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Abstract

The city Rotterdam is superdiverse in which more than 50% has a migrant background. Rotterdam shows that a homogenous group of migrants does not exist and that a migrant group from a particular country is also diverse in people. The city furthermore portrays how conflicts from the country of origin becomes transnational and are imported to the city. This study states that conflict within a migrant group is also an element of superdiversity, which host societies deal with. One of the imported conflicts in Rotterdam is the polarisation between the Turkish and Kurdish migrants from Turkey.

Many news outlets have written on the polarisation within the migrant group from Turkey and on the attempts of the local authorities to deal with conflicts within this group. This research tries to understand the approach of the local authorities’ in Rotterdam. Moreover, it tries to understand changes in the approach with the research question How can we understand policy changes in the approach of local authorities within the municipality of Rotterdam towards the conflict between the Turks and Kurds?

Moving from the superdiversity theory towards Mahoney’s explain theory/model on institutional reproduction and change, this thesis uses this model to form an understanding of the municipality’s and police’s approach towards superdiversity related conflict and the approach towards polarisation between the Turkish and Kurdish migrants from Turkey in special. Through policy analysis and interviews with authorities, it concludes that in the authorities’ approach there is both continuity and change. On the one hand, migrant organisations remain an important partner for their ability to (de)mobilise their people and the authority they hold. On the other hand, the local authorities’ also try to reach people who do not identify with migrant organisations. They look for ‘the informal leaders’ as a partner against polarisation and want to talk and give a voice to ‘the silent middle’. The changes are based on the insights of one thinker/scholar on depolarisation; Bart Brandsma. The tensions in Rotterdam after the failed coup attempt in Turkey has made the authorities realize to intensify new and different approaches. One of the conclusions is that the new and old approach are used on all superdiversity-related conflicts and therefore there is no direct approach in this specific conflict between the Turks and Kurds. Another conclusion is that the implementation of the new approach is a challenge to put in practice for the authorities’ and therefore they keep on needing the old approach in contacting migrant organisations.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

The goal of this chapter is first to introduce the context and motivation for this study, followed by an explanation on the societal and theoretical relevance.

1.1 Aim study

Since 1984, The Turkish state has been in war with the Kurdish guerrilla movement, the Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan (PKK), and both sides have received extensive support from the groups they represent (Baser, 2016, p. 3-5). Dutch newspapers have had attention for this conflict in Turkey (Kieskamp, 1996). One of the reasons for this attention is the large diaspora from Turkey in the Netherlands and tensions within this group in large Dutch cities. An in-depth search into these news articles show that this situation mostly lives in the city of Rotterdam, which has a large diaspora from Turkey. A recent example is the Dutch newspaper Trouw that reports on “clashes” between Kurds and Turks in Rotterdam during a protest of Kurds on the 4th of February, 2018 (Markus, 2018). An older article also elaborates on the ‘Turkish’ tensions in the Netherlands (Kieskamp, 1996). The recent attention to the polarised diaspora from Turkey is encouraged by the coup attempt in Turkey in July 2016. This event has caused large tensions in Rotterdam (NOS, 16 July 2016). Returning topics in the media are concepts as the import of conflict by transnational activities, diversity and polarisation in the Turkish diaspora and conflict management (the role of the authorities). Baser argues that the Turkish diaspora shows how the transfer of “homeland conflicts” (2014, p. 5) and political rhetoric of the migrants migrates to the host country including conflicting relationships. She points out that this continuation of polarisation can be seen as threats and challenges for “scholars, policy-makers as well as the media” from the host society (Ibidem, p. 3).

Tensions and potential threats are triangularly discussed by the police, the municipality and the Public Prosecution Service in Rotterdam (Rotterdam, 28 September 2017). The influence of foreign conflicts has created local tensions and it feeds into polarisation among groups in the city (Ibid., p. 4-5). In order to prevent this, the municipality of Rotterdam and the police have set out a number of policies to counteract polarisation and prevent societal tensions (within their general policy approach to radicalisation). The municipality describes that dialogues prevents further tensions and serve to prevent the import of international conflicts into Rotterdam. Together with the policies on integration, the program aims to identify
polarisation, tension and fear in its early stages and to discuss this through dialogue (Rotterdam, 21 April 2015).

Although the municipality has presented their policy report (on the import of international conflicts and) polarisation (Rotterdam, 2015), the tensions between the groups from Turkey remains a complex policy-issue in Rotterdam. The events in Rotterdam after the Turkish coup attempt shows how important it is for the local authorities to have an appropriate approach to polarisation. The city is superdiverse which means that there are different groups living in the city and may present different issues to the local authorities. Superdiversity is a descriptive concept in explaining the societal composition of a city. Steven Vertovec uses superdiversity as a concept to describe the change in migration patterns and how this diversity influences the host society (2007, p. 1025). Maurice Crul adds that superdiversity also describes the diversity within groups in society (2016, p. 55). This (in-group) conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish community from Turkey is an element of superdiversity, which shows the diversity in a migrant group in the form of polarization. In-group conflicts are an underestimated topic in the superdiversity literature.

This research presents an institutionalist approach on this case of superdiversity to understand how institutions such as the municipality and the police change their policies within a fast-changing society. The unit of analysis is policy change within Rotterdam’s municipality and police. With the institutional approach, this research aims to understand the policy change within such stable institutions with superdiversity-related conflict in the background. Therefore, the literature starts with superdiversity and focus mostly on institutions and change. Deliberated from the above, this research aims to answer the following question: ‘How can we understand policy changes in the approach of local authorities within the municipality of Rotterdam regarding the conflict between the Turks and Kurds?'

In this research, the focus is on policy change within policy-making institutions. The research question of this study therefore focuses on the municipality and police in Rotterdam.

To answer this question, this research uses sub-questions, which are answered by a policy analysis and qualitative research. The sub-questions are:

1. What is the situation of the in-group conflict between Turkish and Kurdish community (from Turkey) in Rotterdam?
2. What is the current approach of Rotterdam’s municipality and police towards the in-group conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish community in Rotterdam
3. What has been the approach of Rotterdam’s municipality and police towards the in-group conflict in the past?

The first sub-question looks at how the tensions are situated in Rotterdam according to the local authorities without zooming into the groups or conflict in particular. It looks at the development of the situation in Rotterdam. This is important to understand the policies and how policies develop. The second sub-question follows up by examining the current approach of the city within this situation. It presents an understanding on how the municipality and the police act upon the conflict. This is followed by the third sub-question, which looks upon the approach in the past. Thereby, the change in approach can be understood. A policy analysis and qualitative research with interviews are conducted for this study.

The following chapter presents the theoretical framework on the institutional approach and policy change. Literature on superdiversity is used as a tool to understand superdiversity’s influence on policies. Chapter 3 describes the research design of this study including the methods, followed by chapter 4 in which the policy context on the national and local level will be outlined. This chapter also discusses the context of the ‘imported conflict’ and identifies the groups in the Turkish diaspora. After that, chapter 5 presents the findings based on the policy document and especially the interviews. Chapter 6 discusses these findings together with the theoretical insights. Hereby, the sub-questions are answered. The final chapter includes the conclusion of the study, discusses the theory with this conclusion and outlines the limitations of the findings with some recommendations for future research.

1.2 Theoretical and societal relevance

The theoretical relevance of this research is that it attempts to contribute to the literature of the institutional approach to policy change. This policy change is presented in a situation of superdiversity and its forthcoming complexity. While superdiversity is a local phenomenon, this research also provides a local focus on policy changes in the city of Rotterdam. Therefore, it shows that societal tensions caused by superdiversity do have an effect on the local authorities of a city, problems are picked up quicker, which leads to policy changes. The literature on institutions and the institutional approach on public policy hardly recognizes change(s) (Peters, 2000, p. 10). This study tries to present a case study in which this stability is tested by the changing societal context of superdiversity and it looks upon how the institutional approach tries to understand policy change. In this way, both theories, on superdiversity and the
institutional approach, are confronted. The conflict side in the superdiversity-literature has not been elaborated enough (Vertovec, 2007; Crul, 2016).

The societal relevance of this research is significant, because this conflict within the diaspora group from Turkey has been widely discussed. The debates have continued on the local and national level. It has raised questions on safety, polarisation, integration, and the involvement of a ‘foreign state’ in the Netherlands and how to react on this (NOS, 21 September 2015). The aftermath of the coup attempt in Turkey has brought many complications to the local authorities, because different groups within the diaspora clashed openly (on the streets) or privately (NOS, 16 July 2016). The complexity of this case pushes policy-makers and police officials to reflect on their approach, especially the events around the coup attempt has had the impacts on the city. The aim is to study policy changes on polarization because of the growing visibility of the in-group conflict. The polarization within between the communities from Turkey seems to be present in Rotterdam more than in the past.
Chapter 2. Theoretical framework

Earlier research has focused on the sociological aspects of group conflict by studying migrant groups. For example, Berkowitz and Mugge (2014) have looked at (migrant)group conflicts and their transnationalism and identification. Additionally, other research also focused on the influence of national policies on these migrant group conflicts (Baser, 2014; Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2001) and these studies have taken the national perspective as the main focus. These studies argue that the (political) institutional context of the receiving state determines the activities of migrant groups. Both open and closed institutional systems have influenced the import of homeland conflicts (Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2001, p. 262-263). However, these tensions with migrants are mostly located in the cities. Cities with large numbers of migrants are so-called superdiverse cities and this concept explains the changed societal context. This section discusses the concept of superdiversity and its implications on city institutions. Additionally, it studies that this diversity accommodates institutional change, in contrast to the stability presented by the institutional framework. Deliberated from this, this section ends with key expectations for this study.

2.1 Superdiversity

Superdiversity is first used by Steven Vertovec (2007) to describe the impact of migration on society and “the diversification of migration patterns” (p. 1025). Next to labor, people now also migrate for education, political reasons, marriage and family reunification. Men, women, young and old migrate for various reasons, which Vertovec studies by looking at inflows, variation in countries of origin, languages, religions, channels (work or study), statuses, gender and places (not only major cities) (p. 1028-1045). Additionally, Maurice Crul (2016) adds to Vertovec’s concept that groups in society are becoming more diverse than before. There is diversity in ethnicity, gender, age, education and political viewpoints (p. 55). One of the results is that in large cities with superdiversity, the minority groups (often migrants) become the majority and the majority (host society) becomes the minority. Furthermore, Vertovec discusses the effects of this diversity on the host society. He argues that superdiversity may challenge policies with new complexities and policy-makers should acknowledge the “enhanced transnational practices - the fact that ‘migrant communities.. can “cohere” to different social worlds and communities” (2007, p. 1049). Literature in superdiversity acknowledges that this pluriformity can lead to conflicts when diversity is not acknowledged as a new reality of society. Conflicts between
migrant groups and host society is mostly discussed by focusing on ‘us vs them’ sentiments in society (Geldof, 2013). In recent years, academic works begin to study disputes within migrant groups, because of transnational political practices (Berkowitz and Mugge, 2014). However, this point remains underdeveloped in superdiversity literature. The literature has to work towards an understanding that in-group conflicts in cities are another element of superdiversity, because a particular migrant group can also be polarized in the host country.

2.2 Implications for institutions

The migration of non-Dutch disputes and superdiversity itself challenges cities and its institutions. Vertovec shows this with an example that “schools, health services and local authorities are among those institutions which have to meet the challenges of growing linguistic complexity” (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1033). Institutions influence (and are) behavior of individuals and/or communities with formal and informal rules for social behaviour which can result in political and social structures (Vandenabeele, 2007, p. 547). Informal rules are the rules in cultural customs, traditions, behavioural codes and taboos. Formal rules are less flexible and consist of laws, rights and constitutions. They try to create “social coherence upon human activity, through the production and reproduction of settled habits of thought an action” (Burns and Scapens, 2000, p. 6). Additionally, institutions impose how “people are supposed to act” (Vandenabeele, 2007, p. 548) together with policies and therefore are less likely to change.

However, the settled habits and actions are not always in sync in times of change (Burns and Scapens, 2000, p. 6). In large Dutch cities, society changes due to superdiversity. This means that informal rules change with the introduction of new cultures, behavioral codes and taboos to society. Like society, these informal rules are also not homogenous anymore. This low-scale institutional change also influences other institutions in the city. The police, for instance, have to deal with new cultural taboos. Therefore, city institutions adjust their approach to superdiversity’s complexity and in-group conflicts.

2.3 Institutional approach and change

The institutional approach will be used to examine policy changes within institutions. The institutional approach studies the “the social context in which policy processes take place” (Cairney, Zahariadis & Scholten, 2016, p. 31) and therefore looks at the role of institutions (Diermeier, 2015, p. 16). This approach states that policies are stable for a longer period of time because structures exist although involved actors can change. Policies (and institutions) endure
and are not easily disrupted (Clemens & Cook, 1999, p. 445). Formal structures such as laws, rights and constitutions influence this institutional continuity (Peters, 2000) and together with informal rules, they are bounded and protect certain values. The institutional framework focuses mostly on the influence of normative standards of behavior, constructed by socially appreciated and accepted values, on policy-making. As a result, March and Olsen argue that institutions and the forthcoming policies are “taken as given for a long time” (March and Olsen, 1996, p. 249). They conceptualise this as the normative approach in the institutional framework. Another theory within the institutional approach is the historical institutionalism (Thelen, 1999). This theory also claims that institutionalized norms and values influence the continuity of a certain policy choice, described as path dependency (Ibid., p. 371). Mahoney adds to this by explaining that this can even be the case when past circumstances are no longer existing (2000, p. 510). Certain policies are “socially and historically embedded in institutions” (Cairney, Zahariadis & Scholten, 2016, p. 4) and leads to a certain institutional reproduction of policies as named by Mahoney (2000, p.517). Reproduction means that there are no interventions from individuals, groups and organisations.

Historical institutionalism is critized for its focus on policy processes as unchangeable. In general, the institutional approach hardly provides explanations for change. The sociological institutionalism however adopts the Punctuated Equilibrium Model as an explanatory framework for when this stability changes. This model suggests that, in order to disrupt a long period of stability which accounts as the equilibrium, punctation is important for key changes (True, Jones and Baumgartner, 2007). The punctuation of the so-called positive feedback not only stands for, but also reinforces the moment of change. In this sense, positive feedback stands for the minor change which triggers (future) major change (Ibidem, p. 9). Two mechanisms strengthen the positive feedback: actors shop for the best venue to aim for policy change, and image manipulation (finding new events and evidence) to shift the attention towards policy change (Ibidem, p. 11). Therefore, policy-choices of institutions can change after a long period of stability.

However, it seems that the Punctuated Equilibrium Model looks at ‘what causes change’ without explaining why a certain policy changes. Therefore, other models and theories in the institutional approach are created to understand and explain change in institutions’ policy process. Scholars try to identify the meaning of change, how it can be categorized and explained. Mahoney describes this as “reversing self-reinforcing processes” (2000, p. 517). Deliberated from Thelen’s and Mahoney’s work, Capoccia argues that institutions change due
to “reinterpretation and coalition-building among social and political actors” (2016, p. 7). To understand what change is, Capoccia identifies types of change according to earlier work in this field (Ibid., p. 5). The first type of change is, defined by Schickler (2001), that new rules are merged with old rules for improvements in their effects, indicated as layering. Another type is indicated by Thelen (1999) as conversion in which existing rules are reinterpreted to serve new conditions. The third type is described by Hacker (2004), who identifies institutional change as drift points in situations in which old rules are not altered when social conditions change. The last type is exhaustion in institutions where it diminishes after overuse, as argued by Streeck (2009). Furthermore, Capoccia states that scholars in the institutional approach are divided in explaining change with path-dependency theories, which argues that change is related to exogenous factors, and in explaining this change with theories based on endogenous institutional change.

On the one hand, the institutional approach has mainly focused on stability (reproduction) of policy, and on the other hand, this approach is also occupied with understanding change. Mahoney combines this in his work by using insights from Randall Collins and with that providing a model of four explanations for change and reproduction (2000, p. 517), pointed below:
The utilitarian explanation describes institutional reproduction as a result of cost-benefit assessments of actors. Consequently, reproduction becomes the rational choice of actors instead of adopting alternatives. In this explanation, the mechanisms of change are stimulated when competitive pressures/alternatives increase. Therefore, reproduction is no longer in the interest of the actors because of more working alternatives (p. 518). Campbell (2007, p.7) argues that in new situations actors look at the efficiency of institutions. However, this explanation has been criticized for its market-orientation. It suggest that every institution works as a market in which costs and benefits are assessed. Therefore, this explanation does not fully explain institutional change for cultural and social institutions.

For this reason, this utilitarian explanation cannot explain institutional change in a new environment of superdiversity. Although used by Mahoney (2000), this explanation is not further be used in this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism of reproduction</th>
<th>Utilitarian explanation</th>
<th>Functional explanation</th>
<th>Power explanation</th>
<th>Legitimation explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution is reproduced through the rational cost-benefit assessments of actors</td>
<td>Institution is reproduced because it serves a function for an overall system</td>
<td>Institution is reproduced because it is supported by an elite group of actors</td>
<td>Institution is reproduced because actors believe it is morally just or appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential characteristics of institution</td>
<td>Institution may be less efficient than previously available alternatives</td>
<td>Institution may be less functional than previously available alternatives</td>
<td>Institution may empower an elite group that was previously subordinate</td>
<td>Institution may be less consistent with values of actors than previously available alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism of change</td>
<td>Increased competitive pressures; learning processes</td>
<td>Exogenous shock that transforms system needs</td>
<td>Weakening of elites and strengthening of subordinate groups</td>
<td>Changes in the values or subjective beliefs of actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The literature above provides the background for the institutional approach to policy change. The following three explanations are more applicable in explaining institutional change in an environment of changing societal contexts, which is more relevant for the continuation of this research.

In the power explanation for institutional reproduction, institutions endure because it is promoted by an elite that benefits from this (Mahoney, 2000, p. 521). Just like Mahoney, Campbell also argues that the most powerful people install the institutions that they want and have the power to change these institutions for their own benefits (2007, p. 10). According to Mahoney, this power position of the elite and the disadvantage of other groups in society leads to a dynamic of conflict (2000, p. 523). Therefore, disadvantaged groups can mobilise social movements “with strategic framing of issues and interests, mobilization of resources, and coalition-building” (Campbell, 2007, p. 11) in order to stimulate institutional change. Moreover, power struggles within the elite group and the division in interests within this group can also lead to institutional change (Mahoney, 2000, p. 523). However, this does not mean that power struggles end with “the most efficient institutions or that institutions will change at all even found to be deficient” (Campbell, 2007, p. 11). This explanation relates change to “conflicts and struggles to control valued resources, dominate markets and otherwise obtain power” (Ibid., p. 10).

Another explanation in the institutional framework is that of the functionalists. Mahoney explains that institution reproduction is caused “by the beneficial effects.. to a system” (p. 519). He continues by arguing that an institution “serves some function for the system, which causes the expansion of the institution, which enhances the institution’s ability to perform the useful function, which leads to further institutional expansion and eventually institutional consolidation” (Ibid.). This explanation hardly recognizes change with the belief in self-regulating systems and change can only be realized by an exogenous shock that influences the overall system to transform and adopt a new setting (p. 520). Campbell also argues that an institution only changes for a broader environment in which this change is realized (2007, p. 8). As Mahoney suggests and which is also mentioned by Capoccia (2016), this explanation only focuses on exogenous mechanisms changing institutions and otherwise institutional change cannot be realized.

The last theory is the legitimation explanation. This explanation argues that institutions are designed according to “a logic of appriopriateness” (Campbell, 2007, p. 8). This means that institutions are bound to the norms, beliefs and morals of what is believed as correct and/or just (Ibid.) Therefore, an institution is viewed as legitimate and reproduction is “reinforced through
processes of increasing legitimation” (Mahoney, 2000, p. 523) and these processes are supported by positive feedback. The legitimacy of institutions can change when certain events lead to the evaluation of the beliefs and values. This change is therefore stimulated by events that bring “changes in actors’ subjective beliefs and preferences, not changes in the power distribution of actors or changes in the utility functions of actors” (p. 525). Coming back to Cappoccia’s work (2016), this explanation highlights the role of endogenous mechanisms on institutional change.

2.4 Expectations

The development in society towards superdiversity has presented complexities. Not only does the societal balance in cities change, but also non-Dutch disputes can be imported and institutions have to face these complexities. This raises the question on how superdiversity-related conflicts lead to change in policy (approach) of institutions. On the one hand, superdiversity and related conflicts point towards the change in society, while, on the other hand, the institutional approach argues that institutions often show a long period of stability. The connection between societal diversity and policy-making institutions, as a representation of this society, is therefore needed to be understand.

In this light, this research studies how policies change with superdiversity-related conflict. It contributes to the literature on policy changes from an institutional approach. With the model of institutional change, it tries to provide explanations for policy change within institutions facing superdiversity-related conflict. This superdiversity-related conflict is not focused on polarisation between host society and out-groups (as this is discussed in the literature). This research positions itself in the literature with the argument that migrant groups are diverse and that in-group polarisation is another element of superdiversity and the superdiverse society. This research furthermore adds in-group conflict/polarisation to earlier researches on implications of superdiversity.

Thereby, the following expectations for this research looks at these points addressed in this theoretical framework:

- Expectation 1. Institutions and institutionalized policies change because of exogenous shocks from transnational conflicts of migrants
- Expectation 2. Institutions and institutionalized policies change because of changes in the beliefs and values of involved actors on policy-complexity of superdiversity-related conflict.
• Expectation 3. Institutions and institutionalized policies change because of the strengthening of subordinate groups and weakening of elites by change in the majority/minority balance in cities.
Chapter 3. Research Design

This chapter describes the methods, case selection, data collection and operationalization of the variables used in this study. In the final part of the design, the validity and reliability are described and the limitations are discussed.

3.1 Question

This research aims to examine the local authorities in their policy change towards ‘imported’ conflicts in migrant groups, in order to understand 1) how policy change can be explained with the institutional approach and 2) thereby to understand if change is a reaction to superdiversity in the city. In doing so, based on the policy document and qualitative analysis, the research creates an understanding of Rotterdam’s policy and approach. Herein, the emphasis on local authorities represent the approach by policy-makers and the police as civil servants within the municipality. Therefore, this study aims to answer ‘How can we understand policy changes in the approach of local authorities within the municipality of Rotterdam towards the conflict between the Turks and Kurds?’

As mentioned in the first chapter, to answer the research question, this research uses sub-questions:

1. What is the situation of the in-group conflict between Turkish and Kurdish community (from Turkey) in Rotterdam?
2. What is the current approach of Rotterdam’s municipality and police towards the in-group conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish community in Rotterdam
3. What has been the approach of Rotterdam’s municipality and police towards the in-group conflict in the past?

The first sub-question provides an understanding of the conflict between the Turks and Kurds situated in Rotterdam. It does not focus on the conflict in Turkey or describe the groups, but it looksat how the groups and this conflict are situated in Rotterdam. This question provides information to study the following sub-questions. The second question looks at the current approach and policies of Rotterdam towards societal tension, diversity and polarisation (within this case). Lastly, the third sub-question asks how the approach was in the past. Thereby, it becomes clear how this was different (or not) in comparison to the current approach.
To answer these sub-question, a qualitative research helps to explain and to critically assess information that academic literature does not provide. Interviews may present findings and answers that are not present in the literature because it looks upon choices and experiences of the municipality and police. Furthermore, an in-depth study of the municipality’s policies may lead to findings which have not been discussed in literature before.

3.2 Operationalization

To understand the change in policies and approaches of local authorities towards superdiversity-conflicts, this research uses a case study approach towards the conflict between the Turks and Kurds in Rotterdam. While conducting this study and looking for findings on this matter, indicators from the theory guides the process. The research question asks for an understanding of the policy changes in the approach, which suggests an examination of the before and after the change. Both change and reproduction are examined according to indicators presented by Mahoney’s theory (2000). This theory examines how institutional reproduction and change can be explained. The case study tests this theoretical institutional approach for policy change by looking at societal changes and implications of superdiversity. Table I on the next page lists the indicators and questions for the interviews and the examination of the policy document.

Table I presents the three concepts Mahoney presents in his theory, namely the concepts of ‘characteristics’ (in his theory the characteristics of the institution and in this research, characteristics of approach), ‘mechanisms of reproduction’ and ‘mechanisms of change’. Based on these concepts and their definitions, the table also presents the indicators distilled from the theory that are operationalised into main questions. The overall interview questions can be find in Appendices I.

The operationalisation creates an understanding on the policy-situation and policy-approach of the local authorities. Discussing the characteristics of the policy will further lead to an understanding of the situation in which the current policy has changed. This provides the policy-situation, as mentioned with the first sub-question. Moreover, the indicators for reproduction and change provides an understanding on how the policy developed. Thereby, all sub-questions will be answered with the indicators.

Table I. Operationalisation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Main question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of approach</td>
<td>“Distinctive reasons” (Mahoney, 2000, p.517) in which an institution/policy develops</td>
<td>Situation related to approach</td>
<td>How would you describe the situation of the conflict in Rotterdam?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current policy</td>
<td>What is the city’s current approach? How is this approach built?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involved actors</td>
<td>Which actors/groups are involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms of reproduction</td>
<td>Mechanisms that lead to continuity: institutions and the forthcoming policies that are “taken as given for a long time” (March and Olsen, 1996, p. 249)</td>
<td>Function of past policy/approach</td>
<td>What was the approach in the past?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Role of) beliefs in past approach</td>
<td>Why was this approach used in the past?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Power past approach</td>
<td>What is the power of the past approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms of change</td>
<td>Mechanisms that reverse “self-reinforcing processes” (Mahoney, 2000, p. 517)</td>
<td>Exogenous shocks/turning points</td>
<td>What has led to the change in approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belief in new approach</td>
<td>What was the turning point?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strength groups</td>
<td>What has changed? Why do you think that these changes are important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the role of groups on the approach?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Methods (Data collection and Data Analysis)

The data for the context chapter is conducted from academic journals, statistical databases and local and national newspapers online. The empirical data in the findings chapter will be conducted through qualitative research from four interviews and the municipality’s policy document. This section will specify the methods for the qualitative research.

To create context on the groups’ composition, the conflict in Turkey and the Dutch national policies academic literature and facts and figures of the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) will be used. Keywords as ‘Dutch migrant policies’ and ‘Turkish-Kurdish conflict’ provide via Google Scholar the academic literature to study the context and background on the national approach towards transnational political conflict between the migrant groups. This data provides background information for the situation in Rotterdam and the approach of the authorities towards this situation.

For the analysis on the policy of Rotterdam, the municipality site has a policy document published on their approach towards polarisation and societal tension (Rotterdam, 2015). Without mentioning the case, this document provides the approach and thoughts of the municipality towards ‘imported’ conflicts. This document emphasizes the approach of dialogues and therefore another step is to look up how many dialogue initiatives the municipality has taken during recent tensions and past tensions. This is researched on the website of the municipality and via keywords as ‘dialogue initiatives in Rotterdam’ at online newspapers as the Nederlandse Omroep Stichting (NOS), De Volkskrant and Trouw. The online platforms also provide information on past approaches and situations of the municipality. Nevertheless, the police also has put out reports on threats for the society in Rotterdam with an eye on ‘foreign conflicts’ and the resulting potential of polarisation. These police documents and further online news articles on police approach towards conflicts between migrants will further support how local authorities have dealt with these issues.

As one part of this research is a policy analysis, another important element in the qualitative analysis are the interviews with policy-makers and the police on this matter. The interviews provides in-depth understanding and information in order to explain certain decisions by local authorities and to understand the situation in Rotterdam. The interviews are semi-structured, which creates more space for diverse questions in order to gain new information. Therefore, some questions are prepared before the interviews. However, depending on the answers on these questions, during the interviews follow up questions on specific answers are also used. Semi-structured interviews provide flexibility in questions.
Interviews are important because the knowledge derived from these interviews cannot be examined through a literature review for example. These interviews may present new findings, which has been overlooked by the literature before. They are transcribed, presented and analysed with a discussion on these results.

The gatekeeper in this research has delivered key contacts from his network to interview. The gatekeeper is a political and administrative advisor for the municipality and police in Rotterdam and during a meeting he mentioned his contacts of policy-makers and police officers on the issue of societal tensions/polarisation. The selection for the interviewees are on the basis of their expertise on this particular subject and they have to be a civil servant in Rotterdam. Both the police officers and policy-makers in Rotterdam, who have expertise on this issue, are civil servants for the municipality and have policy-relevancy on the approach towards societal conflicts with migrant groups. They are the relevant local authorities in this study. However, in order to prevent the interviews from being identical, a selective amount of interviews are held. This specific-defined case study does not require much quantity in interviews and looks for quality in interviews. The transcribed interviews are categorised according to the indicators in a table (Appendices II).

3.3.1 The Interviewees
Four interviews are conducted with key servants from Rotterdam’s authorities on this issue. They were chosen by their position and activities, which determine the local authorities’ approach to the case. The table provides an overview of the interviewees’ position and activities. To safeguard their anonymity, their names are not incorporated to the table. Therefore, when referred to a quote or arguments, the interviewee’s number or position is used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Policy advisor</td>
<td>Safety department: anti-radicalisation program</td>
<td>Municipality of Rotterdam</td>
<td>26.06.2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>municipality Rotterdam</td>
<td>approach and program against societal tensions and polarisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Specialist Police unity Rotterdam ‘Kracht van het Verschil’ (power of the difference), = alliance- and network-building and diversity management → connection between the police and society

3. Police chief district North of Unity Rotterdam Besides chief responsibilities: Dossier ‘Turkish tensions’ - chair of network Turkey within the police, part of the ‘Kracht van het Verschil’ and diversity management. Police office of district North in Schiedam 24.07.2018

4. Police Chief district South of Unity Rotterdam Besides chief responsibilities: Dossier ‘Turkish tensions’ Police office of district South, Rotterdam 19.07.2018

3.4 Case selection

The Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy recently published an infographic on migration related diversity and stated that the three largest cities, Amsterdam, the Hague and Rotterdam, have the largest diversity index (WRR 2018). The cities have changed fast over the last decade with this diversity and this is also visible in changes in societal tensions and polarisation with more imported conflicts. Most (super)diversity literature focuses on conflict between in- and outgroups, but also this has changed. Many tensions also occurs within migrant groups. Especially in Rotterdam this seems to be the case looking at different key events as clashes between Turks and Kurds during a Kurdish demonstration for instance. These tensions in Rotterdam seem to grow with the developments in Turkey and the transnationalism of
migrant groups. The large quantity of Turkish migrants and the Turkish consulate may also have a part in the tensions. For this study, Rotterdam is taken as the case study.

The tensions are not something new for Rotterdam. Earlier attempts by the mayor to host dialogues between representatives of the political organisations and to encourage them to sign an agreement on their input for public order has not led to the expected results. (NOS, 17 September 2015). All in all, the municipality and the police in Rotterdam have made their effort in their approach towards this conflict. Therefore, this case-study approach may show that the societal changes led by superdiversity may influence institutional change.

3.5 Limitations
Consequently, researches’ methodology have limitations and implications. This research is limited to the police and municipality, which are a segment of the local institutional authorities in the city of Rotterdam. The small and specific case study in this design may not provide room for more local authorities. Additionally, this small and specific study does also limit the quantity in interviews and therefore a couple of interviews are conducted, while an elaborative qualitative analysis has to be built from a certain amount of interviews. Therefore, the empirical evidence is based on four interviews and this can lead to limitations in the empirical strength of the findings. Furthermore, the answers to some of the interview questions may be the same (when asking for the current approach towards migrant group conflict for instance). Moreover, the scope of the case may further not provide room for follow-up questions during the interviews. The short time frame in which the research has to be conducted may lead to limitations on the results of this research. The study only focuses on the city’s approach and will not, for example, look upon the results of this approach in practice or the role of the migrant groups’ themselves. Hereby, the research is only reflected on local authorities and key civil servants and their insights on how the city approaches this case.

3.5.1 Ethical considerations
For the purpose of a good research, the questions for the interviews and the interviews in general need to be formulated and conducted objectively without portraying the personal opinion of the researcher. Furthermore, the interviews are taken one-on-one and personal information is kept confidential. The policy-makers who are going to be interviewed, will be chosen carefully and only in relation to the research question.
Chapter 4. Context and background

This chapter will describe the general national context towards migrants in the Netherlands, which will contribute to further research on the local context. Afterwards, the two migrant groups and the ‘imported conflict’ will be described.

4.1 National Context

From the 1970s until the beginning of the 2000s, the Dutch approach towards migrant communities was multiculturalist in which the government encouraged and assisted the migrant groups’ organization. It was believed that integration could be achieved by the emancipation within the migrant’s cultural identity. The inclusive Dutch context expected that the organizations were less orientated to homeland politics (Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2001, p. 270). It was believed that group emancipation would lead to individual participation. Grants were provided to organisations that actively worked for their group and were “held responsible for the actions of individuals” (Schrover, 2010, p. 345).

From the 1990s onwards, and especially from the 2000s, multiculturalism lost its political support due to…. Mainstream policies replaced targeted policies in order to minimize the socio-cultural differences between migrants and native society. In political and academic debates, it was argued that migrants were not integrated, and that multiculturalism had created segregation in Dutch society (Reekum & Duyvendak, 2012). Migrant groups were too much orientated to homeland politics (Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2001, p. 270). However, academic work also discusses that, in the Dutch context, the focus of politics and policies are still focused on the migrant organisations. Schrover argues that there is an institutional path dependency on this multiculturalist approach from the past (Schrover, 2012, p. 345).

4.2 Local context

Rotterdam’s political coalition followed the national shift shortly after. Poppelaars and Scholten (2008) argue that Rotterdam followed this shift “more closely than other major cities, mainly because of its political coalition consisting of Christen-Democrats, the Liberal party and Fortuyn’s party, Leefbaar Rotterdam” (p. 347). When Leefbaar Rotterdam became the biggest party, it aimed for assimilation policies for migrant groups and did not have an open approach towards diversity anymore (Tersteeg, Kempen e.a., 2014, p. 11). However, in practice, the policies were not fully implemented as it was initiated. When in 2015 tensions rose between
the Turkish and Kurdish groups in Rotterdam, mayor Aboutaleb initiated dialogues with different ‘Turkish, Kurdish and Alevi’ organisations (NOS, 17 September 2015). This has been termed as a multiculturalist approach next to the new assimilation approaches towards migrant groups. Poppelaars and Scholten (2008) also argue this with the argument that “this instrumental way of interacting with migrant organizations might even contradict the ideas of local political leaders” (p. 349). The scholars point out that although the city’s administration has had a closed approach towards migrants and their organisations, civil servants continued with their contact and cooperation with migrant groups’ and their organisations (Ibid.). This closed approach meant that the administration is more closed to contact and cooperation with migrant organisation leaders, which has been a strategy in the old multiculturalist context. In 2017, the mayor initiated a meeting after the Turkish coup tensions in Rotterdam for everyone with a ‘Turkish background’. The AD reports that not many citizens came to the meeting and the attendees were no unknown persons, which means that they were a part of migrant organisations (AD, 25 September 2017). In the local perspective, although there is a break with the multiculturalist past, in practice there is also a dependency on migrant organisations.

4.3 Identifying the groups and conflict

From the 1950 and 60s onwards, Turkish and Kurdish migrants from Turkey moved to Western Europe after the labour migration agreements between Turkey and states as Germany and the Netherlands. After the 1975s, many students, asylum seekers, refugees, exiles and families from the labour migrants followed. In contrast to the Turkish migrant group who migrated for labour and family reunification, the Kurdish migrants from Turkey are more diverse in their migratory reasons. The reason for this is the political context in Turkey (Baser, 2014, p. 5; Van Bruinessen, 2000).

The categorisation of citizens with a Kurdish background who have migrated from Turkey does not exist, because the Dutch statistics categorise migrants based on the country of origins. Therefore, the Kurdish and Turkish migrants from Turkey are in the same category. The Central Agency of Statistics (CBS) in the Netherlands notes on 400.000 citizens with origins in Turkey, including second generation born in the Netherlands and either both parents or one parent born in Turkey (CBS, 21 November 2016). Citizens with a Kurdish background from Turkey are estimated to be around 45.000 to 100.000 (Kennisplatform Integratie & Samenleving en Expertise-unit Sociale Stabiliteit, 2017, p. 14-15).
4.3.1 The Kurds
The Kurdish migrants moved from Turkey, Syria, Iraq and Iran to the Netherlands for various reasons. The Kurds from Turkey are the largest and most politically active. Most of them also have the Turkish citizenship (Mugge, 2014, p. 75).

Some of these Kurdish migrants organised based on their religious Muslim ties. These organisations are non-Kurdish. However, most Kurds organised as a group along ethnic lines (Mugge, 2010, p. 114). The Union of Associations from Kurdistan (KOMKAR), described as “moderate Kurdish nationalist organisation” by Baser (2016, p.71), has mostly had importance in the Europe in the 1970s and 1980s. The Kurdistan Democratic Communities Union (KCK) took KOMKAR’s place now and has national affiliations in European countries. The Dutch affiliation is named the Democratic Council of Communities from Kurdistan (DEMNED) and is also locally present with organizational centres in Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam and Arnhem (Ibid.).

The main goal of KCK together with the national affiliations is to keep their relevance through the Kurdish migrants. Furthermore, the organisation aims to create awareness on the Kurdish Question in Europe and to construct the Kurdish identity, which has been suppressed in the countries of origin (Ibid.). Within this framework, DEMNED has the goal to lobby for awareness on the situation in Turkey and to root for equal rights in Turkey and the Netherlands. They also try to encounter the institutional exclusion of the Kurds in the Netherlands, as statistics incorporates this group with the Turkish migrants. Local centres serve to encourage integration while also focusing on strengthening the Kurdish identity (Mugge, 2012, p. 13). Kurdish migrants affiliated with these local centres are the identifiable side of the tensions in Rotterdam.

4.3.2 The Turks
In contrast to the Kurdish group, the Turkish migrants from Turkey are harder to identify. They are not always politically active through one organisation and the group of ethnic Turks is diverse. Some are connected to different Turkish migrant organisations and some operate without any connections to an organisation (Kennisplatform Integratie & Samenleving en Expertise-unit Sociale Stabiliteit, 2017). For this reason, the Turkish migrants in Rotterdam will not be delimited to one (ethnic) organisation. Rather, their profile will be discussed.

On the one hand, this group consists of individuals from a Turkish background who are loyal to the Turkish state without any involvement to an organisation. On the other hand, it consists of individuals who express their loyalty through ethnic organisations as the Dutch
equivalence of the Grey Wolves (The Turkish Federation organisations) and through Sunni religious organisations as Diyanet and Milli Gorus for instance (Mugge, 2010, p. 111-112). The Gülen movement is not present as an organisation, but there are organisations, businesses and schools etc. sympathising with this movement. These organisations, movements and individuals sympathize with the Turkish political parties like the extreme-right nationalist party MHP (the Grey Wolves) and/or the leading religious conservative Justice and Development Party (AKP). The Turkish migrants in favour of the secular and republican party (CHP), which was created by Turkey’s founder Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, are also nationalistic (Ibid.). However, they are less visible in the conflict between the Turks and Kurds (Kennisplatform Integratie & Samenleving en Expertise-unit Sociale Stabiliteit, 2017).

In sum, individuals and organisations who cause the tensions with Kurdish opponents, are inspired by two main political parties, who hold a nationalistic and religious view, from Turkey. They are harder to identify than the Kurds in Rotterdam, who are mostly involved in the tensions through DEMNED. Both groups are orientated on the homeland political situation and lobby for their political viewpoints in order to hold a stance against one another.

4.3.3 The ‘imported’ conflict

The declaration of the Turkish Republic in 1923 meant the start of a new nation-state for the Turkish nation, which meant an end of the Ottoman multi-nation vision. Whoever lived inside the borders of the Republic was a Turk. This meant that the label ‘Turk’ for the large ethnic Kurdish minority. For decades, the Kurds resisted this label while the Turkish state forced ‘Turkishness’ with prohibiting any Kurdish expression (Yegen, 2006, p. 126).

The Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan (PKK), Kurdish Workers’ Party, was founded in 1978 as a political party demanding “freedom of expression and recognition of their ethnicity, identity and culture” (Ibid., p. 126). However, the Turkish Constitution did not provide the legal or cultural rights to ethnic groups (Ibid.). The PKK faced political blockades and was dissolved by the Court. From 1984 onwards, the party started an armed struggle against the Turkish state, which has claimed approximately 40,000 lives. Thousands of people became internally displaced because of the fightings and deportations (Berkowitz & Mugge, 2014, p. 78).

The PKK’s initiative aim was to struggle for a Kurdish, socialist state. However, their current interest is regional, democratic autonomy, which Jongerden and Akkaya describe as “practices in which people produce and reproduce the necessary and desired conditions for living through direct engagement and collaboration with one another” (2013, p. 171). In 2001,
the PKK was put on the list of terrorist organisations by the USA and in 2002, the European
Union also placed the organisation on the list of terrorist organisations. The PKK was seen as
a danger to “the independence of the state and indivisible integrity of its territory and nation”
(Berkowitz & Mugge, 2014, p. 78), because of its violence towards the Turkish state.

Although there has been a short peace process, the struggle has been ongoing. The
Kurdish diaspora from Turkey in Europe have either experienced this war before migrating
and/or sympathize with the PKK. Kurdish organisations in Europe and Kurdish media seek to
connect with the diaspora. Most of the Turkish diaspora in Europe feel connected with the
Turkish state in this struggle and stay connected to the conflict mostly through Turkish
television channels (Ibid.). Therefore, the conflict in Turkey moved together with the diaspora
to Western European states.
Chapter 5. Findings

The previous chapter has first indicated the national and local context for migrant organisations in the Netherlands and Rotterdam. Thereafter, it portrays the Turkish and Kurdish migrants from Turkey. The CBS categorizes the groups together because it looks at country of origin, which is Turkey. This group of migrants from Turkey is changing and is becoming more diverse, which brings more issues of polarisation in the superdiverse city Rotterdam. This chapter will provide in-depth findings from the interviews with civil servants from the police and municipality and the municipality’s policy documents on managing societal tensions in Rotterdam. The findings will be outlined per indicator as presented in Chapter 3 with dividing some of them between the police and municipality.

5.1 Characteristics of the approach

5.1.1 Situation related to the approach
The situation in which a certain approach is developed is important in order to understand the approach. As described in the previous chapter, Rotterdam followed the national changes towards migrant groups immediately. When asked for a description of the tensions in Rotterdam within the migrant group from Turkey, every interviewee agreed that the tensions were present in Rotterdam for a longer period.

“There has always been tensions, it did not grow or decrease”, states interviewee 1. However, it becomes visible with incidents in the public. The same point is made by interviewee 2. He states that “the situation between the Kurds and Turks in Rotterdam is a longer process of polarisation and conflict. It is not new. If you look at the Turkish diaspora [edit: diaspora from Turkey], polarisation has always been a part of the group and that has given some tensions as well”. The police chief of North and the police chief of South underline the same point.

Especially interviewees from the police mention that the events with the coup in Turkey were a change in Rotterdam. “The Netherlands did not know how strongly the diaspora was polarised until three years ago. Before the coup, talking about the Turks meant the whole group without any distinctions”, interviewee 3 states. Interviewee 4 also claims that “the real breaking point in Rotterdam was when the attempt of a coup was happening in Turkey. Afterwards, this had results in Rotterdam as growing fears within groups because of tension and the changing context. The violent incidents with the visit of the Turkish Minister of Family Affairs was not
only a result of traditionally conflicting groups”. Interviewee 2, the specialist, calls it ‘tension fields’ and explained “before the coup, the traditional tension field in Rotterdam was Turks vs. Kurds. After the events in Turkey, more diverse tension fields are added which crossed and overlapped one another… Just like the Turkish politics, the diversity in the group, echoes to Rotterdam”.

The policy report of Rotterdam on security also describes the influence of international conflicts in Rotterdam without explicitly naming the conflicts within the migrant group from Turkey (Rotterdam, 2015). It describes that in general “many people living in Rotterdam are struggling with feelings of indignation, disbelief and fear… non-stop, day and night, we [people] are flooded with news of disturbing events and political developments via (social) media” (p. 3) and therefore “the influence of international conflicts can also be felt in Rotterdam” (Ibid.).

5.1.2 Current policy

*Municipality*

The city’s policy document aims for a “peaceful society” (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 3). The citizens also carry the responsibility in this process. The mayor states that “there is a lot of support for an approach that broadly unifies the goodwill of well-intentioned citizens… a strong network at schools and in neighbourhoods and with community and religious organisations. The citizens of Rotterdam are striving for co-existence without social tensions, polarisation or radicalisation”.

The mayor states that all citizens are willing to work for coherence in society and explains what is important to achieve this. He states:

“to live in a ‘we’ society, where people from different cultural backgrounds come together, respect each other, and have consideration for the circumstances of others. In a city with 174 different nationalities, it is vital to have an open dialogue” (Ibid.).

The mayor identifies in this section the important conditions for the approach in Rotterdam such as network-building and maintaining open dialogues.

When asked how this situation created the local authorities’ approach to the civil servants at the municipality and police, the authorities mention that they are still in development on their approach. Interviewee 1 responds “Good to mention is that we are in development. We try to develop new visions on how to encounter tensions. This can change next week for
example, because it is an important topic for us. And we keep on searching for answers on how to approach this the best”.

Additionally, the civil servants from the interviews point out that the approach focuses on network building. Furthermore, the knowledge of the authorities on diversity conflict and polarisation has been sharpened up with insights from Bart Brandsma and this has shaped the approach of the municipality and the police. In the second paragraph, Brandsma (not an interviewee), as involved actor, will be mentioned more. Interviewee 1 pointed out:

“Right now, we have a couple of conditions for our vision on the situation. Among other things, we make use of the insights of Bart Brandsma. Underneath tensions and conflict is the ‘us vs them’ way of thinking. For us, it is important to see this and look at the dynamics under the surface. It is important to acknowledge that there is a large group in the middle. The whole group cannot be eliminated by the actions of a couple of them. An important goal of us is to focus on this group in the middle and to see ‘what connects us?’ instead of ‘what are our differences?’ We are still looking for how the municipality can work with that. So which conversations do you have with whom? What is the topic of conversation? Which signals are there? We try to have the right contacts for every group and topic and then we can now what happens in the city and what sentiments there are”.

Another important point in the approach of the municipality and the police is the importance of the rules and laws. For example, interviewee 1 explains “In terms of conflict, we try to act correctly together with the police according to the law. When someone crosses the law, caused by the conflict in Turkey, we will take actions. When there are tensions, the mayor's judgement and decisions are important because the mayor has to protect the public order and safety (according to the law)”.

The municipality’s policy for societal tensions and polarisation is a part of the policy-program ‘Rotterdam’s radicalisation approach 2015-2018’. The document is mostly focused on (jihadist) radicalism. However, as this radicalism also creates polarisation and tension, the approach is formulated in four main lines against societal tensions. The general approach serves every case of tension. “The goal is to prevent the import of international conflicts to Rotterdam causing societal tensions and polarisation” (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 10). First, the municipality aims to facilitate initiatives from society to tackle polarisation. The second line contains the quick scan method which is important for the municipality in recognizing early stages of
tensions. Third, the municipality also builds on a good network of key figures. The fourth line is that the municipality works together with relevant partners in the issue (Ibid., p. 10-11).

Interviewee 1 explains that in these four lines, not mentioning them explicitly, the role of the neutral and silent group in the middle of the conflicting groups is important. Thereby, the municipality tries to stimulate the society in Rotterdam to take initiatives and, if needed, facilitate these initiatives. These initiatives have to be in line with the municipality’s perspective on societal tensions. The policy-maker and policy document both mentioned that the municipality works on its information position. Therefore, the quick scan served to optimize the municipality’s information position with a larger and well-functioning network of key figures. Together with the police, they try to do the same and have the same vision. Interviewee 1 said “together with the police, we focus on the joint issue and on limiting [the polarisation/tensions]. We invest in workmanship of our people [in the field]. We support them in their job with trainings on polarisation and tensions. People from the municipality, police, welfare organisations, youth workers, partners need the correct information on the issue and how they can act the correct way”.

**Police**

Interviewee 2 also states that polarisation can never be stopped. “But when the polarisation leads to dysfunctionality and becomes destructive, namely the ‘us vs them’ thought gets an edge and creates conflict, then it is the job of the police to limit conflicts and protect. The police have to be connected to the people and has to be approachable for people. People can report signals and we can create a relationship build on trust. It is important that we do not create any obstacles for people to report to the police on this issue. But the police cannot fall into this ‘us vs them’ frame. When we arrest someone, we do not talk about someone’s background in this case anymore. Another condition in our approach is to stay neutral and act from the middle [between the groups]”. The follow-up question was asked on how the police connects with the people as the respondent/interviewee suggests in the above mentioned answer. Interviewee 2 continues with “that we have to know with whom we are connecting, with whom we are doing ‘business’ and which foundation/group/people/actors the ‘tension field’ contains to interact with. Therefore, we look for connections with the Kurdish people’s foundation and the Turkish organisations because we are for everyone”.

This approach is mostly the same for every other societal tension and polarisation. Interviewee 2 states that “the dynamics, the developments, the roles of different actors and the rule of law stays almost the same. However, how a ‘tension field’ reveals itself in practice is different per issue. Your approach is adjusted to the actors, their message and with who you
The police have to look for this every time. Therefore, we try to stay open for everyone in certain neighbourhoods while encountering people. The police encounters people in need of help, people who want to make a conversation or people who are just present in the neighbourhood. The police has conversations with them. Thereby, we look for people who have the motivation to change situations and that kind of partnerships”. For the municipality and the police, there are general approaches towards societal tensions and polarisation because both also answer that the approach is the same for every other case. “The complexity of a specific situation makes it harder to create a policy. What we do is develop our professionalism and knowledge [on polarisation]”, explains interviewee 2.

Therefore, following the same line has been from importance in the approach and work of the local authorities in polarisation management. Interviewee 4 stated that “the interests of the municipality and the police are on the same page”. Interviewee 3 also explained this process with “together with the municipality, we took over the theory of Bart Brandsma on polarisation. We all had to have the same language on polarisation management. The Public Prosecution Service and the mayor also had to be on board because in the past the mayor mostly took his own way”. Interviewee 3 further explained in what way the municipality and the police tried to follow the same approach, like interviewee 2 also points out in his answer “we changed the knowledge and abilities of our staff on depolarisation in order to strengthen the information position, in which we worked together with the municipality on this. We are much more than before ‘on the same page’ and now operate as ‘one government’. The last years, we became more aware of what these tensions ask from us and the municipality”.

These findings show that the similarity between the municipality and the police is that they are on the same page in their approach. They both use the theory of Bart Brandsma and focus on the silent middle. The police’s priority is more focused on maintaining public order and the municipality’s priority lies with safety and depolarisation.

5.1.3 Involved actors
The name Bart Brandsma remains important in every interview. When asked about him and which actors and groups are involved, the involved actors deliver theory and put the policy into practice.

Theoretical knowledge on the matter was important according to the interviewees and this knowledge was found in the work of philosopher Bart Brandsma. He is a consultant in polarisation management. Interviewee 1 describes him as “a philosopher, but he also was a
journalist. He developed a framework for polarisation”. Interviewee 3 explains “the theory of Bart Brandsma is a model with two opposites. They are the pushers. On the one hand, for example, [Geert] Wilders and, on the other hand, [Tunahan] Kuzu, who are both pushers and they both fuel polarisation and discussion. There is no point in moving towards those pushers with arguments and try to engage into a discussion. The pushers have a group of joiners. However, there is a big group in the middle of these pushers, namely the silent middle group. We focused our communication towards the silent group instead of the pushers or joiners. Therefore, language is important. We are more aware of the language we use due to the advice of Bart Brandsma”.

Municipality

The interviewee and policy document further point out the importance of their network. Next to the public prosecutor and the police, the municipality talks about collaboration with important partners and organisations which include “schools, the GGZ, youth workers, healthcare professionals, amongst others. Within these organisations, professionals representing varying disciplines will be trained on this subject” (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 16). For the municipality civil organisations are important.

The policy document points out that, besides civil organisations as GGZ and professionals, migrant and religious organisations remain important partners. It also brings to attention that individuals (without any migrant and/or religious organisation connection) are part of the network of the municipality. The document states that

“Besides collaboration with professionals at case level, we also work with volunteers. A network of advisers who can provide input in terms of understanding key issues and ideology can be engaged for the informal guidance of cases. An important part of the approach is handled by the many community and volunteer organizations Rotterdam has to offer. These include Islamic and Jewish interest groups, mosques, centers that specialize in the study of diversity and self-help organizations. This broad network is aware of Rotterdam’s approach and we can contact them whenever necessary. Many of the initiatives aimed at combating social tensions and preventing radicalization originate from this network. Lastly, we work with a network of key individuals who function as the eyes and ears of the city and play a part in identifying and alleviating social tensions in Rotterdam society” (Ibid., p.16)
Interviewee 1 explains that “their network is fluid, it is something that is a constant work in progress, people come and go. Our network is everywhere. We have contact with youth workers and youth themselves”

**Police**

Migrant/religious organizations are also mentioned as involved actors in the interviews with the police (besides other relevant organizations and professionals). On issues of safety and controlling the security, these organizations play a key role for the police. Interviewee 3 answers that “there is a dependency on the Kurdish organization, the Alevi organization [religious minority from Turkey], the UETD [Union of European Turkish Democrats], the individuals from the Gülen movement and Turkish Federation [Grey Wolfs]. You have to communicate with them because they can influence an important part of their followers. That makes them important partners”. The policy documents and other interviewees have not mentioned names of the organizations, but interviewee 3 has been more open with the names of migrant organizations in their network. However, it is not clear if these organizations are also in the network of the municipality.

The difference in these answers are that the police works more closely with migrant organisations in their network. For the police, they are easy to approach when tensions (can) occur in Rotterdam because the organisations are good organized. This is a short-term and fast solution, next to their investments in finding the silent middle. For the municipality, finding the silent middle is more important because their approach looks more for long-term solutions.

5.2 Mechanism of reproduction

5.2.1 Function of past approach

The involvement of migrant organisations as actors is mentioned as an older approach the municipality uses by the interviewees.

**Municipality**

This is also the case in the municipality’s policy document (Rotterdam, 2015), in which it is categorized as an existing activity of the municipality. The report states

> “delegates from the programme periodically consult with relevant organisations and groups in order to promote the dialogue between them. This concerns organisations such as Spior, Coalitie Rotterdammers Voor Mekaar (Coalition Rotterdam Citizens for Each Other, CVRM), Convent der Kerken, and Platform Levenschouwing en Religieuze
Organisaties Rotterdam (Platform Philosophy and Religious Organisations Rotterdam). In addition to the above-mentioned organisations, we are constantly on the lookout for new partners who can play a part in preventing social tensions. We are especially interested in unexpected, spontaneous encounters and gatherings, both at official and at administrative levels” (Rotterdam, 2015, p.11).

An older policy report from the municipality is the ‘Meedoen of Achterblijven’ (translated: participate or stay behind) from 2005. This report mostly focuses on radicalisation as the idea is that the approach on prevention of polarisation is overlapping with the approach towards radicalisation. The approach focused on early signals and prevention. Therefore, cooperation has been important between servants from the municipality, police, youth workers and ‘allochthonous’ organisations (Rotterdam, 2005). There is no information on the exact names of these organisations. Current policy document takes the lessons from this older document into account for the approach. One of the lessons for the municipality is to keep investing in professionals and key figures even when there is no open conflict/problem. Holding the right tone in the conversation with interested local organisations (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 9)

The interviewees all mention the cooperation with organisations in this case and reflect on this as ‘what the local authorities have been doing for a long time’. Interviewee 1 states that within the complexity, the municipality aims to talk with the right person on the right topic. When asked if these persons were the chairman of migrant organisations in the past approach, the answer is ‘yes’.

Police

The police also answer the same way to the question on the older approach, and explain that this organizational network exists for a long period of time. Interviewee 4, the police chief of South of Rotterdam, puts emphasis on the contact with different organisations: “staying connected to the parties is important to stay a trustworthy partner for every sort of group.”.

Talking about why the police continued its approach, interviewee 3 explains that it is important that the police has people working for them that continue to be critical on the practices. “Within the police, we are not good in questioning our assumptions on cases. We keep on looking at how we did things before. We keep looking back”, he explains. This looking back means relying on older approaches without questioning its effectiveness, which has been a reason for continuity.
5.2.2 Belief in old approach
The interviewees also agree on the importance of continuing this older approach partly.

Police
Interviewee 3 explains “you cannot escape the contact with foundations and interest groups, because it is really hard to find this ‘silent middle group’. You do not want to be dependent on these interest groups because they are pushers, but they do have an important part of the groups under control. The youth listen to these organisations instead of listening to the police. So, organisations keep on being important. If we make deals with them, they know how to keep the people in their place. Until now, they have always kept their promise”. The authorities believe that migrant organisations are reliable partners in demobilising people and maintaining security.

Municipality
Interviewee 1 is not much in favour of working together with organisations. However, keeping in touch with the relevant organisations remains an important aspect of her job: “the mayor stresses the importance to stay in contact, to listen and know what is going on in the city and to try to give an explanation on this. It is not the only goal to bring the conflicting parties together, but we do speak to them. In the past, we only held the conversations with the leaders of organisation. We still do that because it is still important, but we combine it with the new insights. It is ‘and’ ‘and’, instead of ‘or’ ‘or’”, interviewee 1 explains. This means that the municipality uses the old-method and the new insights combined, rather than choosing between the two approaches.

The policy document also states that existing contact with organisations and interested parties should be strengthened. The municipality will maintain the existing contact and create new contacts with organisations (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 11). The local authorities do believe that the old approach is needed, but also hint at changes in their approach.

They both believe in a balance between past and present approach, as interviewee 1 explains this as an ‘and-and’ approach. However, in the answers of the interviews, the findings show that the municipality is more hesitated to work with organisations but choose to not ignore their importance.

5.2.3. (Political) Power of past approach
The authorities still believe in the usefulness of the old approach. When asked why this is still believed, the interviewees agreed that the migrant organisations have an important power position in their community.
Interviewee 4 states that “the Turkish community [community from Turkey] is well organised. I speak with representatives of every party”. One of the reasons that these organisations still hold their power position is because of embeddedness in the community according to interviewee 4. This makes them an important partner for the authorities.

When discussing this past approach and its influence on the current approach and policy, interviewee 4 explains that “[After the coup] we invested in our network on a strategic and tactical level. We had to work on the contact with organisations. For example, the mosque still has an important position. We have talked with different people from the Kurdish organisations, UETD and the Gülen movement. Of course, this does not mean that we are in contact with everyone, but we have contact with the most important actors”.

Interviewee 3 answers with an example “Major Aboutaleb tried to hold an event to build bridges. Without the involvement of interest groups, he aimed to invite 150 youth from the ‘silent middle’. He did not contact any organisation. The youth had to be from the neutral group”. This means that the effort to go beyond this past approach of contacting migrant organisations is present. However, interviewee 3 points out that this effort has not had the expected result. “In the end, eight people showed up. Afterwards, we learned that two of them came from UETD, two from the Turkish Federation in the Netherlands and two from the Kurdish people’s foundation. The other two were the neutrals or from another group, we did not look into that. We saw that this was not really effective. If Aboutaleb had contacted the organisation, there would not be 150 but 350 youth present. This shows that we do need the organisations”.

These quotes show that migrant organisations of any kind continue to have their authority in the group. They are still able to bind, activate and move people. The local authorities are aware of this power and although they do not prefer the contact with migrant organisations, they cannot avoid it. Therefore, the policy document (Rotterdam, 2015) still gives importance to the organisations in prevention of polarisation. It even states that the municipality is open to new contacts with migrant organisations and gives special attention to migrant women organisation. It states that women have an important power and role in preventing societal tensions (Ibidem, p. 11).
5.3 Mechanism of change

5.3.1 Exogenous shocks
The interviewees agreed on the fact that polarisation has always been present between the migrant groups from Turkey in Rotterdam. However, they also agreed that, after the coup in Turkey in July 2016, the polarisation became more complex and it was not along traditional tensions anymore. Therefore, the local authorities realize and agree that they needed to understand this complexity and change the older knowledge and approach.

The coup attempt in Turkey and the results of that attempt in Rotterdam has led to changes in the approach of the local authorities. This exogenous shock is the main answer from the interviewees. “This type of polarisation led to the change in regular police structures. We have installed a central team for incident reports/charges instead of the regular procedure of every district dealing with its own charges. We professionalized the people and the structures to become more dedicated to this case. This has had its impacts on the organisation. We made organisational changes because we had to do things differently.”, interviewee 4 explained.

When asked about what kind of changes the police made after this shock of the coup attempt, interviewee 4 answers “we improved our knowledge and contacts, because our information position was not good in the past. The police worked on this. We do not aim to create dialogues [between organisations] anymore. But talk to the people [of the organisations] separately. We cannot force them to build bridges, in the past we tried to do this. We also saw that the organisations did not have the situation under control anymore during the problems with the visit of the Turkish Minister [of Family Affairs]. Therefore, we lost our control over the groups as well.”, stated interviewee 4. On the one hand, the police know that there need to be conversations with the organisations separately by being approachable through annual personal meetings and close phone calls, but, on the other hand, this interviewee also points out that this situation cannot be controlled only by contacting the organisations.

Interviewee 2 also explained that “polarisation has always been a part of the communities from Turkey, but it became very visible with the coup attempt. The way we [local authorities] anticipated on that has changed after this event. Before this event, a demonstration from the Kurds was seen as a small group protesting. After the coup attempt, we looked at what will happen with the whole Turkish community when Kurds demonstrate. It is about the totality of tensions and if certain actions may trigger these tensions”.

Interviewee 3 also explains that, in earlier cases, this polarised community was not that legible for the authorities. After the coup attempt in Turkey and the events in Rotterdam, this
has changed. He mentions that “for the Netherlands, it was not clear how polarised the communities from Turkey were. When talked about Turks, it was this big group of Turks without the distinction in Kurd/Turk, religious minority and so on. Two years ago, it became clear how polarised the community really is”.

When asked what this means for Rotterdam, interviewee 3 explains that “whatever happens in Turkey now, will be visible in Rotterdam. Rotterdam is the place to be for making a statement. When Erdogan [Turkish president] entered Syria, the Kurds spontaneously started demonstrations especially in the areas with large pro-Erdogan Turks. That is dangerous. There is a constant tension. These tensions have always been present, but in the last two years the authorities became more aware of it”.

5.3.2 Belief in new approach
The exogenous shocks in Rotterdam from (the results of) the coup attempt in Turkey have brought the authorities more awareness on the situation and their approach until this event. The interviewees have pointed out that their approach alone (contact with migrant organisations) was not enough in dealing with this in-group polarisation. The shock resulted in the awareness that the local authorities have to improve their information position on this case and polarisation management in general. With the insights from above mentioned Bart Brandsma, the authorities have combined the new approach with the older approach. Like the interviewees also mention, the approach is “and-and”; combing old with new.

*Municipality*
First, the question has been what the local authorities changed in their approach. The policy document of the municipality portrays the “facilitation of initiatives from society” as the ‘new activity’ within the approach to encounter polarisation and societal tensions (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 10). Their new activity is not the only change, but also the decision to reinforce older activities such as the “quick scan” and “network of key figures”. The document states that “Rotterdammers want to contribute in encountering tensions. Different initiatives, like the walk of 010=1 of 30 October 2014 and the gathering of local residents at the Essalam mosque, have been undertaken without asking support from the municipality. “If there are requests for support, we will judge per initiative to what extent it fits our program and if we can provide a financial contribution or support” (Ibid.). On the network of key figures, also mentioned by the policy-maker, the policy documents states that key figures “are the eyes and ears in a city and catch signals on the possibility of societal tensions. They can also play a role in de-escalating
tensions within their group” (Ibid. 10-11). In 2015, the aim of the municipality was to strengthen this network and change the amount from 100 into 150 key figures (Ibid.).

When asked what the municipality’s new insights are on polarisation management and what has changed in their approach on this issue, interviewee 1 explains that

“for years, we actually have known that when you want to know what is happening in the city, you have to look for informal leaders. These informal leaders are not always from the mosque, but are for instance …. So, we also gain information from informal leaders now. In recent years, with the eye on deradicalisation programs, we have put emphasis on the signals from the society. The last four years we named this program ‘societal tensions/polarisation’. From this program, we have worked and invested in a network of key figures in the city. By using that network, we can track down whatever happens and plays in the city between people. This is something from recent years. Instead of looking for and talking to the ‘usual suspects’ [migrant organisations], what the government did before talking to the organisations, we invested in a network of informal key figures. We have key figures everywhere, also amongst the youth”.

This answer is also what is mentioned in the policy document from the municipality.

The theory of Bart Brandsma has played an important role in this change as the interviewees refer to his insights as the method for changing their approach. The municipality’s policy-maker is mostly aware of the theory of Brandsma. Together with the servants from the police, the mayor is informed about the ideas in this theory. Brandsma has been asked to help in this process and he personally informed the servants and mayor on his insights. Brandsma is not mentioned in the policy document explicitly and also his insights do not fully come back in the document. Therefore, in the interviews, the emphasis has been on his theory and how his theory has changed the viewpoint of the local authorities. Interviewee 1 explains

“when polarised groups oppose one another, we learned that these groups are not representative for the whole community. We do not look for the ‘screaming people’ anymore, we also look at the silent group related to the issue. We also put the situation in perspective instead of working with frames. Do not fall into frames on identity. We look for what is behind this incident or issue. Therefore, we are holding conversations and activities with this silent group in the ‘middle’. We have discussions on how connected you are with this place and what is your connection to the place you live
without speaking of any judgement on integration. We learned from past mistakes, it is naive to think that [conversations with] the leaders of organisations are enough. We also know that it does not work to bring these organisations around the table, they do not want that. It is not anymore a goal to bring them together”.

Police

The police also have the same vision on the changes of their approach. “One of the most important insights is that we have the knowledge that not everyone is represented by the [migrant] organisations. We have the knowledge (?) that polarisation is also an issue for the people ‘in the middle’. It is an important task for the police in different districts/neighbourhoods to connect with these people, interviewee 2 explained. Followed up by the question on the people ‘from the middle group’ and why he thinks these people are important to cooperate with, interviewee 2 answers that “these people do not feel loyal towards an organisation but towards their neighbourhood, living area and the future of their children. We look for individuals and not for leaders of organisations. These individuals need to be empowered and you look for partnerships with them because these people are more diverse, namely neutral, nuanced, not opinionated and unknown. These insights on polarisation management are gained by Bart Brandsma. We have to strengthen the position of the people from ‘the middle’”.

When asked about reaching the silent middle, interviewee 4 explains “the police also have a good network of people who are not connected to organisations, because these policemen are connected to the neighbourhood. That is useful in problems with polarisation: they have the contacts, know the signals and know what is going on in a certain area. Traditionally, they only contacted with mosques and the foundations, but it goes further than that and these policemen know who is an important figure in the area”. Interviewee 3, the chief of North, also mentions the same changes in approach, but also adds the importance of language to that: “we are more aware of our communication. It remains hard to find the silent middle. For now, we can only turn our communication towards them. We talk for and about the Rotterdammer, not the Turk or Kurd… In the past, the mayor had different ideas than our ideas. With the change in approach, we got the mayor on the same page”, he explains.

Key in their belief of the new approach is that the police and municipality work closely together and have fully accepted the new theoretical insights together. They knew the theory before but have now incorporated in their approach.
5.3.3 Strength (of) the groups
This new approach is more focused on empowering individuals from a certain background instead of only empowering migrant group organisations. That is also the focus with “the silent middle” and “network of key individuals” (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 10). With this approach, the local authorities also pay attention to diversity management together with polarisation management.

Both interviewee 2 and 3 participate in the police program ‘Kracht van het Verschil’ (translated: power of the difference). Interviewee 3 explains that “with kracht van verschil, we seek to gain a better connection between the police and society”. The program aims furthermore to battle discrimination, to create an inclusive work environment within the police and variety in the teams. In terms of polarisation and diversity, interviewee 2 explains that the connection to the diverse society of Rotterdam is important. “How does the police work together with society when there are incidents and/or tensions? How can we mobilise the cooperation? There are important questions in my work for the police”, interviewee 2 further explains. Interviewee 3 also explains that “diversity within the police for example will also lead to improvement of the information position”.

In the document of the police on the ‘Kracht van het verschil’, the police aim to stand together with the diverse society in any way. The four important goals in this program are 1) “improving the connection with society”, 2) “struggling against discrimination”, 3) “creating an inclusive work environment” and 4) “more variety within the teams” (Kracht van het verschil, 2016, p. 1). The first goal already points out the dependency the police has on society to cooperate for solutions and security in society (p. 2). This means that the police believe in the strength of the groups in society. The document continues in the third goal to gain more diversity within the police and explains that “an officer with a Turkish background has more insights on the Turkish community, knows the language and cultural habits” (p.3). The police therefore believe in the strength of the group and engages it with diversity plans within the police and towards society.

5.4 Key findings
Some key findings can be distilled from the interviews and the municipality’s policy document. First, the situation in Rotterdam has set the conditions for the approach of the local authorities. This approach is mostly influenced by Bart Brandma’s theory, which has provided insights on focusing on ‘the silent group in the middle of a conflict’. Furthermore, the neutrality of the local
authorities, investments in cooperation, adequate partnerships and the maintenance of the rule of law are important.

Therefore, the approach of the local authorities has changed with Brandma’s theory. Main changes are the focus on: informal leaders outside the organisations, the people from the ‘silent middle’ group, new communication methods and having the same approach as Rotterdam’s police and municipality. However, despite of the changes, the old approach also remains important in which the migrant organisations are an important partner. The interviewees pointed towards the well-organized diaspora and their ability to mobilise and demobilise.

While these findings portray the similarity between the municipality and police as they have the same approach, there are also differences between the two authorities. The police have the priority of maintaining public order short- and long-term. Therefore, they are less hesitated in cooperating with migrant organizations for short-term, fast solutions, while the municipality seems more careful and hesitated in their cooperation with migrant organizations in the answers. Conclusively, the authorities focus on an ‘and-and’ approach in this case, which means working with migrant organizations and people from the ‘silent middle’.
Chapter 6. Analysis

In the previous chapter, the findings from the interviews and the municipality’s policy document have been outlined. In this chapter, the findings will be analysed. Furthermore, the three sub-questions of this research will also be answered:

1. What is the situation of the in-group conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish community in Rotterdam?
2. What is the current approach of Rotterdam’s municipality and police towards the in-group conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish community in Rotterdam?
3. What has been the approach of Rotterdam’s municipality and police towards the conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish community in the past?

6.1 Characteristics of the approach

6.1.1 Situation related to the approach
The term superdiversity is a descriptive concept in explaining societal changes and the forthcoming complexity. The tensions within the migrant group from Turkey is an element of this superdiversity as this import of conflicts has led to policy-complexity for authorities. The findings present that this is also the case for Rotterdam. The city is superdiverse and the migrant group from Turkey is diverse in ethnicities, religious beliefs and political views. One important development presented in the findings on the situation in Rotterdam is the diversification in the so-called ‘tension field’. The local authorities have been aware of the ‘traditional tension field’ between the Turkish nationalists versus Kurdish activists. This tension has been visible over a longer period. However, after the coup attempt in July 2016, the local authorities have realized that there have been more tension fields present within this migrant group. The growth in visibility of tensions within the group has made the authorities realize the diversity in tension fields. This meant new complexities to the city in their approach against polarisation and safety. Furthermore, for the theory of superdiversity, this case shows that in-group conflict is also an element of superdiversity. Migrant groups are diverse, and this case shows that this also means that polarisation within a migrant group migrates with them into the host country. This is visible in Rotterdam.
6.1.2 Current policy
In the current policy, the motive is to go back to the basics. These basics are what the municipality and police stand for; namely cooperation, neutrality and the rule of law are important in their approach. The leading interest of the local authorities is to aim for stability and to prevent future incidents (although they do acknowledge that they cannot solve the problems).

The institutional approach has shown policies ought to create social coherence with standards of behaviour and norms and values (Burns and Scapens, 2000, p. 6). Institutions as the municipality and the police manage this by the rule of law. Therefore, protecting public order and safety comes first. Here, the neutrality of public authorities means that they do not have a political opinion on the case and their approach focuses around the rule of law in punishable cases in the tensions. Then, in light of depolarisation, the authorities seek cooperation with many actors in and around the tensions. The most important group to focus on for the local authorities is ‘the silent middle’. The cooperation with ‘the silent middle’, the informal leaders and migrant organisations provides the local authorities to reach out to signals, before these signals turn into incidents. With ‘the silent middle’, the municipality mostly aims to look at similarities between this group and the authorities, instead of dissimilarities. Thereby, the institutions create a group of people ‘that know how they should act’ and this group can help the local authorities to show conflicted groups on “how they are supposed to act” as well (Vandenabeele, 2007, p. 548). The municipality and police use their authority to create ideas on normality, with ‘the silent middle’, by standardised ideas of behaviour in order to create social coherence. The approach gives the importance to the people themselves to have a contribution in depolarisation, although this silent middle does not take a stance in the conflict and tensions. Therefore, the authorities do have some trouble in explaining how they are connecting to this ‘silent middle’ because of the non-visibility of the group. Furthermore, the findings point out, that especially the police are more dependent of migrant organizations because they prioritize public order and these organizations do have authority among its group. However, informal leaders also play a crucial role in controlling the youth.

6.1.3 Involved actors
The current approach carries the insights of Bart Brandsma, who has influenced the approach of the authorities to a great extent. His timing and one-on-one contact with the authorities has shaped the approach. The insights are important because it provides the theoretical knowledge for the authorities. On a practical level, migrant organisations are important and local authorities
keep the contact with them, as they are capable of controlling their group. The involved actors are different when looked at theoretical meaning making by Brandsma and active safety control done by migrant organisations and other public organisations. The actors from (migrant) organisations however are not part of the policy-making process, while they are active in executing the policy. These involved actors do not come together, but the local authorities contact them independently.

6.2 Mechanisms of reproduction

6.2.1 Function of past approach
The contact with migrant organisations remains important for the local authorities’ approach. In the policy document and even more in the interviews, the local authorities stress the good contacts with the migrant organisation, which has been the case for many years according to the interviewees and policy document (Rotterdam, 2015) (although the local authorities do not want to bring the migrant organisations together anymore but want to talk to them separately). The findings present a reality of an institutionalized dependency on the past multiculturalist approach (contacts with migrant organisations) in the execution of current policy, because it has worked for the local authorities for a longer time. Furthermore, these organisations do mirror society correctly and, therefore, this past approach will keep its role in the future as well.

6.2.2 Belief in past approach
Although this past approach still holds its position in the current approach, there is still some opinionated hesitation about it. This becomes clear when one of the interviewees mentions that the migrant organisations cannot be avoided. They are viewed as pushers in the conflict and the local authorities do not want to be dependent on them only. However, the authorities believe in this past approach because the (migrant) organisations are seen as reliable contacts in their network. The organisations have always kept their promise and continue to prove their important position in the network of the local authorities.

6.2.3 Power of past approach
The local authorities give importance to the past approach because the migration organisations hold a powerful position within the groups. The organisations are easy to approach, are well organized and have the authority to mobilize and demobilize. Therefore, in the policy document (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 11) and even more in the interviews, the local authorities have stressed
the good contacts with the migrant organisation, as was the case for many years (although they
do not want to bring them together anymore but talk with separately)

Experiments with a meeting with the mayor without any involvement of the
organisations, for example, have not had the same results. Therefore, another factor for the
continuity of past policy is due to the power position of migrant organisation and the local
authorities believe that this position is important in implementing policies.

6.3 Mechanisms of change

6.3.1 Exogenous shocks
The result of the Turkish coup attempt in Rotterdam has been the catalyst for the local
authorities to revise their approach. The events in Turkey caused confrontations in Rotterdam
and made the authorities realize how polarized the migrants from Turkey are. The polarisation
in this group became more visible, as these groups all tried to make their political statement in
Rotterdam. According to one of the local authorities, the place to make a statement has become
Rotterdam instead of Amsterdam in the past. Therefore, the authorities realized that the
approach alone was not enough, as migrant organisations also did not have the expected control
over the tensions and conflicts in Rotterdam. Therefore, the authorities have seen that not every
individual is represented by a migrant organisation, because of these individuals were not
directly part of any migrant organisation.

6.3.2 Belief in new approach
The authorities believe in the consultancy of Bart Brandsma, as his insights have influenced the
current approach completely. His advices on polarisation management are followed precisely.
Therefore, the local authorities invested in their information position on the conflict, on the
migrants from Turkey, on empowering ‘the silent middle’, on the use of language, on the
authorities’ neutrality and on unity in approach. They invested in key figures in the city, which
are the informal leaders who are not present in organisations. The aim is even to enlarge the
group of key figures from 100 to 150 (Rotterdam, 2015, p. 11), which shows that the local
authorities have invested in this new approach.

6.3.3 Power of new approach
These changes resemble a new attitude towards diversity and polarisation management. Local
authorities have changed their information position on diversity, migrant groups,
(de)polarisation and policy-making. Their focus has been on gaining new knowledge and new insights by building a more diverse network. The diversity management is done by active involvement in society with ‘Kracht van het Verschil’ (Kracht van het Verschil, 2016). It presents that not the elite is weakening, but the elite is actively encouraging to strengthen subordinate groups within the diverse society of Rotterdam. The empowerment of these groups and encouraging a better connection between local authorities and society, the network of the local authorities enlarges and that will not stay limited with migrant organisations.

6.4 Explaining change
The analysed indicators from the findings provides answers to the sub-questions of this research. This section will answer these questions.

In chapter two, the definition for the ‘characteristics’ is “distinctive reasons” (Mahoney, 2000, p. 517) in which institutions and policies develop. The question what is the situation of the conflict between the Turks and Kurds in Rotterdam? looks for the distinctive reasons in this case. The conflict between the Turks and Kurds from Rotterdam is a part of the polarisation within the migrant group from Turkey. As this conflict belongs to the traditional tension field, the local authorities have now portrayed the situation in Rotterdam as the diversification in tension fields. The coup attempt in July 2016 has played an important role on this view on the situation in the city. The local authorities are alarmed by the polarisation within the group and are more alert than before for the tensions in the conflict between the Turks and Kurds.

In this situation, the local authorities revised their approach and formulated their current policy for these cases. The second sub-question what is the current approach of Rotterdam towards the conflicts between the Turks and Kurds? The current approach is based on the insights of Bart Brandsma to a large extent. These insights focus on emancipating groups who are not involved in the conflict, cooperation with every relevant partner and the local authorities’ neutrality. The idea is to give ‘the silent middle’ a voice in tackling polarisation and investing in contacts with key figures and public (migrant) organisations. While they are emancipating and building their network, the local authorities have to remain and have to secure their neutrality in the process. This is not only the approach in the conflict between the Turks and Kurds, but also in any other polarisation-conflict situation in the city. However, although the approach is broadening, it remains hard to reach this ‘silent middle’ because it is unclear who the authorities exactly are targeting and how they are targeting this silent middle. Figuring their targets out while keeping their broad approach has been an ongoing process.
The last sub-question what has been the approach of Rotterdam towards the conflict between the Turks and Kurds in the past? looks upon the past approach to understand if this is still present in current policy. Then, it becomes visible in what way the approach has changed. In the past, local authorities have been dependent on the contact with leaders from migrant organisations. This multiculturalist approach from the authorities aimed to bring these leaders from migrant organisations together. In this way, local authorities had contacts from different (migrant) groups. By bringing them together, the authorities aimed to cancel out any tension between the groups.

This past approach is still present in the current approach. As mentioned by interviewee 1, it is a “and-and” approach. The new insights /approach from Bart Brandsma is used together with the past approach in contacting migrant organisations. However, the goal is not to bring leaders from the organisations together anymore but contacting them separately. These organisations remain a reliable partner for the local authorities. While partly the old approach is still present in current policy, the local authorities did change their policy for polarization (and conflict) management with the great influence of Brandsma.

They focus on encouraging the silent middle, while in the past the focus has been on migrant organizations. The combination of both the silent middle and migrant organizations in their network is the long-term goal. However, as mentioned in the findings, the police have to deal with tensions and conflicts immediately. For short-term and fast results, they do not hesitate in cooperation with migrant organizations with leaders whom have a certain legitimation and power in their groups they represent. The police find this effective in maintaining public order. The municipality seems more careful in their cooperation with migrant organizations, but the organizations remain in their network.

The tensions in Rotterdam after Turkish coup attempt has been the catalyst for the local authorities to change in their approach. This exogenous shock, which is the indicator for the functional explanation by Mahoney (2000, p. 517), has led to a transformation in the system’s needs. The conclusion will discuss this theoretical connection further.
Chapter 7. Conclusion and Discussion

This study originates from the interest in policy change with superdiversity cases. The import of homeland conflicts is an element of migration and superdiversity in the city (Vertovec, 2007). The incidents in Rotterdam between the Turks and Kurds shows this import of homeland conflicts. In recent years, new incidents have been added which has shown that the migrant group from Turkey is polarized. The local authorities try to manage these cases of polarization and tensions with policies on (de)polarization and public order. These policies may change or be reproduced over a longer period. The purpose of this research has been to understand and explain policy change in Rotterdam’s institutions (police and municipality) with the examination of the policy document and conducting interviews on this topic.

This chapter concludes on the key findings of the research by answering the research question how can we understand policy changes in the approach of local authorities within the municipality of Rotterdam towards the conflict between the Turks and Kurds? It will further discuss what this conclusion means for the institutional approach on policy change. Lastly, the limitations of this study will be discussed.

7.1 In conclusion

The question tries to understand the change. Therefore, the aim has been to look at past and present of the policy and to what changed and what did not change in the approach by distilling indicators from the presented theory. The study leads to a couple of conclusions.

First, to understand policy change, it was important to understand the situation in Rotterdam and how the incidents developed as one of the indicators. The incidents between the Turks and Kurds are named as the traditional (old) tension field. In recent years, more tension fields came to light within the migrant group from Turkey. The local authorities realized that this migrant group is diverse and polarized, especially the incidents in Rotterdam after the coup attempt in Turkey have showed this diversity. Another conclusion is that based on the indicators for current policy and involved actors, that Bart Brandsma’s insights had a large impact on how the local authorities’ approach is formulated and carried out. In his expertise and training, Brandsma has showed the authorities to put the focus on contacting with ‘the silent middle’ and informal leaders while following the law in terms of conflict. Furthermore, the local authorities are working on their information position on this case and (migrant-) polarization in general. With indicators on past policy, power of past policy and the belief of past policy by the authorities, another conclusion for this research is that contact with and working together with
(migrant) organisations remains important and useful in maintaining public order. In terms of creating safety and stability, there is the continuity with the past policy because the migrant organisations are well organized and reliable partners, especially for the police. The difference between the local authorities is that in the findings of the municipality some hesitation towards migrant organizations is visible. The organizations are seen as actors “who cannot be ignored”, according to the municipality. Lastly, change is explained with indicators as exogenous shocks, the power of new approach and belief in new approach. Here, the conclusion is that the incidents in Rotterdam after the Turkish coup attempt has had impact on the local authorities in evaluating their approach and gaining new help and insights to change their approach. There is change in understanding and approaching broader issues of polarization, which may be in-group or between different groups. However, there is not a specific approach for the conflict between the Turkish and Kurdish community. Broadly, they invest in more key figures in the community to work together with and also give importance to their diversity management. Polarization management is not only seen as a safety issue anymore, but also collides with diversity management. The institutions want to mirror society and attract more key figures with diversity management. In that way, the institutions will also have people who understand certain diversity related issues.

To understand how policy change can be explained, three theoretical explanations have been before the empirical data collection:

- Expectation 1. Institutions and institutionalized policies change because of exogenous shocks from transnational conflicts of migrants
- Expectation 2. Institutions and institutionalized policies change because of changes in the beliefs and values of involved actors on policy-complexity of superdiversity-related conflict.
- Expectation 3. Institutions and institutionalized policies change because of the strengthening of subordinate groups and weakening of elites by change in the majority/minority balance in cities

It can be taken into consideration that this complexity of tensions in this case has led to change in the actors’ belief in the policy or that the authorities’ information position was weak, and this harmed their position. However, the most dominant reason for policy change comes from the exogenous shock the coup attempt caused which led to change in actors’ belief in past policy and the realization of their weak information position. Furthermore, as their approach combines
old elements with new approaches, the local authorities did not lose their belief in past policy completely. The interviewees point out that working with migrant organization is still effective, because reaching ‘the silent middle’ is a hard task for the authorities. Additionally, the data does not show that the local authorities’ position has been weakened by strengthening the position of subordinate groups with their diversity management, although the data shows that their information position has been weak. This case confirms expectation 1 the most and shows that the exogenous shocks in Rotterdam from the coup attempt in Turkey has made the local authorities aware on changing their approach. The local authorities mention in all their answers the impact the results of the coup attempt in Rotterdam has had and that this event has made them realize how diverse and polarized this migrant group is. The exogenous shock from expectation 1 is the leading explanation in explaining change.

Expectation 1 based on the functional explanation together with the conclusion that the new insights combined with the older approach on polarization management can serve as an answer to the main question.

7.2 Discussion

First, the results of this case bring points of discussion to the institutional approach. This approach has its shortcomings. Although it brings insights on the functionality of institutions, it is more capable of explaining continuity in policy than change. Looking at the case and the findings, the local authorities do not point out what has caused the change. They have been knowing for a longer time to change their approach, but it has waited until the incidents after the coup attempt.

The coup attempt is a returning element in discussing the policy change within the empirical data. Therefore, according to the theoretical functional explanation, this exogenous shock has transformed the system’s needs. However, this functional explanation does not provide answers on how policy changes and the factors leading to change, because it only looks for a point in which this policy change happens. It answers the question why there is policy change in this case, which means that the explanation does not fully help in how we can understand the policy change. The explanation assumes that before this equilibrium the policy has been stable, which has not been the case. The authorities have known before this equilibrium that they need to change the policy. The institutional approach to policy change with the framework of Mahoney shows that it does not provide the explanatory ground to understand policy change correctly. It does not take into considerations the processes before the equilibrium. In this case, the changing city council also may play a role or the national
context, and the institutional approach as a theory does not provide an understanding of these factors for policy change.

This means that the institutional approach does not fully help to understand the empirical data on polarization within the migrant group properly. In this case, it becomes clear that the institutional approach is an explanatory framework for policy stability, focusing on democratic values and the rule of law. The importance of the past approach into current policy in this case can be explained by the functional explanation (Mahoney, 2000, p. 517). It states that policies are reproduced because it serves an overall system. It serves an overall interest of maintaining public order and preventing escalations in this case. If the focus of the research question had been on stability, then the theory would be more explanatory. However, policies on social issues are never stable and prone to changes, especially within a fast-changing societal context as presented by superdiversity.

The institutional approach also does not point out to what extent there is change. The case shows that the policy change is partly, while the older approach also exists with adjustments. The concept of change can have different degrees and the institutional approach as a theory, it is not traceable to what degree change occurs while the data shows that there is partly change. This point is made by Schickler (2001), which is discussed in the theoretical framework. Schickler’s argument for policy change from an institutional approach states that new rules are merged with old rules to have improvements as an effect. This is indicated as layering, which comes back in this case. The layering theory may provide the space for a ‘and change and reproduction’ understanding (but it has to be studied), which Mahoney’s framework does not cover as much. The local authorities use the new insights together with the older approach, which is also layering, and therefore they have an ‘change and reproduction’ approach. The interviewees mention it as ‘and-and’ approach by combining the old and new approaches. Mahoney’s theoretical overview only gives space for either change or reproduction. With Schickler’s layering theory, Mahoney can provide more explanations to ‘change and reproduction’ approaches by combining existing explanations.

Second, the results of this case also bring points of limitations to the theory of superdiversity. This case shows that superdiversity also means diversity in the community from Turkey, also in the city Rotterdam. Therefore, old pillars of migrant/religious) organizations are not enough in the approach against polarization. The theory of superdiversity argues that there has to be a broader approach from institutions towards society. The findings present that the authorities try to achieve a broader approach with the theory of Bart Brandsma and targeting the silent middle. From the interviews with the authorities, his theory fits the studies on
superdiversity. However, superdiversity in general and in this case of the silent middle lead to the complexity of targeting people. The old idea of a homogenous migrant group presents a clear target group; namely migrant organizations and the people belonging to a certain organization. However, the growing diversity within migrant groups and diversity in general leads to uncertainty in targeting. This also comes to light in reaching out to ‘silent middle’, because the authorities have struggles in reaching these persons. This is not only an implication for the authorities’ approach, but also a policy challenge of superdiversity in general. The questions ‘who are you targeting?’ and ‘how are you targeting?’ remain unanswered in superdiverse cities.

This superdiversity-case has shown policies can change by means of exogenous shocks. In this case, the in-group conflict has transnational roots. As transnational in-group conflicts are a reality of superdiversity, there is a great possibility that functional explanation help to understand policy changes in the area of (migrant) polarization management. New events from outside make authorities realize that polarization needs a different approach.

7.3 Research answer

To answer the research question, the policy change in Rotterdam can be understood as a change in thinking and information position with new insights from Brandsma, on the one side. On the other side, the old approach is reproduced in which the authorities contact migrant organisations (although separately). This partly change and partly continuation happened because of functional reasons as Mahoney (2000, p. 517) points out. The coup related incidents created the exogenous shocks that changed the local authorities’ and the systems’ needs to transform their approach. Factors outside of the institutions has led to the transformation of the policy as the old approach alone did not function anymore.

7.4 Limitations and further research

As any other research, this study also has its limitations and weaknesses. One point of limitation is that, in the interviews, the emphasis easily moved from the conflict between the Kurds and Turks in Rotterdam towards the newer conflict between pro-Erdogan Turks and the Gülen movement after the coup attempt. The conflict between the Kurds and Turks have been described as smaller and older, while the newer conflict is described as something that has left its mark on Rotterdam. Therefore, this has had results on the interview answers. Nevertheless, with follow-up questions, the case of the Kurds and Turks has been repeated while asking the
questions. Moreover, the approach of the local authorities remains the same for both conflict situations and therefore it did not influence the research negatively. Further research on why local authorities select in policy-problems can be made.

The municipality elections last year in March are important to mention. During the interview at the municipality, this was also pointed out. The new council could decide to change the department. It is not clear if this influences the approach, but the uncertainty was present. Therefore, during the interview, the interviewee mentioned that the approach could change or be adjusted ‘next week’. This is an extreme example, however after this study, the approach may not be the same for the municipality as described now.

Another limitation has been that social workers and police officers connecting with the informal leaders and ‘the silent middle’ are not interviewed. That would give a broader vision on how the issue is approached. However, the time limit and size limit of the research was not sufficient enough to broaden the research with more interviews. Therefore, this can also be further researched in a study on how the local authorities’ approach work in practice on neighbourhood scale.


Appendices

Appendices I: Interview questions

Date and Time:
Place:
Profession:

Introduction interviewer and interviewee

1. How would you describe the situation between the Kurds and Turks in Rotterdam?
2. How did this situation develop in the past 20 years? Increase, stability or decrease of conflict?
3. What do you think influenced this development?
4. What is the approach of the municipality/police towards the conflict? How is this approach built?
5. Which actors/groups are involved?
6. What was the approach in the past?
7. Why was this approach used in the past?
8. What is the power of this past approach? Why do you think this approach works?
9. What has led to the change in approach? What was the turning point?
10. What has changed? Why do you think that these changes are important?
11. What is the role of the groups in the approach?
12. Why do you think these changes have been important?
Appendices II: overview of findings

**Situation**

It’s up and down. Tensions are always here, didn’t grow or decrease. It’s always under the ground. There has to happen one small thing and it will still happen. Sometimes it looks like a growth because there are more incidents in the public. That’s what we have seen a couple of times in recent years. It’s always present and it will not change unless the conflict changes there. When it happens then it will have its immediate expression here.

Policy Conditions

changing

We have a couple of conditions. Among other things, we have a lot of the insights of that phenomenon. Underneath tensions and conflict is the ‘us-them’ way of thought. For us it’s important to see this and look at the dynamic under the surface.

In terms of tensions and polarisation, the police and we are trying to do the same and have the same vision. We work on polarisation strategy (management). I’m the head advisor. We work together with the other (interviewee). I give my advice to the ‘triangle’. How the council talks about this topic, influences our policy. With the last council, (Liehr-Rotterdam) pushed it on the organisation. But this does not have a direct influence on our approach and implementation of policy. When there are tensions, the mayor’s judgement and dictates are important because the mayor has to protect the public order and safety (according to the law). Together with the police we focus on the joint and limiting polarisation/tensoes. We invest in workingknowledge of our people. Then we can always support.

The main approach and thought (or ‘tenison field’) is mostly the same for every other group tension. The dynamics, the development, the rules of different actors and the role of law stays about the same. However, how a ‘tenison field’ reveals itself in practice is different per issue. Who are the actors, what are their messages, with which group you need to connect? Your approach is adjusted to this. The police has to look for this every time. We try to stay open for everyone. When you work in a certain neighborhood, you stay open for this every time. We talk to them together anymore.

**Characteristics**

The complexity of the situation makes it harder to sustain police. What we do is develop our professionalism and knowledge (craftsmanship).

Information position in the past was not good. Therefore the police worked on expertise and background information on this kind of polarisation. This type of polarisation led to the change in the regular police strategy.

**Person 1: municipal police**

We now have the knowledge that not everyone is represented by the organisations. We have the insights that polarisation is also an issue for the people ‘in the middle’ (not represented by organisations). It is an important task for the police in different districts to connect with these people. These people don’t feel loyal to their own organisation but towards their district, living area and the future of their children. We look for these individuals and not leaders of organisations. The middle forms the key. These individuals need to be approached also and you look for partnerships with them. The people from the ‘middle’ are diverse: neutral, Muslim, not responded.

**Person 2: Police advisor unity Rotterdam**

Permanent cooperation with the municipality. About important talks, we keep each other updated. We made reports on the important point and decisions we made. This depended on the negotiation model.

**Person 3: Police chief South**

The complex problem is by far harder to handle. We have an important part of the group under control. Furthermore, we have ‘Kraak van Versavel’. To gain a better connection to the society. Together with the municipality, we took over the work of Bart Brandsma. But the OM and mayor had to work under him.

We had to have all together the same language on polarisation management. In the begin the mayor mostly took his own way.

**Person 4: Police chief North**

You cannot escape the contact with foundations and interest groups. Because it is really hard to find the quiet group. We have an important part of the group under control: Furthermore, we have ‘Kraak van Versavel’. To gain a better connection to the society.

Next to the older approach, we have the new approach achieved by Bart Brandsma. The OM had to play a new role, which is a way forward, but we are not there yet. But it remains hard to work. But now, for now, we can only turn our communication towards them. We work with the Rotterdammers, not the Turk or Kurd.
For years, we actually know that when you want to know what is happening in the city, you have to look for the informal leaders. The informal leaders are not always from the mosque. We also look for the informal leaders to gain information now. We have key figures everywhere, also amongst the youth. We know that it doesn’t work to bring groups around the table, they don’t want that. It is not the goal an sich to bring them together.

Polarisation Management, Bart Brandsma.
Changed the knowledge and abilities of our staff on depolarisation.
We work on this together with the municipality. The last years, we are more aware of what these ‘tension fields’ ask from us and the municipality. We are much more than before ‘on the same page’. An important steps that we now operate as ‘one government’.

We don’t aim to create dialogues anymore. But talk to the people separately. We cannot force them to build bridges in the past we did. The coup d’état was a changing point in that. For this issue, we made organisational changes and had to do things different. We improved our knowledge and contacts.

Organisations are needed but we don’t make them talk to one another anymore. We hold our contact separately.

When groups oppose one another in polarisation, we learned that these groups are not representative for the whole communities. Do not only look for the ‘screaming people’, but also look for who is quiet. Keep on relativating the situation instead of working with frames: look for what is behind this. Learned from past mistakes, it is naive to think that the leaders of organisations are enough.

We saw that organisations did not have the control anymore with the problems and conflict during the visit of the Turkish Minister. Therefore, we lost our control over the groups as well. Because the youth is different. The organisations do not fully have control over them. The police also has a good network of people who are not connected to organisations. The network of neighbourhood/district policemen is strong because they are connected to their neighbourhood. That’s useful in problems with polarisation: they have the contacts, signals and know what’s going on in a certain area. Traditionally it was only with mosques and foundations but it goes further than that and the policemen know who is important in an area.

In the past, the interest of the police and the municipality was different. This influenced the cooperation. Now more on the same line.

Holding conversations and activities with the ‘middle’ and don’t fall in frames on identity. Discussions on how connected are you with here, what is your connection to the place you live and are, without any judgment on integration.

Reproduction
I do think that the influence of Turkish organisations are great. The community is really organised.

Have conversations with different organisations, fractions, foundations and persons to keep it all round. This brings us far.

You cannot escape the contact with foundations and interest groups. Because it is really hard to find the quiet group. Actually you don’t want to be dependent on these interest groups because they are pushers. But they do have an important part of the group under control. The youth listen to these organisations instead of to the police. So organisations keep on being important, they now how to keep the people in their place if we make deals with them. Until now, they have always kept their promise. On the local level this stays important. Aboutalibh tried to hold an event to build bridges, without the interest groups, he tried to invite 150 youths from the quiet middle to come. He did not contact any organisation. It had to be from the neutral group. In the end, 8 people showed up. Afterwards, we learned that 2 came from UEDT, 2 from Federation Turks in the Netherlands and 2 from the Kurdish organisation. The other two were maybe the neutrals or maybe from another group, we did not control that. But we saw that it was not

It is not the goal an sich to bring the conflicting parties together (because they don’t want to sit around the table anymore) but the mayor and police chief do find it important to stay in contact, to listen and know what plays and try to give an explanation on this. Because it is AND AND. In the past, we held the conversation with the leaders of organisations and we still do that. It is still important, but also the new insights.

These organisations did lose control during the last incidents with the visit. These organisations are good in mobilising and demobilising. We made good appointments with them.
For example the mosque still has an important position. We have talked with different people from the Kurdish organisations, UEDT, from the Gelen movement etc. This does not mean that we have everyone, but the most important actors are in contact with us.

We keep on looking at how we did things before, but we do not question our assumptions that much. We keep on looking back.
Appendices III: Translated table from policy-document

Dutch version of the table from the municipality’s policy document (Rotterdam’s aanpak radicalisatie 2015-2018, 2015, p. 10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activiteit</th>
<th>Wat willen we bereiken?</th>
<th>Wat gaan we doen?</th>
<th>Hoe monitoren, meten?</th>
<th>Bestaande (B), verstekte (V) of nieuwe activiteit (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tegenaan polarisatie en voorkomen van maatschappelijke spanningen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faciliteren initiatieven vanuit de samenleving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegenaan maatschappelijke spanningen vanuit de samenleving</td>
<td>Stimuleren samenleving om initiatieven te ondernemen en indien nodig faciliteren van initiatieven</td>
<td>Aantal initiatieven georganiseerd door samenleving, rol gemeente daarbij</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick scan</td>
<td>Maatschappelijke onrust vroegtijdig herkennen</td>
<td>Methodiek optimaliseren en onder de aandacht brengen van netwerk</td>
<td>Nieuwe versie quick scan ontwikkeld; Aantal keer quick scan gebruikt</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netwerk van sleutelpersonen</td>
<td>Een dekkend netwerk in de gehele stad</td>
<td>Netwerk in kaart brengen, uitbreiden en meer aan ons binden</td>
<td>Netwerk verbreed tot dekkend netwerk van 150 sleutelpersonen; Bindingsactiviteiten georganiseerd</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samenwerking met relevante partners</td>
<td>Dialoog met en tussen belanghebbende partners bevorderen</td>
<td>Zowel ambtelijk als bestuurlijk het contact met zowel nieuwe als bestaande partners en vrouwengroepen</td>
<td>Contacten met deze organisaties, personen</td>
<td>B/ V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>