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Abstract

In this paper, I explore on people of Groningen experience on earthquake as an impact of gas extractivism in Groningen, The Netherlands. I examine vulnerability meanings from various social dimensions in Groningen to get a richer understanding and a better picture of Groningen.

I utilise feminist political ecology as it is linked feminist economist and feminist political ecology to criticise and challenge the neoliberal ideology of the state to drive away from economic interest and put its citizen well-being into first place. As it happens in Groningen, people in Groningen are overcoming vulnerability by going together to criticise The Dutch government economic interest on gas extractivism in Groningen by doing "care", "common", and "enough". People of Groningen challenge The Dutch government to stop gas extractivism and put its citizen well-being as the government priority.

Relevance to Development Studies

Development projects are mostly focusing on so-called ‘Global South’ countries. It is a common practice in the development project to put ‘Global North’ as a projection of ‘Global South’ development goals. After European crisis, there are ‘Global North’ countries that falling into multiple crises. The development discourse should be changed since “the best practice” country has fallen. This research aims to bring a case of ‘Global North’ country, The Netherlands, as the sixth happiest country in the world, into the surface to bring the discussion that there is something wrong with the development thinkers. This is not about ‘Global North/Global South’, ‘affluence/poor country’, ‘develop/developing country’ but growth ideology behind the idea of state economic structure that putting economic interest beyond citizen well-being.
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Chapter 1: Research Statement

I came to study in The Netherlands with beautiful images of the country in my mind. Like many foreign students I was imagining the Netherlands as a country with many windmills producing energy to sustain and care for the environment. This beautiful picture I got from Dutch tourism advertisements and souvenirs I received in my childhood. As an Indonesian feminist who was studying gay studies, The Netherlands serves as examples of gender diversity and equality. I saw the Netherlands as a trajectory of Indonesia, especially during cultural diversity clash. At that time, I was not conscious of how much my ideas were formed by colonialism.

On February 2017, I read a comment in Facebook’s discussion about Dakota’s pipelines that said American should learn from what has happened in eGroningen where gas extractivism is causing earthquakes. I was not sure how to react when I read that. Earthquakes because of gas extractivism in this flat country? How come extractivism in an advanced country like the Netherlands, causes such problems? How can a state with a welfare system, allow its citizens to suffer, and what sort of care deficit was this of The Dutch state to its citizen?

I was skeptical until I found Lucas Amin’s article in the Guardian that left me silent. In this article, Lucas Amin shared his investigative report on gas extractivism in The Netherlands which induces earthquakes and wrecks buildings. He introduced his readers to three people’s experiences on impacts of

Figure 1. Lucas Amien’s article in The Guardian. In this picture is Annamarie Heite in front of her house.
gas extractivism in the Groningen. They are Annemarie Heite, Jur Huizinga, and Nicolette Marie. Three of them were living in wrecked homes and suffered from the care deficit from Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij (NAM) and the government. Annemarie Heita and Jur Huizinga were facing a demolition schedule for their houses. While Nicolette Marie was vulnerable due to her husband’s health condition, the failing housing market in Groningen was not conducive for her to sell her house.

I recalled what has happened in Sidoarjo in East Java, Indonesia, where gas extractivism has induced mud volcano from the 2006. Their 40,000 people were displaced and left vulnerable because their houses, their farms, their schools, mosques, markets and many buildings were covered by mud (Nuwer 2015). After 9 years of failing to comply the Indonesian government lent $2.1 billion to Lapindo Brantas; the company, to financially compensate the victims. The Lapindo Brantas argues for having financial difficulties.

![Figure 2. Gas Extractivism sets mud volcano in Sidoarjo, East Java, Indonesia. (Nurhadi 2015)](image)

Looking at what has happened in Groningen and Sidoarjo make me think more about how extractivism has changed people’s lives. Whether in a rich or poor country, so call developed or developing country, South or North, institutionally advanced or institutionally bad country, good or bad governance, coloniser or colonised country extractivism was happening. Realising this opened the way for me to question further about development process and was a turning point for me to decolonise my mind away from my assumption that ing development was all about progress and benefit to people and Indonesia needed to follow the example of The Netherlands.

During my research, I found that my Dutch participants were very open to speaking about their sense of vulnerability. My participants expressed emotions such as feeling helpless, angry, insecure and sad. I listened to their unanswered questions like ‘how come the government letting their citizens to live like this?’, ‘Why can’t we negotiate with the gas companies?’. The first
question left me silent. It showed such vulnerability, which I could recognize as an Indonesian who felt the state did not look after people. But I saw a difference to how many Indonesians responded as the first question was always followed by the second question. I could see how their energy transformed from being vulnerable into being determined. Their determination became stronger when I asked them what the government should do regarding gas extractivism. They suggested to reduce, and stop, gas extractivism in Groningen.

Those interviews lead me to see how important it was to acknowledge people’s emotions and experiences. Their vulnerability was experienced but the vulnerability coping mechanism moved to finding ways to “care” for others and to a sense of “commoning”. It leads to their resistance to gas activity by demanding that it would be reduced and there should be an end to drilling. In feminist political ecology (FPE), it is known as “enough” (Wichterich 2015).

In my research, I utilise FPE as my theoretical framework. FPE offers me a holistic framework to understand social relational perspective of the emotional well-being as embodied political concerns around extractivism and ecological actions (Harcourt and Nelson 2015), environment (Rocheleau 1996), political economy (Wichterich 2015, Sunberg 2017). FPE explores political power relations including the interrelationship between local, national and global politics (Thomas-Slattery, Wangari and Rocheleau 1996, Harcourt and Nelson 2015). Furthermore, as I interacted with my participants, I found key words that kept resonating such as neoliberal agenda, privatisation, and green economy. These terms also fit well with FPE theory which is critical of the neoliberal agenda in economy, politics, and environment.

As Christa Wichterich (2015: 81) states on multidimensional crises in European crisis in her article on care, commoning common, and enough that “as a systemic crisis has rebooted discourses in civil society, social movements and critical academic communities” on shifting paradigm to challenge “hegemonic development model” that based on growth interest, wealth accumulation, and “commodification of nature”. The multidimensional crises have proofing a failure of economic growth and it leads discussion on care, commons and enough to revitalise livelihoods, environment, and nature.

Aim of my research

My research aims to explore people’s lived experience of the earthquakes caused by the impact of gas extractivism in Groningen. I analyse their emotional experience of vulnerability, and their coping mechanism expressed in the discourse of care, commoning the common, and enough.

Research questions:

1. How do people experience earthquakes caused by gas extractivism in Groningen?
   a. How do they feel their vulnerability?
   b. What are their strategies for overcoming vulnerability?
2. How can an FPE framework care, commons and enough explain the experience of people in Groningen?
3. How has this research shifted my own academic and personal understanding of development?

Theoretical framework: Feminist Political Ecology

Isn’t it funny that all people in power that we are dealing now are all men?”
(Frans, 03-08-2017)

“From Minister of Economy, Henk Kamp, to Director of National Coordinator Groningen, Hans Alders.”
(Sam, 03-08-2017)

“And the biggest; Mark Rutte.”
(Frans, 03-08-2017).

I met Frans and Sam from Maria, aged 45. She introduced me to Frans, an Indo-Dutch man aged 37, who has the same hair-coloured as mine, dark black eyes, and white skin-coloured. He invited me to have an Indonesian lunch, chicken rendang, in his house with his partner, Sam, a beautiful Dutch woman aged 33 with long blond hair, blue eyes, and same skin-coloured as Frans. I was sipping my coffee while we had interview about it. Later that afternoon, we discussed about why all-powerful people related to extractivism in Netherland are men.

FPE brings feminist theory to political ecology, so that gender becomes a critical variable and social what? determines who has or can gain access to and control over natural resources. This moves us beyond a simple dualism between gender and the environment (Thomas-Slayter, Wangari and Rocheleau 1996: 289; Plumwood 1993; Matthews 2017: 59). In FPE, gender serves as a “set of complex and intersecting power relations” (Arora-Jonsson 2011: 750). Therefore, it is imperative to see how gender is a critical variable in people’s attempts to protect their environment. In line with beyond a simple dualism, Rocheleau et al (1996: 6) states “Women, men, and children are maintaining and developing their own places on the planet through daily management of the living landscape”.

As theoretical framework, FPE advanced feminist theory into environmental studies in early 1990s (Sunberg 2016: 270). FPE looks at “the very definition of environment” and “the gendered discourse of environment science, environmental right and resources, and environmental movements” (Rocheleau, Thomas-Slayter, and Wangari 1996:5).
Locating FPE: vulnerability

“In Help us.”

(Jonn, 04-08-2017)

In my research vulnerability emerged as the strongest emotion and expression, for both men and women. I follow Robert Chambers (1989:1) on defining vulnerability as a state of being “defenselessness, insecurity, and exposure to risk, shocks and stress”. His definition is in line with my data coding where most repeated words from my participants are insecure, risk, hopeless, defenselessness and stress when it comes to answering and explaining vulnerability.

For example, I met Jonn in a Coffee Company in Groningen city. We were the only customers who were taking a break with smoking outside the café. He was asking what brought me to Groningen from The Hague. I shared with him my research aims. He gave me his reaction with a deep breath and sad sight. I felt like I could not do anything to make it less painful. He shared how gas extractivism wrecked his neighbour’s farmhouse and forced them to abandon it. His house is wrecked. His family is torn apart. His wife moved out with their two daughters to Hoofddorp. He is now living in a van.

Jonn shared his experience with many deep sighs and tears in his eyes. That moment his vulnerability challenged the ‘masculinity’ represented by his tattoos. Extractivism had led him to exposing his vulnerability and dismantle his masculinity to a stranger.

In FPE, vulnerability is not defined by sex nor biology. Being a man or a woman does not determine someone’s vulnerability to environmental hazard or disaster. Sarah Bradshaw (2014: s54) argues that gender is socially constructed on “what it means to be a man and woman” and how gender is linked to being neither vulnerable nor virtuous (Arora-Jonsson 2011).

Locating FPE on Vulnerability Coping: Care, Commons and Enough

Being vulnerable in Groningen was not felt just as an individual condition. In Kaffertocht on 16 August 2017, people coped with their vulnerability by coming together to express their rights as people of Groningen to negotiate, and demand an end to drilling. Their demands could be seen in slogans, pictures, petition, and protests.

As with many places in the world, the neoliberal imperative has lead to “economic impoverishment”, depleting resources, “environmental degradation” and “gender inequities” (Mehta 1996: 180). Christa Wichterich (2015: 69) argues that neoliberal agenda has brought multiple crisis in “economic, ecological, and social efficiency” with so much emphasis on economic growth.

Christa Wichterich’s discussion of care, common and enough provides a critical framework for my study. Her analysis looks at wealth accumulation and ‘green economy’ concept in Rio De Janeiro showing the interlinkage of the multiple crisis in “economic, ecological, and social efficiency” due to economic growth (Wichterich 2012; 2015). Wichterich’s discussion of “Accumulation by
dispossession” can be related to the Groningen context of care, common and enough as an expression of people’s coping mechanism and resistance to Dutch neoliberal agenda of extractivism and the care deficit to affected citizens. As stated by Harcourt and Nelson (2015:11) care, common and enough become “key sites” to resisting and troubling “efficiency and growth logic” and it offers to replace mainstream discourse of ‘green economy’.

Care as Holistic Care

In neoliberal ideology, human beings are solely motivated by self-interest. Selfless behaviour such as compassion, love, duty, altruism, and care are considered as non-market sector with no economic value. In line with perspective on male as breadwinner, the care is assigned to women (Beneria 2003: 68).

Criticising neoliberal ideology in domesticate women, feminist economist develops care economics. Care economics draws attention to every day life and the embodied practice of micro-politics in households. Care economics address pivotal role of women in unpaid work that contributes to the national economy (Luxton 2006: 37; Beneria 2003: 43). It acts as an “inclusive citizenship” and “social protection” for unpaid and paid care work (Ra-zavi 2007), and social provisioning for society to sustain and to achieve flourished life (Nelson 2005:6; Power 2004:6). Wichterich refers to Nidhi Tandon’s work on redefining care economics to be not limited to economic sphere but in a broader sense; “holistic care”. Tandon (2013: 22) explains that “holistic care” should cover three dimensions:

First, “care to community and society today” by “securing human dignity and quality of life” (Nightingale 2006; Nightingale 2015; Miller, Hallstein, and Quass 1996; Thompson-Hall, Carr and Pascual 2016).


Third, “care for nature through nurturing biogenetic vitality, biodiversity, regenerations and stewardship” (Walsh 2015; Harris 2015). “Holistic care” is about protecting and sustaining for today’s society, preserving for intergenerations, and loving nature as vital point in human life and it’s ecosystem. Care that is not only about caring to another human being but also nature.

In the context of Groningen, ‘holistic care’ manifests itself in peoples’ everyday life experiences. Caring for their family safety due to living in wrecked homes, caring for their neighbourhood by helping them to repairing houses, caring by reducing demand and stopping gas drilling, caring for the dykes, and caring for their animals.

Common as negotiating the common

Garrett Hardin’s (1968) “The tragedy of the commons” is one approach to understanding the commons, where the misuse of the commons lead to tragedy as the resource becomes unavailable to everyone or depleted. Based on a neoclassical approach, “the tragedy of the commons” argues that “indi-
individual self-interest” (Staveren 2015: 189) or “individual exploitation” (Wade 2005: 62) that causes a depletion of common-pool resources. To manage and prevent “tragedy of the commons”, Hardin suggests a solution that depends on privatisation (Hardin 1968: 1247; Wichterich 2015: 89) or is managed by the government (Staveren 2015: 189).

In 1990, based on extensive research by Elinor Ostrom, Garret Hardin’s argument has been rebutted showing that governing the commons can be successful by cooperative behaviour of the community. Governing high mountain meadows in Swiss by the villagers is one of example given by Ostrom. She argues that defining the commons as merely resources or property is misleading. Following Ostrom (1990: 90) there are eight principles on managing the commons. The commons are not only a resource but also a set of social relations that allow community to negotiate, to demand and to be involved in setting up the rules that can monitor and develop commitments that benefit the whole system. Peter Linebaugh (2008) describes it as “commoning the commons”.

In accordance with Ostrom and Linebaugh, Wichterich (2015: 90) explains commoning as “process of negotiations generates new social contracts with rights, duties and rules on how to define, care and share common resources in a fair and democratic manner”. Holistic care, she argues means that commoning is “a way to protect commons and public goods from privatisation, commercialisation and speculation if it is accompanied by a strong regulatory regime that governs and finally stops the commodification of living organism and public goods, patenting of biodiversity and genes, as well as speculation on harvests and ecosystem services” (Wichterich 2015: 90).

The commons in the Groningen context is analyzed as contested commons. The Dutch government and Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij (NAM) are define the commons as resource and exclude social relations from the commons. This definition of the commons produce the commons as something fixed rather than dynamics with no space to negotiate. The Dutch government controls and manages gas for the national benefit. Rees (1990) and Omara-Ojungu (1992) study that the commons is merely define as “the very notion of property and resource” are as something fixed and ignoring social relations “between groups and places and dynamics in time” (as cited in Rocheleau, Thomas-Slayter and Wangaarai 1996: 11).

The people of Groningen are challenging the Government understanding of gas as just an economic resource by defining the commons not only as resources, but also as social relations that are part of their (the citizens’) commoning. They are not only negotiating the rules and demanding to be involved in governing resources, but also reminding The Dutch government that social relations and commoning should come first before the physical common.

**Enough as Resistance**

As I did my research, I encountered the term “enough” from all of my participants. Most of them were saying it is important to reduce gas extractivism and some of them even more clearly saying stop gas drilling. ‘Samen gas terug’ or together using less gas, ‘stop de gaswinning’ or stop to drilling gas both...
are slogans that I found during Koffertoch to commemorate five years of earthquake in Huizinge village, Bedum municipality.

According to Wichterich (2015:92), ‘enough’ is coming from the culture of enough and sufficiency as an expression to refuse “further externalise social and ecological costs, and the risk and damage caused by global productions.” In the context of Groningen, enough serves as vulnerability coping that transforms into resistance to care for their environment today, and future generations.

Beside using FPE to understand care, commons, and enough, I also employed situated knowledge and intersectionality theories developed by feminist theorists. Situated knowledge helps me to distinguish between the knowledge in my research paper as my participant’s knowledge, and my knowledge as researcher. Intersectionality helps me to analyse intersecting social dimension I observed and analysed during my fieldwork and my set of data.

**Situated knowledge**

The importance of situating knowledge is based on argument that knowledge produce depends on who produces it. Donna Haraway (1988) defines situated knowledge as objectivity that comes from “knowledge producer” and “the object of study”.

I acknowledge that my position of embodied difference as an Indonesian student researcher has influenced my interactions with people. Clare Madge (1993: 296) argues that “situating knowledge it is crucial to consider ‘the role of (multiple) “self”, showing how a researcher’s positionality (in term of race, nationality, age, gender, social and economic status, sexuality) may influence the “data” collected and thus the information that becomes coded as “knowledge”’. I am aware of multiple self of me; my country origin as an Indonesian who were once colonized by Dutch, my Javanese ethnicity, my gender as a woman with dark skin and dark brown hair, my language limitation - not speaking Dutch, and my name with origins from the Groningen people dialects—Wichtje, meaning as a girl; are influencing data I collected.

I believe that as a researcher and my research participants have “no neutral knowing and observing adaptation” and “no innocent positions” (Haraway 1991: 91). I acknowledge that during this research my research participants and I are historically, politically and culturally situated. Colonial past between Indonesia and The Netherlands has significantly influenced my interactions with my participants. My Dutch participants have different knowledge with mine on Dutch colonisation in Indonesia. Ten of my participants has grandparents who worked in Indonesia colonial era. There were times when they were romanticising Indonesia as part of the Netherlands by showing their old Indonesia memorabilia. For me, it was a hard time to manage colonial wound I have. But for them, it was a great time to engage and encounter with Indonesian.

Therefore, my research is situated as there is no such a ‘neutral’ knowledge produce during interviews, during data analysis and finalising my research paper. Both of researcher and participant are knowledge producer. Therefore, I
am aware that “knowledge thus positioned, or situated, can no longer claim universality” (Rose 1997:308).

**Intersectionality**

Intersectionality first coined by Kimberle Crenshaw in analysing intersecting social identities in system of oppression, domination, or discrimination. Intersectionality provides ways to comprehensively understand social dimensions of identity assembling in power and social structures within different people living in different ecological manner and economic that producing distinct exposures, sensitivities, and adaptive capacities. Intersectionality defines as "the interaction between gender, race, and other categories of difference in individual lives, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural ideologies and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power" (Davis 2008: 375 cited in Thompson-Hall, Carr, and Pascall 2016: 375).

In this research, intersectionality helps me to map out intersections of social dimensions; for example: resident and non-resident, gender, age, ethnicity, rural and urban areas of Groningen. Furthermore, intersectionality analysis is important for analysing people’s adaptive capacities to care, common and enough to cope with their situation.

**Methodology**

**Ethnography orientation**

I employ ethnography orientation through three types of data. *Firstly*, data I collected through engaging with my participants as a “participating observer”; *second*, visual data from pictures, drawings, documentaries, and videos I gathered during fieldwork; *third*, internet ethnography through facebook groups, personal blogs, and websites.

As observer participant, I wrote ethnographic field notes in a daily basis. I was taking notes on most interaction I made, observation, and people’s reaction to me. Later, I made daily reflexivity notes as a situating technique. I refer to Linda McDowell (1992:409) that as a researcher I should acknowledge my position and my research participants, and “write this into our research practice”. I was involved in social events in my neighbourhood, such as helping to cleaning and organising sheds of my neighbours, going to neighbour birthday parties, invited in dinner in friends’ family, having coffees and rolling cigarettes, cooking Indonesian food for them, and joining in at festivals and protests.

Before conducting interviews, I shared my aim and my language barrier with my participants. I was asking them to help me with particular Dutch words that I did not understand. I gave them a paper and pencil, or typed in my iPad. Besides conducting interviews, I asked my participants to draw their earthquake experiences. I found it interesting since they shared different story through their drawings.
Second, I was collecting visual data from online newspaper like www.dvhn.nl; social media like Youtube, Facebook, the documentary movie “The Silent Quake” (De Stille Beving), a song from Wat Aans! “Vibration Plate” (“Triploat’) and taken by myself during fieldwork. Srivastava in his book “Essentials of Cultural Anthropology” (2013: 174) argues that “film, sound and videotape records are today an indispensable scientific resource since they provide reliable data on human behaviour”. I also asked my participants to draw me their most positive experience about the earthquake in Groningen.

Third, according to Hine (2015: 74) and Haverinen (2014: 47-49) public (and semi-public) blogs can be utilised for fieldnotes. I followed, observed and analysed facebook groups such as ‘Laat Groningen Niet Zakken’ or ‘Don’t let Groningen Falls’ later during my research I found that this group creating a new group named ‘Nederland Laat Groningen Niet Zakken’ or ‘Netherland lets Groningen Fall’, ‘Schokkend Groningen’ or ‘Shocking Groningen’, ‘Groningen Bodem Bewegingend’ or ‘Groningen Land Movement’. I also followed website of www.dwarhuis.nl as this website has rich and updated information on earthquakes in Groningen.

People and Place

My research was conducted over 40 days in Groningen Province with narratives from several municipalities; Groningen city, Slochteren, Delfzijl, Bedum, Ten Boer, Loppersum, Hoogezand, and Menterwolde. Detail of the locations can be found on the map below:
Those municipalities were chosen based on Joris Hoekstra’s research report from Research for the Built of Environment (Onderzoek voor de gebouwde omgeving) TU Delft. Joris Hoekstra (2016) mapped and scaled out destruction caused by earthquakes in Groningen Province. He scaled out into four different colours; red for more than 60% damage, orange for 39% to 60%, yellow for 5% to 39%, and green for less than 5%.

Map 2. Map of buildings destruction in Groningen (Hoekstra 2016)

As I employ intersectionality theory, I selected my participants from varied social dimensions with random representative sampling; genders, generations, ethnicity, resident/nonresident, and rural/urban. I consciously acknowledge varied social dimensions are needed to achieve richness of my analysis.

I had research interviews with 22 people: 14 women and eight men. Thirteen of them are aged in their 30s, four of them are in their 40s, three of them in their 50s, and the last two were 29 and 14. My participants had various ethnic backgrounds: four Indonesians with one bBtknese, one Sundanese, and twoJavanese; one Indo-Dutch; one Dutch-Surinamese; one American; 13 Dutch, and two with Dutch nationalities but preferred to be called as a Javanese Indonesian and as a Friesland. There are three non-residents and 19 residents with 11 people from rural areas and 11 of them from urban areas. I conducted seven in-depth interviews and a quick interview with two participants of 22 participants. I was contacting them through social media, emails, and friend to friend.

During my research in Groningen, I came to owe a lot to my friends who treated me like part of the family. Flo who cooked Dutch cuisine, Carin who invited me to her birthday; Frans and Sam with their rendang, Martin and Ellen family who welcomed me and cooked Indonesia Rijstaffel for me. Besides interviewing, I was involved in social events such as family dinners, cleaning sheds, having BBQ dinners in Slochteren, and cooking Indonesian cuisines when I was staying for few days in Delfzijl and Groningen City. Here, food
played an important role for me to be engaged with my participants. Some people may assay it is food diplomacy. But I would rather call it as food intimacy as it is expressing caring to others and it brings people together in one table.

**Ethics and Limitation**

I started my interview by asking my participants' consent to reveal their identity in my research paper such as name, gender, age, and where they live. Considering that this case is a sensitive issue, I decided to protect my participants' identity by using a pseudonym but declare other information such as gender, age, and their municipality.

However, I use a real name for a public figure or my participants who were once having their name published.
Chapter 2: ‘De Aardbevingen Beheersen Ons Leven’ Earthquakes Seised Our Life

In this chapter, I explore people’s experience on earthquakes, and I examine vulnerability means for them. Besides that, I explain vulnerable cause by giving a brief explanation on gas extractivism in Groningen and meaning of gas extractivism for The Netherlands.

I aim to bring a discussion about a vulnerability on earthquakes as an impact of gas extractivism interplays through gender, aged, resident/nonresident, ethnicity, and rural/urban area. At the end of this chapter, I share my main findings that vulnerability has brought Groningers' togetherness and strengthened social cohesiveness in Groningen. It leads them to care, commons, and enough.

Living in ruins: vulnerability meanings in Groningen

It is important to share how people are experiencing and memorising earthquakes differently. They took the most familiar thing in their life to describe earthquake moment. For example, my participants who are coming from a rural area they described earthquakes like a tractor coming to their houses and my participants who lived by central station describe it as a train coming through their house. Meanwhile, participants who shared the same nationality as mine, Indonesia, explain it as earthquake and taking experience earthquake comparison between Indonesia and Groningen. Furthermore, it is interesting to see how they care about others in the middle of their experience of sharing. This was sometimes placing me in a hard situation during my research as my participant was dealing with traumatic moments in their life.

The easiest moment I had with my participants was with two participants from Indonesia who were experiencing earthquakes before living in the Netherlands. Geologically as a volcanic country, tectonic plates; Eurasian plate, Australian Plate, the Philippine plate, and Pacific plate, in Indonesia frequently move and meet causing earthquakes

“I was taking my daughter to sleep. It was around 20.05 when I heard a heavy truck passing through my house. My daughter’s bed was shaking. I was afraid that it would make my daughter awake but she was okay...she is still sleeping...I did not feel panic at all because I was experiencing once before back home…I was just thinking about her.”—17 August 2017.

Anna was explaining that I could not visit her for interview through Facebook messenger calls. She was considered my topic as a sensitive topic and she wanted to be carefully response to it. Anna, aged 37, married a Dutchman in 2002. She and her husband met in Indonesia and fell in love. They both decided to get married, and she moved to Netherlands to build a family.

Earthquakes in Menterwolde has changed their life. The biggest was in 2015 measuring 3.1 on the Richter scale and 3 km under the earth. It was creating cracks in the walls, but frequent earthquakes make it worst. Unfortunately,
her family has not received any compensation. NAM (Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij) inspection was reporting that her house crackings because of lack of maintenance. “It is an old house, built in 1915. But houses in here are built around that time. Hence, we have to repair the damage with our own money.”

I met with Karunia, aged 39, at the University of Groningen campus. I came to a meeting point she suggested, across her office by the canal. We came from the same region in Indonesia, Yogyakarta and graduated from the same university, but it was the first time I met her. “It was terrible. I never thought that it would reach the city…I was experiencing a big earthquake in Yogyakarta before and it was terrible…If I should compare it with the Yogyakarta’s earthquake, it felt almost the same. It had less magnitude but only 3 km under the earth. I panicked, but then I saw my friends, most of my friends are Dutch, and I think they have never experienced and earthquake before. They were terrified and pale. So I was trying to calm them while we were going outside the building” (5 August 2017). At the end of our conversation, Karunia was stressing out that many people who live in the urban area are struggling.

Both of these women were foreigners in the Netherlands. A few Indonesians who know about earthquake and wanted to share their experiences. Even though they live in a different area; Anna is in the rural area, and Karunia is in the city, they have ‘freedom’ to migrate from the Netherlands. A privilege that most of the resident in Groningen are lacking. This factor has an important role in my interview with them. Vulnerability has different meanings for them. Earthquakes do not make them vulnerable as they are having a ‘freedom’ to migrate and build their life outside the Netherlands. They can find a secure place, family, assets outside The Netherlands. Having no Dutch citizenship is making their life more convenient.

Anna keeps her Indonesian passport as it will help her to enter the country if she wants to visit her family. For her, it is also a document that makes her feel safe living in Groningen as she has a ‘freedom’ to take her family migrate to Indonesia. In the other hand, Karunia lives in Groningen as a PhD student. This year is her last year to live there. Next year, she is planning to go home to? But if Indonesian political situation is getting worse, she wants to go to the USA. Karunia secretly has two passports; Indonesian and American as she was born in the USA.

When I was asking about vulnerability, both of them do not feel vulnerable. Anna was saying that she is going to feel vulnerable if she lost her family and her passport. She feels unnecessary for hoping NAM to cover wrecks on her house since hoping to make her feel vulnerable. As some of her neighbours are waiting for repairing funds that never comes. For Karunia, she does not feel vulnerable at all. Earthquakes in Groningen make her think that she should be looking after her Dutch friends as these people who are affected more than her. In this context, Karunia suggested that her Dutch friends are more vulnerable.

According to Robert Chambers (1989), vulnerability has two sides. He argues that “risk, shocks, and stress” where the subject is individual or household as external side of vulnerability. While being defencelessness, “meaning a lack of loss without damaging loss” such as physically fragile, “economically im-
poveryished”, being social dependent, “humiliated or physically harmed’ are internal side of vulnerability.

“De aarbevingen beheersen ons leven”-27 July 2017. Those words came first from Maria, a Dutch resident who has Indonesian and Dutch parents but introduced herself as an Indonesian to me. I was not sure what I heard, so I took a pen and asking her to write what she had just said. “Earthquakes seise our life” was the first thing she said when I asked her about her experience with earthquakes.

In 2005, Maria moved to Groningen from Rotterdam. She built her life with her partner in Groningen city in a small house. In 2014, an earthquake reached Groningen city, which created small cracks on their ceiling. They are trying to sell their house but there are no buyers. She wants to move back to Rotterdam but she has a job in Groningen and no money to get a new house in Rotterdam. She told me while looking at the other way. At that time, I knew she was in tears. She felt being ‘trapped’ and forced to adjust to the situation and earthquakes news that making her feels vulnerable. At the end of the interview, she said she was considering to move to Indonesia and build a new life on Mollusca Island. However, it is not easy to migrate since she is a Dutch citizen.

Figure 3. ‘Te Koop’ or ‘For Sale’ sign in Slochteren, Groningen. ‘Te Koop’ signs are easily found in Groningen especially in the most damage area.

The second encounter I had was with Jonn. I met Jonn for the second time in a café by the UMCG there we met his friend Niels, aged 41. Both of them are Dutch but Jonn prefered to be called Friesland rather than as Dutch. They were close friends but experiencing earthquakes differently. Niels was living by the central station in the Groningen when an earthquake hit Groningen city in 2014. It was morning, and it felt like a big train crashing his flat. There was no damage in his flat, but during an earthquake, he was thinking to jump from his flat. He thought it was a bomb blasted somewhere near his
flat. He thought it was impossible than an earthquake would be reach the city. He moved from his flat, choosing to live far away from train station and railway.

Earthquakes have frequently occurred in Delfzil. The most earthquake he remembered happened in 2009. It was like there was Harley Davidson tour with tractors tour by the house. He was cooking for his family during that time. Books in a cabinet fell on the floor. “Since then earthquakes are occupied my life. Conversations I had with my ex-wife had no solutions. Like we were living in a hell, yes we are. We like coming back home, which we can not see as home anymore as it is wrecked here and there, talking about earthquakes, dealing with earthquakes, then leaving the house for work. I am a teacher in the city, but my mind was thinking about my family’s safety. I feel I failed as a father. I could not give my daughters a home, a shelter to feel safe. I had nothing to say when my ex-wife was asking me for a divorce. This is beyond me.”

Aiming to find more people’s experiences, I googled keywords; earthquake [aardbeving] and life [leven] an article published in RTL Nieuws [News] came up in my result. There was Trudy Alevin, aged 64, who were telling RTL Niews that earthquakes seise her life and her husband. She has been working for 45 years in Martini Ziekenhuis [Martini Hospital], planning to be retired when she turned 62, selling their house and planning to travel together. The earthquake has shattered their plans. It was making cracks her house in 2013. Four years after their house is fully repaired but unsellable. “The earthquakes seise our life. Our plans are coming undone!” (Rtnieuws 2017). According Dutchnews (2017) and NOS (2017), a report by ‘Atlas voor gemeenteen’ found that the home market in Groningen has fallen in an average of 2.2%. In Loppersum, one of
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"De aardbevingen beheersen ons leven. De plannen die we hadden gemaakt, gaan niet door. Het erge is dat er veel mensen zijn die het nog veel erger hebben getroffen dan wij."
earthquake epicentre has to fall to 8% while in the city is between 0.9% to 2.9%

Judit, aged 51, used to live in Slochteren. She has a nice cozy house with a green yard but not well-maintained. She drove me to her house on 1 August 2017 to show me what kind of life she had. “It was constant insecurity I felt like every day. I was living alone there since my husband passed away in 2011. Until in the morning, I felt like big trucks coming to my house in 2014. If I am not mistaken, the epicentre was in Froombosch. I was so scared. What if I died buried in my house...alone...that would be sad dear, no one wants to die that way. So, I moved to the city. I know that I can feel earthquake still in the city but at least not as dangerous as if I were in Slochteren. My house does not feel homey anymore. Everything has changed now darling”—1 August 2017. Judith is a Dutch blond woman. She was asking my opinion about finding a lovely red lip colour in Douglas for a date. That was how we met.

Figure 5. Wreckings house in Slochteren

My interview with Judith has to lead me to Annemarie Heite, Annemarie Haan, Tiemen Meulema and Alie Meulema in a documentary film ‘De Stille Beving [the Silent Quake] by Piet Hein van der Hoek. They life has changed like Anna, Karunia, Maria, Jonn, Niels and Judith.

Annemarie Haan was living with her family in the shed. It was a small shed consist of a huge bed for her entire family. She felt like no one could help her. In the movie, she was asking to Annemarie Heite; “Who will help me?” I recalled to Jonn’s reaction when I was telling my research by giving me a response “Help us.” There was one second Annemarie Heite lost her words. She possibly did not how to react to me when I heard those words came from Jonn.

In the movie, Alie and Tiemen Meulema shared how vulnerable means for them by saying “You lost your security. You have lost hearth and home” (Alie Meulema). “You have lost everything...you have the feeling that everybody has deserted you.” (Tiemen Meulema in De Stille Beving 2017).

Tiemen Meulema (62) was a Tiemen Meulema (62) was a farmer in Ten Boer who was reporting earthquakes to NAM since 30 years ago. In spring
2014, his 200 years farmhouse wrecks and collapsed in two days. They had to get out from the barn with the help of firefighters (Sandman 2016). They lived in a temporary house, but they could not revive their farm and animals. Tiemen felt externally and internally vulnerable. He went to the hospital three times since 2014 for heart disease. On Thursday, 6 September 2016, he passed away due to heart disease.

Figure 6. Tiemen and Alie Meulema is staring at their collapsed farmhouse (Ebenezer 2014)

Embodied vulnerable: Gas Extractivism Impact on Grunn’s health

In the 2016 University of Groningen in collaboration with National Coordinator Groningen are investigating earthquakes impact on health, perception on security, and people’s view about the future of Groningen. The coordinator is undertaking research until the end of 2017. The intermediate report of this research reveals that people with multiple damages are suffering physically and psychologically. They are dealing with health problems; regular insomnia, concentration problem, memorising moments, fatigue, digestive problem, muscles and joint issues, frequent headache and palpitations. About 50% of people who experience multiple series of the earthquake are dealing with mental health issue; negative feelings, depression, defenselessness or feeling unable to control their life anymore (University of Groningen 2016).

---

2 Groningers or Groningen people in local term.
In the picture below, the research team are mapping out health conditions of earthquakes affected people based on colour. The darkest blue colour is defining were most people suffering, and the lightest blue colour is less health problem occurred.

Gas Extractivism: A Bless or A Curse?

On 22 July 1959, NAM discovered a huge gas field in Slochteren. The Slochteren gas field has 2.8 trillion cubic metres and it later declared as the biggest gas reserve in European countries (Botter 2009). Later that year, NAM also discovered gas field between Delfzijl and Slochteren. However, gas discoveries were kept as secret from public and media. It was only reported to Ministry of Economic Affairs de Pous from the Christian Historical Union (CHU) (Botter 2009). It was seen as problematic to extract gas as it was not considered to have economic value as much as coal and oil. According to Kielich (1988:19), Salvador Bloemgarten as Shell Managing Director was saying: “Stay out gas, there is no money to made. Hence, when a small gas field discovered in Coevorden, Drenthe Province, in July 1948, NAM was not taking over but it was managed by Coevorden. In 1951, Coevorden was the
first city in the Netherlands where gas was used to cook in every households in the city (Correlje, Linde, Westerwoudt 2003: 26).

A huge discoveries in Slochteren 1\(^3\) has a significant consequences for Dutch gas extractivism. In order to support economic value for gas, the Minister of Economic Affair, de Pous, was establishing principles for gas regime in the Netherlands which is called ‘Nota inzake het aardgas’ ['Nota de Pous] in 1962. To create gas ‘market-value’, gas was introduced as an alternative fuel to oil. Consumer would paycheaper prices than with alternative fuels, but “the market value principle also ensured” so consumers were not paying significantly less (Correlje, Linde, Westerwoudt 2003: 34). This regulation was followed by a new energy policy law in 1967. It triggered the concession chaos during May 1963 to December 1965 where eighteen different companies held overlapping exploration concessions. The free exploration regime was considered problematic. Hence, the Dutch government introduced a new concept in energy policy in the Netherlands: an exclusive drilling permit (Hulten 2009: 5).

The Dutch government discussed with NAM regarding ownership shares. One of important decision was ownership sharing between the Royal Dutch Shell, Exxonmobil\(^4\) and the Dutch Government. The Dutch government receives 40% and 60% is divided between Royal Dutch Shell, which receives 30% and Exxonmobil the remaining 30% (Kaijser, A. 1999).

Figure 7. Shares between Shell, ExxonMobil, and The DutchState

---

\(^3\) The first gas field in Slochteren named as Slochteren 1.
\(^4\) It was Esso.
Nota de Pous was giving NAM a ‘green light’ to extract gas in Groningen. Gas infrastructure was massively developed in Groningen. As it can be seen from the pictures I found from Groningen archives below:

Figure 8. Building gas infrastructure in Slochteren 1. in 1963 (Bilsen 1963a)

Figure 9. Setting up gas pipelines in Slochteren, Groningen in 1963 (Bilsen 1963b)
Figure 10. Gas campaign in Rotterdam ‘Morgen is Hier: Aardgas’ meaning ‘The Future is Here: Natural Gas’. It was part of creating ‘market-value’ to gas as a cheaper and cleaner alternative energy compared to coal and oil. (Noort 1966)
Gas revenues have become significant for the Dutch government. For the last decade, gas comprises around 3.7% to 5.4% percent of total government revenues. Gas revenues are pivotal revenues for total government revenues. It can be seen from the public deficit of the gross domestic product below:

Table 1. Dutch government balance sheet from 2001 to 2011 (CBS 2017).

In 2005 to 2008, gas prices were significantly increased from 120% to 217% compared to gas prices in 1998 (Avro 2012). On the graph above, it can be seen that gas price changes in 2001 and 2011 have a positive effect on government revenues. These price changes had contributed to positive government balance sheet from 2006 to 2008. (CBS 2017)
According to Statistics Netherlands (CBS-Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek), gas extractivism in the Netherlands has produced 3582 billion m³ since the discovery of Slochteren. It means 80% of gas reserves have been extracted and only left for 20% with 680 m³ in the Groningen gas field and the rest 260 m³ is from small fields. The Dutch government plans for sustainable energy by reducing fossil fuel to zero in 2050 are based on the calculation of domestic gas reserves. By 2023, the Netherlands government expects to use 16% sustainable energy as part of the agreement of Energy Agreement for Sustainable Growth (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy n.d.).

Living like a ‘Prisoner’

"Everyone is prisoner in Groningen"
(Derwin Schorren 2014)

Groningers’ experience internal vulnerability with constant defenselessness along with gradual economic impoverishment. Based on my research findings, three people were consistently warning The Dutch Government and NAM about earthquake risks. They suggested The Dutch Government and NAM put Dutch citizen safety first instead of economic growth. It started with Ad Oele, a representative from Partij van de Arbeid Labour Party (PvDA, Liberal Party) who was sending a letter to Harry Langman, Minister of Economic Affairs in 1972 to share his care to Groningers regarding the Dutch government policy to extract gas in the region. It was ten years after Nota de Pios released. Ad Oele was asking four questions related to earthquake risk that government and society might be dealing with due to gas extractivism as what happened in coal extractivism in Limburg. Ad Oele shared his care through a letter saying that Groningen is geologically unstable for gas drilling and it might be putting Groningers in a bad situation. He concerned to avoid further earthquakes in
Limburg as an impact of coal extractivism. Instead of listening to Ad Oele concerns, his analysis was ignored and left unanswered. Ad Oele shared his experience with Carel Grol and Heiko Jessayan (2016). In 1963, a year after he sent the letter, he was elected as a Mayor of Delft. His new duties became his main focus, rather than his concern with Groningen.

The second attempt was from Peter van Gaag. Peter was an independent geologist. In the 1990s, Peter was researching about Groningen geological structures. Geology character in Groningen is a unique type of soft clay were very fragile with a quake. It means that an earthquake with a low magnitude is considerably causing a huge damage. At that time, he sent his report to the commissioner but being ignored. His care action was considered as unlogical research findings (Dockery 2016).

The third attempt was by Jun Huizinga. Jun Huizinga lived in Loppersum with farmhouse built in 1864. He was reporting earthquakes to NAM since 1996 but... “They denied it was from gas”. (Dockery 2016). Until in the 2011, Director of NAM stated that earthquake reports as an impact of gas extractivism were not making sense.

In 2012, Huizinge—a village in Loppersum municipality, hit by magnitude 3.6 Richter scale earthquake with depth 3 km. It was confirmed damaging 2200 buildings (Damsvel 2017a). The Huizinge earthquake was the biggest earthquake and it becomes a turning point for the government to assess and to respond to their citizen situation.
Figure 13. The Dutch government institutions to response Groningen earthquake

The Dutch government has set up some institutions to manage the impact of gas extractivism in Groningen. The first institution was Centrum Veileg Wonen (CVW)[Centre for Safe Living] who manage damage claims and can require the NAM to pay restitution. CVW assesses damaged houses based on Shell guidelines. More than fifty percent of CVW is owned by Arcadis, a worldwide Shell supplier (CVW 2017).

The Minister of Economic Affairs has established a new institution with one of the responsibility is to supervise CVW; the National Coordinator Groningen (NCG). On 31 March 2017, NCG took over NAM’s responsibility for taking care of damage reports and assessment. NCG is headed by Hans Alder, with 160 civil servants. In doing their work, the NCG has De Technische Commissie Bodembeweging (Tebb, Technical Committee on The Earthquake. Tebb acts as independent committee advising on detection, mineral extraction and geological movement. It consists of many experts and researchers from varied fields such as mining, geology, seismology, soil engineers, hydrology, construction and legal affairs.

Besides, the National Coordinator Groningen, the state has also set up Staatstoezicht op de Mijnen (SoDM, State Supervision of Mines) as the advisory body to Minister of Economic Affairs particularly advising the Minister of
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This graph is inspired by Lubach—a host in talkshow series “Zondag met Lubach”, in “Gronings Gas” episode. Details of the show can be followed in this link: https://youtu.be/KpkUGyjf7bY.
Economic Affairs particularly advising the Minister of Economic Affairs on the planned recovery of the Groningen field, taking into account specific limits.

From August 2012 to March 2017, NAM has accepted 73,242 damage reports (Damveld 2017a). These damages are the accumulation of 1089 earthquakes that occurred since 1990 to March 2017 (NAM 2017). The latest data I gathered in November 2017 state there have been 1169 earthquakes, suggesting 80 earthquakes have occurred in the last eight months.

Based on NCG (2017) quarterly report, gas extractivism has cost 464 million Euro, with 308 million Euro for damaged buildings, and 157 million euro for research and reports on damaged buildings. This number is very small compared to the total Dutch government revenue of gas extraction: 265 billion euros (Aardgas in Nederland ny).

Scare and Defenselessness

Instead of assisting people to cope with their vulnerability, NAM has restricted people from talking about their compensation that they receive, or compensation promises, they have got from NAM. “People are scared. They are scared to speak out against NAM in case their compensation will disappear, and they are scared to talk to the press” John told Dockery (2016) in his investigative journalism.

In my interviews with my Anna, Maria, Frans and Sam they were telling me that they should not talk about this. They do not know what will happen to them in future. Talking openly about this case can lead to ‘a lousy maintenance’ for house damage reports which is commonly happening. Anna was asking me to call her while her husband at work. She said that she wanted to be careful since she had no idea what would happen in the future if she talked, or let me come to her house. Maria, Frans and Sam were politely asking me to not taking any picture of their houses. I respect their wishes since I know they are in a difficult situation. These people have not got any fund to repair their houses. NAM was saying to them that based on their assessment their houses are not eligible as they are old houses. Maria, Frans and Sam told me that their neighbours were getting the funds and some are only receiving NAM promises. In line with that, Anna was saying a case of her neighbour who was listed to get 2000 Euro for repairs but had not received it.

For them, it is not a matter of getting reparation fund as much as it is about the neverending task to repair house when the cracks are always coming back again. What matters is how to stop earthquake and to get their lives back together without feeling even less secure. To live their life like normal Dutch citizen.

However, reparation funds are creating an issue in the society. As pointed out by Sandra Beckerman: “The fund has divided society because one neighbour receives and the other doesn’t.” It has become a crucial issue for Sandra Beckerman, a representative in parliament from Socialistische Partij [SP, Socialist Party]. However, people are overcoming this “divided strategy” by coming together. She drew her concern for me as below:
Figure 14. Impact of reparation funds on society. Drawings provided by Sandra Beckerman
Chapter 3 ‘Samen Sterk’ Strong Together: Care and Commons

It is fascinating and inspiring to see how these vulnerable people have the energy to cope by criticising “growth-obsessed” in the Dutch economy. I found they were being critical while at the same time expressing familiar discourse in FPE; care, common and enough. Christa Wichterich (2012; 2015) argues care, common and enough are part of a critical resistance ‘movement’ against neoliberalism. In Groningen, I figure that care, common and enough are going further than just criticising and opposing to the Dutch development agenda but are also part of coping with vulnerability.

Care, commons and enough are my findings I gathered from interviews, web-searching, and analysing visual data; “De Stille Beving” documentary film, YouTube Videos, and web-searching. Instead of being individualistic, these people are thinking and acting care beyond themselves. Care, commons and enough are simultaneously coming up after they shared about their vulnerability. I argue that care, commons and enough are unseparated as it is interlinked and conjoined. I write care, commons and enough in a different parto give a detailed and further explanation to my reader and to make it easier to follow my argument.

In this chapter, I share people’s expression on care and common as a ‘tool’ to emerge from a defenselessness situation they are dealing with. Care means a holistic care, or beyond the self, and common refers to a strategy to negotiate the commons.

Care: Think and Act Beyond The Self

I utilise care as “a holistic care” by Nidhi Tandon (2013) because it is fitting for what I found in Groningen. People expressed their care differently, but they believed their care to the other self is creating good relations in time frame logics (today, tomorrow, and future) and political space (their livelihoods, neighbourhoods, Groningen, and the Netherlands). Discussion on political space is not about human being who live in their livelihoods but also animals, pets, and nature. They are all shaping what life means for them.

In this context, care is a notion that belonged to everyone. It is not merely entitled to care work but care that works for anyone. Money is not just a currency. It is not because care has no “market value” nor because of “market failure” but care is priceless, and it cannot be measured with money.

Living in a problematic situation due to gas extraction makes many Groningers more critical of the Dutch development agenda. How the Dutch government is putting economic interest at the first place rather than Dutch citizen in Groningers are hurting their lives. It is significant for The Dutch Government taking Groningen care movement as a lesson learned to take care of its citizen instead of commits to a care deficit.
Living with Groningers for 40 days has changed my perspective about how individualistic Western society is. Every time I walked out of a house people were always saying “Hi”, “Hallo”, “Good morning” or “Good afternoon”. In the first week, I found it was strange. I was experiencing living in European countries for the first time in Oslo, Norway, where people were not greeting each other. This experience was shaping my knowledge about social relation in a Western society. This daily cultural conversation became a social connectedness that plays an important role in how care develops in Groningen.

I was experiencing society’s closeness through sending each other food, asking for a hand to clean and organise their sheds, offering help to clean neighbour garden, taking care of their pets during summer holidays, fixing their bike, and doing child sitting. There was no exchanging money for all of those activities. I found it significantly different with the care deficit from the Government. A “care gap” exists in Groningen.

Following Nidhi Tandon on care, I share my findings based on three types of care. First, “care to community and society today” are most of the care expression I found from my participants. In this case, they were contrasting “care to community and society” with a care deficit by the government. Second, “care for future generations in a finite world through the equitable management of natural resources and consumption” (Wichterich 2012, Wastl-Walter 1996). This care is mostly expressed by parents when they were talking about their children. However, future generations do not necessarily mean children but also Groningen in the future, or the Netherlands in the future. For example, Lubach in his show were expressing future generations as Groningen and the Netherlands in the future. Third, “care for nature through nurturing biogenetic vitality, biodiversity, regenerations and stewardship”. Farmers and children are articulating their care to animals, nature and pet. However, these three types of care do not always stand on their own, and are instead they are interlinked with each other.

In the conversation I had with Niels and Jonn, both of them are sharing care for today society and future generations. Niels captured his feelings into pen and colours and put it into drawings. He said that Groningers are used to work with each other, and to help each other. Maintaining good relationships with their neighbours is something common in Groningen. He believes society is stronger after earthquakes. It is creating social bonding about one issue: earthquakes, and about one goal: to stop gas extractivism. While the government—here he drew Mark Rutte as a symbol; and the politicians, he said, are wanting to keep drilling.
“Government only cares about money, not the people. They care about getting gas from Groningen not taking care of Groningers. How we live is really up to us and not their concern. It is sad cause it is happening in the Netherlands, a welfare country they said. I don’t even know what it means anymore. But my life is way better than farmers in my neighbourhood. I have a job; my daughters live safe in Hoofddorp, that is a good thing, right? I think I am staying here because I want to fight. It should not happen to us. Not for Groningers in the future.” —Jonn, 3 August 2017. During that conversation, Niels was saying that he helped Jonn to set up his van with a lighthearted joke about how it sucked is being a Groningers. “But, the beauty of it; brotherhood.”.

At the end of the conversation, Jonn drew me a picture of his ‘wreck-ing’ house, a wheelbarrow with bricks, and a tree. It shows his daily life to repair the house, carrying bricks with a wheelbarrow to help his neighbours. He joked that he should take care of a big tree by his house in case everything collapsed, and there are only trees left standing.
Meanwhile, Maria and Judit were sharing their care about today society regarding earthquakes situate in Groningen: “We are trying to help our neighbour whenever there is someone who feels helpless. Like cheering them up. I know what we do is more likely will not change anything. But at least, everyone needs to be sort of a supporting group to each other. That is what we have.”—Maria, 27 July 2017. Maria was telling me about this right after she took away her tears with tissue.

For Judit, a single woman, asking around to their neighbour to help her to fix cracks on her wall was a weekly activity before moving to the city. “I used to ask my neighbour to help me to set my wall dear. No paying, no anything. It is a common thing in Groningen we are helping each other”.

As parents, Maria, Jonn, and Anna were thinking about the future of Groningen related to the future of their children. They have nearly the same opinion about how it is important to demand the government to stop gas extraction for their children. “It is about to stop catastrophe in Groningen for our children”—Maria, 27 July 2017. “Yes, we need to be careful with it. I do not want earthquakes to happen for a long time. I do want to worry about my daughter safety when she is in bed or at school. I want her to have a better future than me, with no earthquakes.” Anna—17 August 2017.
I met Elys, Maria’s niece when I was visiting her. She shared with me that what frightened her most about earthquake are animals. It is because they are more powerless than a human being. Elys told me that when an earthquake hit Hoogezeand, her cat was shaking. “Is gas extractivism bad for us? Not only causing an earthquake, but I heard about the environment too. And what if the dyke is broken because of it? Are we going to drown? The Netherlands?”. Elys’ question makes me remember two men, first, a man I met in Koffertocht who was talking about broken dykes. My friends, Flo and Martin Kluit, were translating what he was saying, as he spoke in Dutch.

Second, Tiemen Meulema a farmer from Ten Boer who I knew from web-searching and “the Silent Quake”. His everyday life shaped by his interaction with his farmhouse and the animals he had. “Even the animals...sorry...(crying). The animals. It tears them up. They are all over the place. Even the cat. It’s the powerlessness. They don’t understand, and they do nothing for you. They don’t understand that you’re up to your neck in trouble.” Elys, the “dyke” man I met in Koffertocht and Tiemen Meulema was concern about human relations with nature. To maintain good relations with nature is to give proper attention to it, to stop earthquakes and stop gas extractivism.

Beside care experienced by the Groningers. There is care from non-Groningers to giving support and standing up for Groningers. An Indonesian student I interviewed is one of them. Karunia has ended our conversation by sharing her concern about her Dutch friends and Dutch people who live in the rural area. “These people have a hard life. In the rural area, people are consid-
erably poorer. I mean they have limited option for living. The Dutch government should take the lead to protect their people.”—Karunia, 5 August 2017.

Based on University Groningen (2016) research on health problems in Groningen, Prof. Tom Postmes argues that caring for Groningers should be the priority of the state. He explains that Groningers demands should be taken seriously. First, the government should do is showing government care by giving them certainty, safety, and feeling secure while assessing and repairing damaged buildings. It should be simultaneously doing. Second, making medical care accessible. The most damaged area is quite far from the hospital since the hospitals are located in the city. Third, making damage claims as quickly as possible.

Commoning the commons: Negotiating Groningen

In 1594, Groningen becomes part of the Republic of the Seven United Provinces of the Dutch Republic. At that time, Dutch and English military forces conquered Groningen from the Spanish Empire, or Spanish Netherlands. It was commanded by Spanish military commander, Francisco Verdugo. However, in the Siege of Groningen from 19 May to 22 July 1594, Francisco Verdugo lost the war and Spanish military army was evicted from Groningen (Motley 1867).

Learning about the history of Groningen helps me understand why this province has different dialect compare to other parts of the Netherlands. When I was talking to people and saying that I do not speak Dutch, then they were saying they do not either as they spoke a Grunneg or Gronings dialect. It helped me to make sense when my participant was insisted they were Frisian rather than Dutch. Furthermore, it is making me understand why in every discussion I had with my participants they always compared Ranstrad area and Groningen; why Groningen gas revenue are mostly spent in Ranstrad area and why it is hard for the government in the Hague to comply with their demands,
solve their issue, and end their suffering. “There is no commons without commoning” (Linebaugh 2008).

In this subchapter, I discuss “commoning the commons” in Groningen. Commoning the commons is about Groningers making demands to negotiate the commons. The commons are not something fixed but negotiable where democratic space exists. When the Netherlands military conquered Groningen from Spanish Empire, the logic of the commons was there. But once Groningen became part of the Netherlands, the Netherlands set up rules and regulation to make it fixed and unnegotiable. Groningen resources and social relations are managed by the Netherlands. Economic interests are prioritized before Groningers’ well-being.

“On behalf of the government, NAM has extracted gas from the Groningen’s land.
This extraction is degrading land and causing earthquakes.
And they are extracting it anyway

The government is incapable to implement a clear and coherent policies to tackle this problem
Or to give fair and generous damage protocol
And they are extracting it anyway

The government is incapable to clearly communicate it to the Groningers in earthquake are
And they are extracting it anyway

The United Nations has interfered and demanding to the Netherlands to put safety and mental health at the first place for Groningers.
But they are extracting it anyway.”

(Litanie “5 jaar na 3 komma 6” [A petition of 5 years 3.6 Richter], 16 August 2017)
The above text was a petition read in ‘koffertoch’ or ‘suitcase tour’ to Huizinge on 16 August 2017. Koffertocht is a protest to commemorate five years of the biggest earthquake in Huizinge village in Bedum municipality, Groningen. At 20.00, sixty churches in Groningen rang their bell together to call people to join the koffertocht. For people who unable to participate due to health problems or on summer holiday, they advised to put a poster ‘Dit Huis Staat Nog’ or ‘the House still stands’ and put Groningen flag in a knot. ‘Dit Huis Staat Nog’ is is sarcastic commentary that translates as the house still stands. It is a sharp statement that the house stands because of support from scaffoldings around the house. Meanwhile, Groningen flag in a knot is a symbol of extracting the commons that impinging on Groningen’s freedom.

There were two departure points in Ewsum, Middlestum municipality, and in a parking area Eemshavenweg in Middlestum. I came with Flo to parking area Eemshavenweg at 20.20. I guess it was the first for Flo to came and joined the protest since he did not know anyone except for his best friend, Martin Kluit, a city council member from SP. I noticed people were looking at me when I came out from the car. There were only seven cars parked with 15 people. Around 08.50 more people came, including activists from Miliedefensie came with two metres long knitted banner slogan ‘Laat ons Niet Zaken’ ‘Do Not Give Up’, as well as journalists.
At the *koffertocht*, people brought a suitcase, bag, and boxes. The suitcase, bag and boxes were symbols for how they are being displaced because of gas extractivism. The suitcase, bag and boxes are not just for packing clothes, but also pack their lives. “It is a symbol to show that earthquakes have made these people displaced ” said René Paas, Commissioner of the King, to reporter from RtvNoord (2017). Furthermore, in an interview with Rtlnews, Trudy Aleven said that the government hardly helps the victims. At the koffertoch, they brought suitcases and bags walked to earthquake epicentre to show how Groningers has lost not only their homes but also their province (RtvNoord 2017). René Paas and Trudy Aleven, remind me of the conversation I had with my participants. They said that Groningen is not Groningen anymore. Tiemen Meulema was also saying the same thing; “Ten Laar is not Ten Laar anymore (De Stille Beving 2017).
From the parking area, we walked to a meeting point, Melkema farmhouse, in Huizinge. There, I met some people I saw in newspaper, articles, and YouTube channel; Sandra Beckerman from SP, Annamarie Heite—a spokeswoman, Agnes Mulder from CDA, and Henk Nadarajan from PvDA. In the newspaper, I read that Hans Alder (National Coordinator Groningen) and René Paas (King’s commissioner) came, but I did not see them.

At 22.00 the event began with a reading of the petition to negotiate with the government to stop gas extractivism. In the petition, they declared the care deficit by the Dutch government. After five years negotiating the commons, the Dutch government are still extracting gas from Groningen. Mayor Albert Roden van Wyk was stating that Groningen crisis is not the only regional prob-
lem but also national. The Groningers are not alone negotiating their commons, but have national and international support.

Here, people were commoning the commons. Groningers are negotiating Groningen as part of their care to today’s society, future generations and nature. As a way to protect Groningers from further damage; well-being and infrastructure, conserve Groningen for their children and preserve nature. However, it is not only for Groningen but also the Netherlands. In line with Harcourt (2015: 252): “People negotiate place as they protect and conserve places, enhance and modify places, and create connections with other places at different levels.”
Chapter 4 ‘Samen Gas Terug’ [Leave it in the Ground]: Enough.

“It’s time that those who have deliberately for years on end have put economic interests before our safety are going to be held liable. The bitter truth is that for many years to come we will have to deal with earthquakes and all the misery that comes with it. Regardless whether the gas tap will be closed further. Just closing the gas tap is not enough by a long shot. The earthquake clock keeps on ticking.”

(Annemarie Heite in De Stille Beving 2017)

Figure 27. Protest against gas extractivism at the NAM office in Assen (Jannink 2016)

Enough derives from the culture of enough as a critique of a consumptive society. According to Christa Wichterich (2015: 91), feminist political ecology has been discussed since the 1990s as a critique of “overproduction and “over-consumption” in relation with “overpopulation” discourse as “the main root of environmental degradation”. It is part of long history of industrialisation and how industrialisation has failed society. The society, especially in grassroots level, has been counter growth idea by reinventing and revitalised “alternative projects”, “livelihoods” and “place-based” to achieve a “good life” and “happiness” (Wichterich 2015: 93).

In Groningen ‘enough’ is strongly-related to gas extractivism. The ‘enough’ discourse emerged due to the strongest earthquake in Huizinge in 2012. At first, the development of ‘enough’ discourse was to limit gas extraction, to cap or to reduce gas extraction to reduce earthquake risks. After debating with no final result on reducing earthquakes, it is now becoming to stop gas extraction in Groningen.
I encountered ‘samen gas terug’ when I was doing web-searching with keywords; Groningen, earthquake, aardbevingen [earthquakes], aardgas [natural gas]. When I was asking my participants about that, they have a different interpretation; to cut gas extractivism and to stop gas extractivism. Maria, Judith, Jonn, Niels, Ana, Elys, Denise, Anouk, Pieter, Frans and Sam were saying that ‘samen gas terug’ stops gas extractivism. For them, it is too tricky to make a policy to reduce gas extractivism as it is difficult for them to monitor gas production. “We are dealing with a big company and the government which make it somehow way difficult to measure. They are all expert in measurement. I possibly have a trust problem.” Frans—3 August 2017. For Flo, Sabina, and Lor they informed me that it means as ‘to do something less’ by reducing gas production. “It is impossible to stop gas drilling as we need gas. I do not think I can manage winter without gas”—Sabina, 23 August 2017. It is important to note that Flo, Sabina and Lor are not living in the most damaged area in Groningen. While Maria, Judith, Jonn, Ana, Elys, Denise, Anouk, Frans and Sam are living in damaged houses. Meanwhile, Niels and Pieter are living in the city. Niels was traumatised by the earthquake, so he moved to a new flat, and Pieter is a grassroots lawyer.

Figure 28. ‘Samen Gas Terug’ or Leave it in the Ground is a slogan coined by Milieudefensie organization to stop gas extractivism and practicing caring to Groningers. In here, caring represents by slogan and a knitted flag as a warm fabric to protect from cold.

Those debates are occurring at the grassroots level. At the parliament level, there are 125 debates after Huizinge’s earthquake (Damveld 2017a). In 2013, Prime Minister of the Netherlands, Mark Rutte, gave the word to cap gas production to 24 billion m3. However, earthquakes are still occurring. It was revealed that gas production was being reduced to 27 billion m3 after a decision made by Hoge Raad der Nederlanden (HR-The Supreme Court of The Netherlands) of the Netherlands on 18 November 2015 (Damveld 2017a).
In 2013, research conducted by SoDM had findings that 12 billion m\(^3\) per year are not a safe limit to prevent earthquakes. A possible way to stop earthquakes is to stop gas production in Groningen (Damveld 2017a). However, in parliament, debates are about reducing gas production instead of stopping it. The VVD, CDA, and the PvdA agreed to build a new gas infrastructure. On 15 February 2017, the SP, CHU, and Groenlinks stated that gas extraction should be reduced to 12 billion m\(^3\).

On 1 March 2017, the court of the North Netherlands declared that “the state has acted carelessly in the period from January 2013 until December 2015,” for not putting its citizen first as advised by the court. The government still wants to produce more gas as announced by Henk Kamp on 15 February 2017, but that gas production will be capped at 21.6 billion cubic metres in October 2017. However, the final decision will be judged by the Dutch Council of State as the top administrative court on 15 November 2017.

In his show about Groningen earthquakes, Arjen Lubach was saying: “All the Dutch have enjoyed gas revenues for 50 years. We have a super awesome country because of gas revenues. What we can do now is to be generous to the people whose has no life and damage houses. To pay back what they have given to us. This gracious and polite. I raise, as this is a correct etiquette for people who live in a welfare state like us” (Gronings Gas-Zondag met Lubach (S06) 2017). In line with Lubach statement Christa Wichterich argues that it is pivotal for the state to be a “caring state” for its citizens to reduce “social and environmental cost.” (2015: 94).
Chapter 5 Conclusion

“It is an undeniable reality that in today’s network and information society people are both more assertive and more independent than in the past. This, combined with the need to reduce the budget deficit, means that the classical welfare state is slowly but surely evolving into a participation society. Everyone who is able will be asked to take responsibility for their own lives and immediate surroundings.”

(Willem-Alexander 2013)

On 17 September 2013, The King of The Netherlands, Willem-Alexander, delivered his speech discussing Dutch financial crises and revealing to rethink Dutch welfare system. The King of The Netherlands suggested Dutch citizen be self-reliance as the social spending of Dutch government would be significantly reduced. This speech delivered a year after the biggest earthquake hit Huizinge, Groningen.

In January 2014, two massive companies in Groningen declared bankrupt. Heiploeg was the biggest shrimp company in the European country, and Aldel was an aluminium smelter located in Groningen with 300 employers. While the rest of The Netherlands is facing financial crises as consequences of "the falling of the welfare state", people of Groningen are dealing with multi-facet of crises; economic and political crises, environmental crises and livelihood crises. During that year, I recall there were nine of my participants were unemployed. In her article, Christa Wichterich pointed out that in European societies the work and the lives have become "more precarious and less resilient" due to multiple crises happening (2015: 84).

Experiencing frequent earthquakes have wreckings buildings and exposing people to be vulnerable. A state of being defenselessness, scare and having no control over life are a traumatic experience. It can cause severe permanent health damage. It is ironic situation while the Dutch government ‘recovery program’ is more focusing on damage buildings.

In my research findings, a state of being vulnerable is felt most by two social dimensions categories; Dutch residents and people who live in rural area. Being a Dutch resident in Groningen is less convenient than being a non-Dutch resident. A non-Dutch resident has a freedom to migrate and to build their life outside Groningen or The Netherlands. They have full control over their life. On the contrary, Dutch resident has no choice either than dealing with their everyday vulnerability. Moving out from Groningen it is not simply as it may seem, especially because people are working in Groningen and investing their money in a house that unable to be sold.

People who live in the rural area are prone to be more vulnerable compared to people who live in the urban area. It is because the most damage buildings are located in rural area. Also, most of the time rural area are earthquakes epicentre location as the gas drilling locations are taking place in the rural area. Dutch residents that live in the rural area are the worst combination of vulnerability.
Meanwhile, vulnerability meanings do not belong to gender dualism. Both female and male are exposed to vulnerability. It also applies to age. An adult is vulnerably exposed as a child. However, interplays between Dutch resident, rural area and old people age 50s to 60s should be put to attention as this is the most vulnerable groups. I encountered with one of my participants who belong to this category, and I could not further interview him as he continued wiping. I was concern on his health, so I stopped my interview.

Being vulnerable has brought Groningers to come together, share their feelings, support each other, and caring for each other. It is strengthened their social cohesiveness that I witness as part of their social value. It is interesting to witness how these vulnerable people are coming together to cope their vulnerability and criticising neoliberal ideology of The Dutch government. They are protesting why The Dutch government has put “growth-obsessed” in the first place rather than their well-being as the Dutch citizen.

Their critiques are expressed in care, common, and enough as interlinked and conjoin concepts. Care expressions for today society, the future generation, and nature are interlinked with enough to stop gas extractivism and negotiating the commons. Care, common, and enough are a simultaneous process that can not be separated. In ‘care’ it is not only expressed by the Dutch residents but also non-Dutch residents. In ‘common’ and ‘enough’ are not only negotiated by the Groningen, but also in national and international level. They work together to support each other under various ‘umbrella’ themes; anti-fossil, the environmental movement, etc.

Furthermore, I found ‘enough’ as a resistance that shifted from using less gas to stop gas extractivism. This discourse is influenced by unrest parliament debates and dubious government to set a limit of gas production. The Groningen fates have been a political game for Dutch politician. The Dutch government has promised to capped gas production since 2013, but earthquakes are still occurring and wrecking buildings. In 2016, the discourse has a switch to more firm demand; enough. Stop gas extractivism in Groningen.

**Development Meanings for Me**

My aim to do research Groningen is to decolonise mind. I define decolonise as a shift in thinking. A shift of thinking in development and a shift of thinking in my colonial thinking. There is an urge in me to break away from mental colonialization.

My colonial thinking is not only coming from my family but also my engagement with the institutional theory for the last five years. Being a researcher in the resource-rich country, Indonesia had exposed me to ‘resource curse’ or ‘the paradox of plenty’ and how to overcome it. In institutional theory, the best solution to overcoming or preventing resource curse is by setting up rules and regulations. To set up rules and regulation, I used to look at a developed country like Norway, The Netherlands, or Canada as an example or as a best practice. Based on the assumption that develops or affluent country has a better governance compare to developing country with many corrupt practices taking place. My engagement with this theory has influenced me to perceive a developed country as a projection of Indonesia in a future.
Therefore, Lucas Amin’s article surprised me. I remember the first thing I had in mind was a question; Why do an advanced country like The Netherlands with better rules and regulations dealing with this issue? I then decided to take this research as decolonise project for my self, especially to have a shift in thinking about development.

After completing my research, I realise a shift in thinking about development. It is not about setting up rules or regulations to extract resources but “growth-obsessed” norms. It does not matter how good a country set up rules, but it can end up with disaster or exposing to risk because of economic interest that is taking at the first place. Rules and regulations become hidden tools to manage. Therefore, development is not about dualism between developed or developing country. Development is simultaneous process that happening not only in developing country but also in developed country.

Furthermore, doing research with Dutch participants serves as decolonising project for not only me but also my participants. During interview, I had colonialism dialogue with my participants. I did this because I was feeling uncomfortable when they were romanticising Dutch colonialization. Especially when they were approaching me and asking me about Indonesian memorabilia they received from their grandparents. For example, my participant was asking me about keris [assymetrical dagger] while telling me that this keris once belonged to a Javanese man whom his grandfather killed during the colonial war. It left me silent for a second but then I realised that I should embrace the fact that Indonesia was once a Dutch colony. By telling myself about this making me calmer then after that, we discussed colonial era.

I realise my research serves not only as academic but also a personal journey for me. I acknowledge that I possibly will never decolonise my mind without doing research in Groningen, The Netherlands. I have found my shifting idea on the development and having colonial dialogues with my Dutch participants is a precious experience for me.
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3 Later written as FPE.

4 Rendang is a spicy dish from Indonesia.

5 Groningen people called themselves as Groningen people.

6 City in Haarlemmermeer municipality in North Holland Province.

7 Suitcase trek in earthquake’s village’, Huizinge.

8 Christa Wichterich use “wealth accumulation” but I chose to use David Harvey concept “Accumulation by dispossession” because it is not only about ‘wealth’ but also ‘power’. David Harvey concept is covering ‘wealth’ and ‘power’.

9 Ostrom (1990: 90) offers eight principles on managing the commons; first, “clearly defining group boundaries”; second, governing rules should meet with local needs and condition; three, making sure that the people whose affecting by the rules are able to join and voice to revise the rules; fourth, making sure that “the rule-making rights of community are respected by outside authorities”; five, “monitoring; six, sanctions for rule violators; seven, accessible and low cost for resolution dispute; and eight, ‘build responsibility for governing the common resources in nested tiers from the lowest level up to the entire interconnected system’".