, this legal victory underscored the squatters' resistance against the discriminatory policies emerging from exclusive notions of Dutch citizenship. The squatters, like other Dutch citizens, had every right to adequate housing, so the verdict ran.[118] And the municipality had now been forced to admit this.

**Behind the Front Line. Solidarity Against Limitation**

The previous sections primarily deal with tactics employed at the squatters' front lines. But it is important to also take into account the tactics, publications, and cultural production that emerged behind these front lines. As sociologist Hanspeter Kriesi notes, a movement's attempts at facilitating internal coherence and alliances with other movements are often less visible from the outside—but these attempts are nevertheless crucial to the outcomes of a movement's actions.[119]

In the case of the Bijlmerkrakers, going behind the front line is especially relevant. Since their very presence in the Netherlands was challenged by political and media discourse, the Bijlmerkrakers had to handle their repertoire with care, since they could not rely on a self-evident sense of belonging. A case in point, here, is the squatters' shifting public stance towards systematic racism. Maatrijk's initial reluctance to engage with the topic of racism in Dutch indicates he actively steered clear of this sensitive issue.[120] That the Bijlmerkrakers were, in fact, busy with the cultivation of assertive collective identities and alliances becomes clear when reconstructing the protest tools employed by the Bijlmerkrakers to mobilize and rouse their adherents and allies, rather than to directly convince their adversaries. Behind

the front line, the Bijlmerkrakers engaged with the political concept of *solidarity*. And this engagement proved key in the movement's eventual successes.

The term "international solidarity" was commonly used in international left-wing and socialist discourse by the early 1970s.[121] With the increased popularity of international socialism in the early twentieth century, international solidarity between the diverse groups suffering from capitalist oppression became an important point on the agendas of socialist and communist organizations.[122] After the Second World War, communist-inspired anticolonial movements spearheaded a resurgence of actions geared towards establishing international left-wing solidarity. These new calls for solidarity were avidly picked on by communist groups, as well as by the European and American New Left.[123]

Solidarity denotes unity, and specifically, as sociologist Kurt Bayertz defines, "unity (as of a group or class) that produces or is based on a community of interests, objectives, and standards."[124] Solidarity, then, is based on identification with an imagined community, to use Benedict Anderson's term, that shares certain (political) interests. But with this affective identification come certain obligations.[125] To social movement scholar Dieter Rucht, solidarity "implies the expectation and practice of mutual support."[126] In other words, if a movement successfully calls for solidarity, it may receive aid from movements that heed its calls. Employing a rhetoric of solidarity, then, has strategic advantages for those dealing with political voicelessness.

The Bijlmerkrakers constructed solidarity alongside, roughly put, four lines (which, in practice, sometimes overlapped). The first of these was an assertive, liberational sense of solidarity with Surinamese people—both in Suriname and in diaspora. Across pamphlets, protest signs, and posters, words and phrases in Sranantongo signalled the Bijlmerkrakers' linkage to Surinamese culture.[127] A protest sign called upon 'brada en siesi' ('brothers and sisters,' in Sranantongo) to support the squatters' struggle.[128] Between painted banners and cardboard signs, Surinamese flags were used.[129] The squatters brought allies, friends and families together in a festive *Konmakandra*—Sranantongo for "coming together"—with music, food and art.[130]

Through the Amsterdam-based Surinamese Dutch record label Wrokoman (Sranantongo for 'labourer'; the name signalled the label's socialist leanings), the squatters' Bijlmerkoor (Bijlmer choir) also released a double single with two protest songs that had been sung throughout the squatters' actions.[131] The choir's collaboration with Wrokoman—a label with a niche following of Surinamese migrants—suggests that their songs were specifically intended to muster support among Surinamese Dutch migrant audiences. Accordingly, the single artwork emphasized a distinct Surinamese cultural identity. Its bright red cover featured the five-pointed star of the Surinamese flag, and described its contents as "Surinamese battle songs."[132]

A strong sense of Surinamese solidarity resonates through the Bi-

jlmerkoor's musical repertoire.[133] 'Krakers fu Bemre,' (Sranantongo for 'Squatters of the Bijlmer') the first song of the choir's single, opens with a distinctly Caribbean rhythm. As steel drums kick in, maraca's and buleador drums meander and ripple through the song in polyrhythms. After a chorus of trumpets starts to punctuate the groove with upbeat stabs, the choir's vocal harmonies launch into a plea for decent housing that incorporates sentences in Dutch as well as Sranantongo.[134]

The presence of these two languages in the choir's songs underscores the complex but undeniable entanglement of the Netherlands and Suriname.[135] The Creole migrants of the Bijlmerkrakers identified as Surinamese, and spoke Sranantongo, a language particular to Suriname. At the same time, they had grown up speaking Dutch, and were Dutch citizens.[136] By exhibiting this multifaceted cultural heritage, the Bijlmerkoor implicitly but strongly problematized notions of Dutchness that strictly separated the Netherlands from its former colonial regions, and that constructed Surinamese migrants as "'not belonging to the nation and yet living inside it."[137]

Although the squatters' musical production seems to have largely been directed at the movement's following among Surinamese migrants, music was also employed on the movement's front line. Various news reports describe instances of singing and steel drum performances at squatters' demonstrations and sit-ins.[138] On the one hand, this integration of songs in protest actions could be construed as a merely tactical move: historically, songs in many shapes and guises have been used to anchor the bodily movement of crowds.[139] But, as memory scholars Daniele Salerno and Marit van de Warenburg argue, songs simultaneously 'remember' and connect contemporary actions to past movements and cultural traditions.[140] The movement's employment of music with distinctive Surinamese-Dutch characteristics, then, suggests that the Bijlmerkrakers actively remembered and affirmed the specific musical traditions of Suriname.

Doing so, they refused Dutch preconditions for citizenship that demanded, as sociologist Gloria Wekker puts it, "that those features that the collective imaginary considers non-Dutch […] are shed as fast as possible and that one tries to assimilate."[141] By connecting symbols of Surinamese identity to protest slogans and chants that reaffirmed their position as Dutch citizens, they cultivated what Essed et al. dub a "sense of home and meaningful life" that was anchored in Surinamese heritage, but that was also firmly located within, rather than outside, Dutchness.[142]

Secondly, the Bijlmerkrakers stressed their proximity to transnational black emancipation movements such as the civil rights movement, the emergent black power movement, and anticolonial movements. In newspaper interviews from 1975, the Bijlmerkrakers foregrounded their support for anticolonial struggles all over the world.[143] Photographs of the Bijlmerkoor capture the singers with a raised Black Power fist (a symbol that was also included on the cover of the choir's single), and the attire worn by the younger squatters mirrored American Black Power activists' taste for berets, leather jackets, flared jeans, and afro hair styles.[144] Through their

performance and engagement with transnational black movements, the Bijlmerkrakers built upon a long tradition of pan-African and anticolonial solidarity and drew on Black Power fashions to cultivate a strong, empowering sense of identity.[145] In this sense, they asserted their grounding in the historical black diasporic networks that Paul Gilroy dubbed the "Black Atlantic."[146]

Thirdly, the squatters cultivated a sense of solidarity with socialist networks. The Bijlmerkrakers worked closely with LOSON, which, aside from asserting its Surinamese identity and its anticolonial stance, had explicit Marxist leanings. The squatters also maintained ties with socialist Surinamese-Dutch organizations such as Wrokoman, newspaper *De Rode Ster*, and anticolonial Marxist activists.[147] Furthermore, they employed a decidedly anti-capitalist rhetoric. "The banks, the trade sector, and insurance companies are allowed to build their offices and safes wherever they want," argued a squatter in an interview with the socialist Surinamese Dutch newspaper *De Rode Ster*.[148] "How deceitful it is to blame housing shortages on the arrival of the Surinamese while complete neighbourhoods are being demolished in front of the eyes of millions of people, only to please capital!"[149]

In a similar tone, the Bijlmerkoor musically addressed housing shortages in anti-capitalist terms: "Offices for capitalists while our neighbourhoods are taken down; capitalists and the municipality, they're speaking in the same tongue."[150] Within the networks of Surinamese organizations such as LOSON and Wrokoman—networks that built on a rich left-wing and communist anticolonial tradition—Marxist theory was a popular lens to interpret and structure the struggle for Surinamese self-determination.[151] A look behind the squatters' front line thus shows that, when engaging with these allies, the squatters expressed radical, anti-capitalist sentiments—radical sentiments that might have led to a backlash when expressed 'out in the open' in their conversations with the municipality.

The Bijlmerkrakers' sustained reliance on anti-capitalist rhetoric and their engagement with Surinamese-Dutch Marxist organizations helped expand the squatters' networks. The squatters gradually attracted the attention and support of Dutch left-wing media and parties (with the notable exception of Samkalden's Labour Party, which maintained its hostile stance towards the squatters). Communist newspaper *De Waarheid* ("the truth") concurred with the Bijlmerkrakers' assessment that capitalism was a primary cause for their terrible housing conditions.[152] The newspaper pleaded for solidarity with the squatters and accused the "right-wing media" of drawing a racist and false causal relation between criminal incidents in the Bijlmer and the presence of the squatters.[153] The left-wing PPR similarly called for solidarity with the squatters and proved to be a valuable aid for the Bijlmerkrakers after publishing the aforementioned open letter.[154] Through their engagement with socialist ideas, the squatters forged ties with allies from the Dutch left, and managed to reap the fruits of solidarity.

Finally, and as indicated above, the squatters actively fostered a sense of solidarity with squatters' organizations by emphasizing their shared struggle against Dutch housing policies. From the outset of their actions, the Bijlmerkrakers joined forces with squatters' groups such as Aktiegroep Nieuwmarkt, and hosted "solidarity" marches and protests with these groups.[155] The Konmakandra event further cultivated the Bijlmerkrakers' links to Amsterdam squatters' collectives. It invited allies from Surinamese, socialist and squatters' circles, and was intended to strengthen "unity between Surinamese, Dutch and foreigners in the battle for affordable homes."[156] Throughout 1974 and 1975, the Bijlmerkrakers actively sustained this unity. The Bijlmerkrakers attended various squatters' protests to express their solidarity with the squatters' movement at large.[157] On November 2 , 1974, for instance, the Bijlmerkrakers participated in a march to express solidarity and support for squatters "from Bijlmermeer to Jordaan."[158] On December 3, the Bijlmerkrakers protested against evictions of squatters that took place to clear room for a new metro line.[159] The squatters' struggles, the Bijlmerkrakers explained, were a "shared struggle."[160]

**Conclusion**

The case of the Bijlmerkrakers exemplifies the active ways in which Dutch colonial migrants participated in negotiations over citizenship and belonging. Much historical scholarship on decolonization and migration in the post-war Netherlands has concentrated on institutionally political decision-making, as well as on political and media discourse. The Bijlmerkrakers illustrate that Surinamese Dutch migrants utilized a plethora of organizational and contentious tactics to insert themselves into these political processes.

Resisting the particular forms of marginalization and political 'voicelessness'—relegation to illegal, sub-standard housing, exclusion from political decision-making and social services—imposed upon them on account of their exclusion from conceptions of Dutch citizenship, the Bijlmerkrakers drew from various contentious repertoires to improve their situation. In highlighting how the Bijlmerkrakers employed a particular combination of squatters' tactics, nonviolent civil rights repertoires and practices of solidarity and network building, this article showcases how the dynamic process of repertoire building relates and answers to the specific forms of subalternity experienced by the actors at hand. The article thus hopes to underscore the analytical value of combining the Gramscian concept of subalternity—specifically, as reworked by Lauwers, Beyen and Suedenjoki—and Tilly's framework of the contentious repertoire, as this combination helps analyze how (post)colonial migrants in Europe developed, with Essed, 'strategies to cope with racism' and exclusion, and forced entry into negotiations over citizenship and belonging.[161]

Analyzing the case of the Bijlmerkrakers using the theoretical lenses of subalternity and the contentious repertoire reveals that (post)colonial migrants

faced with subalternity and exclusion from national identity creatively and flexibly combined tactics from their next-door neighbors, from globally circulating repertoires, and practices of community and network building. The case of the Bijlmerkrakers thus also emblematizes, with such scholars as Gilroy and Essed, the close relation between cultural practices of belonging and home-making—through, for instance, community festivals, musical practices, clothing—and tactics and practices that political history and social movement studies more easily tend to label 'political.' Adding to the discussions opened up by these scholars, the article offers a potential framework for grasping in a systemic way how protest strategies, political negotiations, and cultural practices interrelate and overlap as elements in (post)colonial migrants' historical mechanisms to assert belonging and to fight marginalization and political voicelessness.

**NOTES**

[1] Het Parool, "Protestactie Surinamers in Stadhuis," *Het Parool*, August 20, 1974, https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?query=bijlmerkrakers+stadhuis&coll=ddd&identifier=ABCDDD:010837348:mpeg21:a0118&resultsidentifier=ABCDDD:010837348:smpeg21:a0118&rowid=6.
[2] Het Parool.
[3] Het Parool.
[4] See: Guno Jones, *Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders: Nederlandse politici over burgers uit Oost & West en Nederland 1945–2005* (Amsterdam: Rozenberg, 2007); John Schuster, *Poortwachters over immigranten: het debat over immigratie in het naoorlogse Groot-Britannië en Nederland*, Migratie- en etnische studies 9 (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1999); Hans Ramsoedh, *Surinaams onbehagen: een sociale en politieke geschiedenis van Suriname, 1865–2015* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2018).
[5] Marnix Beyen, Karen Lauwers, and Sami Suodenjoki, *Subaltern Political Subjectivities and Practices in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: Between Loyalty and Resistance*, 1st ed. (New York: Routledge, 2023).
[6] Charles Tilly, *The Contentious French* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014).
[7] Philomena Essed, ed., *Refugees and the Transformation of Societies: Agency, Policies, Ethics and Politics*, Studies in Forced Migration 13 (New York: Berghahn, 2006); Deanna Dadusc, "Squatting and the Undocumented Migrants' Struggle in the Netherlands," in *Migration, Squatting and Radical Autonomy*, Routledge Research in Place, Space and Politics Series (New York: Routledge, 2017), 275–84; Jones, *Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders*; Ramsoedh, *Surinaams onbehagen*; Schuster, *Poortwachters over immigranten*.
[8] Guno Jones, "Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders: Nederlandse politici over burgers uit Oost & West en Nederland 1945–2005" (Amsterdam, Rozenberg, 2007), 19.
[9] Guno Jones, "Citizenship Violence and the Afterlives of Dutch Colonialism," *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism* 27, no. 1 (March 1, 2023): 100.
[10] Beyen, Lauwers, and Suodenjoki, *Subaltern Political Subjectivities and Practices in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*.
[11] Marcus E. Green, "Rethinking the Subaltern and the Question of Censorship in Gramsci's Prison Notebooks," *Postcolonial Studies* 14, no. 4 (2011).
[12] Laura Garcia-Morena and Peter C. Pfeiffer, "Unsatisfied: Notes on Vernacular Cosmopolitanism," in *Text and Nation: Cross-Disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities* (Columbia: Camden House, 1996), 191–207.
[13] Beyen, Lauwers, and Suodenjoki, *Subaltern Political Subjectivities and Practices in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*; Willibald Steinmetz, Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey,

and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, eds., *Writing Political History Today*, History of Political Communication 21 (Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 2013).
[14] Beyen, Lauwers, and Suodenjoki, *Subaltern Political Subjectivities and Practices in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*.
[15] Beyen, Lauwers, and Suodenjoki.
[16] Beyen, Lauwers, and Suodenjoki.
[17] Jones, *Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders*.
[18] Miguel Heilbron, "ZWARTBOEK: Segregatie in Amsterdam En de Rol van Discriminerend 'Spreidingsbeleid' Door de Gemeente in de Jaren '70," *The Black Archives Blog*, July 24, 2017, https://www.theblackarchives.nl/tba-blog/zwartboek-segregatie-in-amsterdam-en-de-rol-van-discriminerend-spreidingsbeleid-door-de-gemeente-in-de-jaren-70; "Huisvesting Gastarbeiders Laat Veel Te Wensen Over," *Reformatorisch Dagblad*, December 17, 1971, https://www.digibron.nl/viewer/collectie/Digibron/id/tag:RD.nl,19711217:newsml_4f0c9574a8914a5aec4aa0acde401e07.
[19] Tilly, *The Contentious French*. In social movement studies, social movements are often conceptualized as political efforts organized at a low, grassroots level. Although social movements can overlap with other organizations, social movements, as an analytical category, are often distinguished from, political parties, NGO's, and private enterprises. See: Davita Silfen Glasberg and Deric Shannon, *Political Sociology: Oppression, Resistance, and the State* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press, 2011); David A. Snow, Sarah Anne Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, eds., *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements: New and Expanded Edition*, Wiley Blackwell Companions to Sociology (Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell, 2018).
[20] Charles Tilly and Sidney G. Tarrow, *Contentious Politics* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015).
[21] Tilly and Tarrow.
[22] Philomena Essed, ed., *Refugees and the Transformation of Societies: Agency, Policies, Ethics and Politics*, 1. paperback ed., repr, Studies in Forced Migration 13 (New York: Berghahn, 2006), 2.
[23] Collections used include *Documentatiecollectie Solidariteitsbewegingen in Nederland* (COLL00284), *Archief Aktiegroep Nieuwmarkt* (ARCH02413), *Archief Kraakkunsten Cultuur* (ARCH04643), *Archief LOSON* (ARCH03174) in the International Institute of Social History.
[24] Notable sources include digitized Surinamese-Dutch newspapers—such as *De Rode Ster*—and digitized recordings of the (protest) songs used by the Bijlmerkrakers.
[25] To obtain and select press coverage, digital Dutch-language newspaper database *Delpher* was used. Its collections were searched using the temporal parameters "01-01-1974 – 31-12-1975," and using different search terms related to the case study at hand, such as "Bijlmer," "Bijlmerkrakers," "Kraak*," "Krakers*," "Kraken," "Gliphoeve," "Surinam*," "Samkalden," "Maatrijk."

[26] Miguel Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders," *De Correspondent*, October 14, 2017, https://decorrespondent.nl/7450/niet-voor-surinamers-amsterdam-sloot-complete-wijken-voor-niet-witte-nederlanders/53c251b3-f7eb-0d7e-2177-2a7057260d1d#:~:text='Niet%20voor%20Surinamers.,niet%2Dwitte%20Nederlanders%20%2D%20De%20Correspondent&text=Hoewel%20Surinamers%20in%20de%20jaren,masse%20in%20de%20Bijlmer%20terecht.

[27] Guno Jones, "Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders: Nederlandse politici over burgers uit Oost & West en Nederland 1945-2005" (Amsterdam, Rozenberg, 2007), 218-219.

[28] Jones, 220-222.

[29] Jones, 222.

[30] Jones, 224.

[31] Jones, 244; Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[32] Jones, 241.

[33] Ramsoedh, *Surinaams onbehagen*.

[34] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[35] John Schuster, *Poortwachters over immigranten: het debat over immigratie in het naoorlogse Groot-Britannië en Nederland*, Migratie- en etnische studies 9 (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1999), 154.

[36] Schuster, 153.

[37] Jones, "Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders," 153.

[38] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[39] Heilbron, "ZWARTBOEK: Segregatie in Amsterdam En de Rol van Discriminerend 'Spreidingsbeleid' Door de Gemeente in de Jaren '70."

[40] Heilbron; Essed, *Refugees and the Transformation of Societies*.

[41] Heilbron, "ZWARTBOEK: Segregatie in Amsterdam En de Rol van Discriminerend 'Spreidingsbeleid' Door de Gemeente in de Jaren '70."

[42] Jones, "Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders," 244–245.

[43] Jones, "Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders," 244.

[44] Jones, 244. The terms "autochtoon" and "allochtoon" became a mainstream set of concepts in research, policy and governmental texts. Only in 2016 did the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) retire the terms. See: Masja de Ree, "Termen Allochtoon En Autochtoon Herzien," *CBS.Nl*, October 25, 2016, https://www.cbs.nl/nl-nl/corporate/2016/43/termen-allochtoon-en-autochtoon-herzien.

[45] "Huisvesting Gastarbeiders Laat Veel Te Wensen Over"; Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[46] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor

Niet-Witte Nederlanders."
[47] "Huisvesting Gastarbeiders Laat Veel Te Wensen Over."
[48] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."
[49] Nadia Ezzeroili, "De Kraakactie Die de Bijlmer Voorgoed Veranderde," *De Volkskrant*, September 6, 2017, https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/hoe-de-bijlmer-de-bijlmer-werd-het-verhaal-van-de-voormalige-gliphoeve-bewoners~bff251d4/.
[50] "Gliphoeve" (VPRO, 2017), https://www.vpro.nl/programmas/gliphoeve/.
[51] Ezzeroili, "De Kraakactie Die de Bijlmer Voorgoed Veranderde."
[52] Ramsoedh, *Surinaams onbehagen*.
[53] Het Vrije Volk, "Kraakactie in Bijlmer Succesvol," *Het Vrije Volk*, July 16, 1974.
[54] Retrieved via photos in the *Stedelijk Museum.* Stedelijk Museum, "In the Presence of Absence," *Stedelijk.Nl*, September 2, 2020, https://www.stedelijk.nl/nl/digdeeper/wendelien-van-oldenborgh#image-43138.
[55] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."
[56] Laurens Ham, *Op de Vuist: Vijftig Jaar Politiek En Protestliedjes in Nederland* (Amsterdam: Ambo/Anthos, 2020), 115.
[57] De Rode Ster, "De Actie in de Bijlmer," *De Rode Ster*, November 1974, https://web.archive.org/web/20201022231926/https://www.theblackarchives.nl/wat-willen-wij-met-de-donaties-doen.html.
[58] Translated by author, from: "Onzinnig dit tekort te wijten aan de 'overbevolking' van de steden. Wanneer er een tekort aan woningen bestaat moeten er ter plaatse meer bijgebouwd worden voor de bevolking. Maar dat gebeurt niet!" De Rode Ster.
[59] Jones, "Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders," 244.
[60] Komitee Solidariteit met de Krakers van de Bijlmer, "Geen Ontruiming! De Bijlmerkrakers Roepen Op Tot Steun," 1974, ARCH03174 Archief LOSON, International Institute for Social History; De Rode Ster, "De Actie in de Bijlmer."
[61] Translated by author, from: "Geen ontruiming! De bijlmekrakers roepen op tot steun. Van bijlmermeer tot jordaan (o.a. pension de tijdgeest) en nieuwmarkt worden nu bewoners met huisuitzetting bedreigd. Stop dit wanbeleid van gemeente en huisbazen. Wonen is geen gunst maar een recht."
"Geen Ontruiming," n.d., ARCH03174 Archief LOSON, Box 74, International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
[62] Het Vrije Volk, "Samkalden: Geen 'Dictaat' van Bijlmerkrakers," *Het Vrije Volk*, August 21, 2023,
[63] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."
[64] De Tijd, "Massale Kraakactie van Surinamers in de Bijlmer," *De Tijd*, June 26, 1974,

[65] Translated by author, from: "Daarna zullen we gaan peilen wat de gemeente Amsterdam en de woningbouwverenigingen willen doen." De Tijd.
[66] Eric Duivenvoorden, *Een voet tussen de deur: geschiedenis van de kraakbeweging [1964-1999]* (Amsterdam: Uitg. De Arbeiderspers, 2000), 51.
[67] Duivenvoorden, 51.
[68] Duivenvoorden, 51–52.
[69] Duivenvoorden, 99.
[70] "Gliphoeve."
[71] Duivenvoorden, *Een voet tussen de deur,* 99; Komitee "Solidariteit met de Krakers van de Bijlmer," "Poster 'Geen Ontruiming.'"
[72] Het Vrije Volk, "Samkalden: Geen 'Dictaat' van Bijlmerkrakers."
[73] Beyen, Lauwers, and Suodenjoki, *Subaltern Political Subjectivities and Practices in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,* 17.
[74] Translated by author, from: "De surinamer zal dit keer niet door de knieen gaan. Wij laten ons niet pakken, zoals de Turken in de Afrikaanderbuurt in Rotterdam." De Tijd, "Massale Kraakactie van Surinamers in de Bijlmer."
[75] Nationaal Archief, "Vlam in de Pan!," *Nationaalarchief.Nl*, March 6, 2012, https://www.nationaalarchief.nl/beleven/verhalenarchief/vlam-in-de-pan.
[76] Translated by author, from: "Den Uyl / Samkalden / Wij eisen een goed opvangbeleid voor sur. en antillianen." Retrieved via photographs of the actions in the Amsterdam *Stedelijk Museum*: Stedelijk Museum, "In the Presence of Absence," *Stedelijk.Nl*, September 2, 2020, https://www.stedelijk.nl/nl/digdeeper/wendelien-van-oldenborgh#image-43138.
[77] Translated by author, from: "Stop ondemocratisch spreidingsbeleid / Voor betere, betaalbare huizen."
Retrieved via: Stedelijk Museum.
[78] Slogans criticizing Den Uyl's hypocrisy were used avidly: "Den Uyl / we willen progressief beleid voor surinamers en antillianen!"; "Samkalden's antwoord op surinaamse zoekenden is 'rot op' uit onze flats!" Retrieved via: Stedelijk Museum.
[79] Het Parool, "Protestactie Surinamers in Stadhuis."
[80] Het Parool; Het Parool, "Protest Tegen Ontruiming," *Het Parool*, April 11, 1974; Het Vrije Volk, "Samkalden: Geen 'Dictaat' van Bijlmerkrakers."
[81] Het Parool, "Bijlmer-Krakers Wensten Gesprek," *Het Parool*, August 20, 1974; Het Parool, "Protest Tegen Ontruiming"; NRC Handelsblad, "Bijlmerkrakers Beraden Zich over Verdere Acties," *NRC Handelsblad*, August 20, 1974.
[82] Het Parool, "Protestactie Surinamers in Stadhuis."
[83] NRC Handelsblad, "Samkalden Naar Krakers Bijlmerflats."
[84] Duivenvoorden, *Een voet tussen de deur,* 99.
[85] Aldon D. Morris, "A Retrospective on the Civil Rights Movement. Political and Intellectual Landmarks," *Annual Review of Sociology* 25, no. 1 (1999), 528-529.
[86] Duivenvoorden, *Een voet tussen de deur,* 29.
[87] Aldon D. Morris, "A Retrospective on the Civil Rights Movement. Political and

Intellectual Landmarks," *Annual Review of Sociology* 25, no. 1 (1999), 528-529.
[88] Duivenvoorden, *Een Voet Tussen de Deur*.
[89] Jones, *Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders*; Heilbron, "ZWARTBOEK: Segregatie in Amsterdam En de Rol van Discriminerend 'Spreidingsbeleid' Door de Gemeente in de Jaren '70."
[90] Marco Antonsich, "Searching for Belonging – An Analytical Framework," *Geography Compass* 4, no. 6 (June 2010): 655.
[91] De Tijd, "Massale Kraakactie van Surinamers in de Bijlmer."
[92] De Tijd.
[93] De Tijd.
[94] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."
[95] Lara Shalson, *Performing Endurance: Art and Politics since 1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 28.
[96] Shalson, 28-29.
[97] De Tijd, "Massale Kraakactie van Surinamers in de Bijlmer"; NRC Handelsblad, "Bijlmerkrakers Beraden Zich over Verdere Acties."
[98] August H. Nimtz, "Violence and/or Nonviolence in the Success of the Civil Rights Movement: The Malcolm X–Martin Luther King, Jr. Nexus," *New Political Science* 38, no. 1 (January 2, 2016): 1–22.
[99] Translated by author, from: "Overeenstemming bereikt. […] Kraakactie is stopgezet onder voorwaarde dat binnen veertien dagen voor alle betrokkenen een verantwoorde oplossing zal worden gevonden." De Tijd, "Regering En Amsterdam Zoeken Naar Opvang Voor Surinamers," *De Tijd*, July 2, 1974, https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?query=regering+en+amsterdam+zoeken+naar+opvang&coll=ddd&identifier=ddd:011236631:mpeg21:a0032&resultsidentifier=ddd:011236631:mpeg21:a0032&rowid=2.
[100] Translated by author, from: "Redelijk tevreden […] structureel aan te pakken." De Tijd.
[101] Translated by author, from: "problemen van de immigratie moeten worden betrokken." De Tijd.
[102] Het Parool, "Protestactie Surinamers in Stadhuis."
[103] Het Vrije Volk, "Samkalden: Geen 'Dictaat' van Bijlmerkrakers."
[104] Translated by author, from: "Noem het dan niet gediscrimineerd maar er wordt wel vervelend geselecteerd." De Tijd, "Regering En Amsterdam Zoeken Naar Opvang Voor Surinamers."
[105] De Tijd.
[106] Translated by author, from: "kolonialistische actie." De Volkskrant, "Bijlmer-Krakers Dreigen Met 'bloedig Verzet'," *De Volkskrant*, October 25, 1974.
[107] Translated by author, from: "bloedig verzet." De Volkskrant.
[108] Translated by author, from: "bloedig verzet"; "lange oorlog"; "Maar dit houdt ook in dat er familieleden van de politieagenten zullen zijn die het politie-optre-

den nooit meer kunnen vergeten. Wij zullen onze oplossing tot geweld zoeken." De Volkskrant.
[109] De Volkskrant.
[110] Translated by author, from: "Onbehoorlijk racistisch beleid […] dat appelleert aan racistische gevoelens in deze samenleving" De Volkskrant.
[111] De Volkskrant.
[112] Translated by author, from: "Geschokt door de autoritaire acties." De Volkskrant.
[113] De Volkskrant.
[114] "Gliphoeve"; De Volkskrant, "Bijlmer-Krakers Dreigen Met 'bloedig Verzet'."
[115] Wrokoman, "Bijlmerkraakaktie Suksesvol," *Wrokoman*, January 1975, https://www.stedelijk.nl/en/digdeeper/wendelien-van-oldenborgh-en#image-97926.
[116] Translated by author, from: "…de krakers hebben van de gemeente amsterdam afgedwongen dat al meer dan 70 mensen in de huizen kunnen blijven. Niemand hoeft meer terug naar de vieze pensions. De gemeente is gedwongen de bouwvallige barakken af te keuren als opvangcentra." Wrokoman.
[117] Wrokoman.
[118] Wrokoman.
[119] Hanspeter Kriesi, "New Social Movements and Political Opportunities in Western Europe," *European Journal of Political Research* 22, no. 2 (1992), 209-212.
[120] De Tijd, "Regering En Amsterdam Zoeken Naar Opvang Voor Surinamers."
[121] Zeina Maasri, Cathy Bergin, and Francesca Burke, eds., *Transnational Solidarity: Anticolonialism in the Global Sixties*, Racism, Resistance and Social Change (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2022).
[122] Maria Todorova, *The Lost World of Socialists at Europe's Margins. Imagining Utopia, 1870s–1920s* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020), 283.
[123] Maasri, Bergin, and Burke, *Transnational Solidarity*.
[124] Kurt Bayertz, ed., *Solidarity*, Philosophical Studies in Contemporary Culture 5 (Dordrecht Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999): 281.
[125] Bayertz, 282.
[126] Alison Bailey and The Center for Peace and Justice Education, Villanova University, "On Intersectionality, Empathy, And Feminist Solidarity: A Reply To Naomi Zack," *Journal for Peace and Justice Studies* 19, no. 1 (2009): 14; Dieter Rucht, "Distant Issue Movements in Germany: Empirical Description and Theoretical Reflections," in *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere* (Michigan, 2000), 77.
[127] Pamphlets and posters, ARCH03174 Archief LOSON, Boxes 72-74, International Institute for Social History, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
[128] Retrieved via: Stedelijk Museum, "In the Presence of Absence."
[129] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[130] LOSON, "Poster Kommakandra."
[131] The label Wrokoman was affiliated with the Surinamese Dutch newspaper of the same name, as well as Surinamese Dutch network LOSON. Ham, *Op de Vuist,* 115.
[132] Bijlmerkoor, *Krakers Fu Bemre*, 1974, The Black Archives, https://youtu.be/CpwfxKnAJdA.
[133] De Bijlmerkrakers, "Bow Tap Egi Krakti," n.d., COLL00284 Documentatiecollectie Solidariteitsbewegingen in Nederland, International Institute for Social History; De Bijlmerkrakers, "Krakers Fu Bemre," n.d., COLL00284 Documentatiecollectie Solidariteitsbewegingen in Nederland, International Institute for Social History.
[134] Bijlmerkoor, *Krakers Fu Bemre*.
[135] Bijlmerkoor, "Lyric Sheets," n.d., ARCH04643 Archief Kraakkunst- en Cultuur, International Institute for Social History.
[136] Jones, *Tussen onderdanen, rijksgenoten en Nederlanders*.
[137] Essed, *Refugees and the Transformation of Societies,* 109.
[138] Het Parool, "Protestactie Surinamers in Stadhuis"; NRC Handelsblad, "Snelle Charges van Politie Breken Verzet in Nieuwmarkt," *NRC Handelsblad*, April 8, 1975, https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?query=bijlmerkrakers&coll=ddd&page=2&identifier=KBNRC01:000032706:mpeg21:a0030&resultsidentifier=KBNRC01:000032706:mpeg21:a0030&rowid=1.
[139] Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison, *Music and Social Movements: Mobilizing Traditions in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
[140] Daniele Salerno and Marit Van De Warenburg, "'Bella Ciao': A Portable Monument for Transnational Activism," *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 26, no. 2 (March 2023): 181.
[141] Gloria Wekker, *White Innocence: Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 7.
[142] Het Parool, "Protestactie Surinamers in Stadhuis"; NRC Handelsblad, "Snelle Charges van Politie Breken Verzet in Nieuwmarkt"; Nira Yuval-Davis, *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations* (London: Sage, 2011), 203; Philomena Essed and Isabel Hoving, eds., *Dutch Racism*, Thamyris / Intersecting: Place, Sex and Race, no. 27 (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V, 2014), 11.
[143] Karel Bagijn, "Werken Met Één Doel. Bevrijding Suriname," *Het Parool*, September 6, 1975, retrieved via copies in *Stedelijk Museum*. https://www.stedelijk.nl/nl/digdeeper/wendelien-van-oldenborgh#image-43138.
[144] Bijlmerkoor, *Krakers Fu Bemre*; Het Parool, "Protestactie Surinamers in Stadhuis"; Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."
[145] Reiland Rabaka, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Pan-Africanism*, Routledge Handbooks (London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020), 1–3;

Tanisha C. Ford, "Soul Generation. Radical Fashion, Beauty, and the Transnational Black Liberation Movement, 1954–1980," *Journal of Pan African Studies* 5, no. 1 (2012), 294.

[146] Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (London: Verso, 2002).

[147] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[148] De Rode Ster, "De Actie in de Bijlmer."

[149] Translated by author, from: "Wel mag het bank-, handels-, en verzekeringswezen de stad volbouwen met hun kantoren en kluizen. Hoe misleidend is het niet het woningtekort te wijten aan de komst van de Surinamers hier naar toe, terwijl onder de neus van miljoenen mensen hele woonwijken worden gesloopt ten genuste van het kapitaal!" De Rode Ster.

[150] Translated by author, from: "Kantoren voor kapitalisten, onze wijken die gaan er aan, Kapitalisten en gemeenten, die spreken dezelfde taal." De Bijlmerkrakers, "Krakers Fu Bemre."

[151] Luna Hupperetz, "Cineclub Vrijheidsfilms. Restoring a Militant Cinema Network," *The Moving Image* 22, no. 1 (2022): 56; Jones, "Citizenship Violence and the Afterlives of Dutch Colonialism."

[152] Bart Schmidt, "Surinaamse Stemmen Uit de Bijlmer. Rassistische Misdaad-Stories Geven Onwerkelijk Beeld," *De Waarheid*, August 2, 1975, https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?query=gliphoeve&coll=ddd&page=2&identifier=ddd:010375612:mpeg21:a0110&resultsidentifier=ddd:010375612:mpeg21:a0110&rowid=2.

[153] Schmidt.

[154] De Volkskrant, "Bijlmer-Krakers Dreigen Met 'bloedig Verzet'."

[155] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[156] Translated by author, from: "eenheid tussen surinamers, nederlanders en buitenlanders in de strijd voor goede betaalbare woningen." LOSON, "Poster Kommakandra."

[157] NRC Handelsblad, "Snelle Charges van Politie Breken Verzet in Nieuwmarkt"; Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant, "Strijdbare Stemming Tegen Afbouw Oostlijn," *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, March 12, 1974.

[158] Heilbron, "'Niet Voor Surinamers.' Amsterdam Sloot Complete Wijken Voor Niet-Witte Nederlanders."

[159] Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant, "Strijdbare Stemming Tegen Afbouw Oostlijn."

[160] Translated by author, from: "gedeelde strijd." Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant.

[161] Philomena Essed and Isabel Hoving, eds., *Dutch Racism*, Thamyris / Intersecting: Place, Sex and Race, no. 27 (Amsterdam: Rodopi B.V, 2014), 24.