Introduction or on the danger of “acting normal”

Nana Adusei-Poku

On Monday the 23rd of January the Dutch Prime Minister published in anticipation of the upcoming election, a public letter in all major dutch newspapers. In this letter aiming at the “silent majority” Rutte opens with the sentence, that “there is something wrong with our land” and asks citizen’s to “act normal” and protect Dutch values or to otherwise “leave”. The Netherlands is a very cool and prosperous country, he states, which does not tolerate anti-social behavior. Amongst which he lists, acts such as spitting on conductors, harassing Gay men, lifting up Women’s skirts and calling “ordinary Dutch people racist”.

This letter can neither be read as detached from the right wing, or let’s simply call it (global) fascist populist movement around Geert Wilders, nor from the rising Islamic- and xenophobia in this country. Whilst his call for non-violent and respectful behavior may appear as a reasonable claim, the question remains “what is normal” and “who” is he really talking about?

The vilification of young men of Turkish and Moroccan descent in the Dutch media, is picked upon in this letter and hence directly connected to the fear of “foreigners” and Islamicisation or “Radicalization” by the 6% of Muslims living in The Netherlands. Rutte eloquently manages to make these statements through a passive aggressive tone, by not-naming Turkish and Moroccan communities, who he —“collectively”— wants to defend the Dutch values against. This defence is highly sexist as the main perpetra-
tators of aggression against the Dutch value system are constantly named as Dis Muslim men, which points towards a hetero-patriarchal conflict. By this, I mean that the duality with which Muslim men are the aggressors from whom Muslim, as well as Christian women as well as white Gay men, have to be saved from is a common European narrative. \textit{(Stake in the Unknown)} To “act normal” and protect Dutch values conclusively includes being openly xenophobic, sexist, populist and ignorant of the long history of Dutch racism and colonialism. But to write this would also offend the Prime Ministers view that “ordinary Dutch people are racist”, which is another aspect of this letter, that remains questionable. It seems that racism are exceptional individuals and the rest are innocent. The misunderstanding here of racism as simply a curse word is dismissive of the systemic racist structures on which the Dutch (global) ideological system is based and moreover that racism is not connected to privileges and prejudices from one group against another. My emphasis here lies on privilege as it is a defining factor whether a group can maintain and structurally create forms of exclusion and exploitation. Because a White, person, who is affected by homophobia, classism or ageism does not necessarily lose their racial privilege when it comes to finding work, housing or access to healthcare. Their actions, however, can have a massive effect on the lives of people of color.

The Dutch idea of Norms and Values (Normen and Waarden), which is deeply rooted in the Dutch Cultural Archive \textit{(Rooted in the Dutch Cultural Archive)} are held high, but in times in which being right wing, xenophobic and racist has become the new norm this letter is not only alarming but a call to not remain silent and take action.

At the beginning of the academic year, September 2016 the HR published a short essay called Samen Leven in deSamenleving co-authored by Ron Bormans and Izak Dekker. In this text Bormans and Dekker try to establish the University of Applied Sciences as a “Village” within a City as a kind of intermediary space with rules, or in other words with Norms and Values. The introduction starts with a nostalgic glance to the past when going to primary school was marked by small scalenes and “many dialects”. Which creates a homogenised picture of who went to this school, other languages are not part of this reminiscing narrative, which hence already emphasizes (again without naming) the fact that the Dutch demography is not homogenically White Dutch anymore. It cannot go unnoticed, that Dekker and Bormans chose amongst the first three “Thinkers” to uncritically cite the polititian Piet Fortuyn. A person, whose hate speeches against Islam and Muslims divided dominating presence in the Dutch discourse in the late 1990’s early 2000’s. The sentiment, which he expressed in his book \textit{Tegen de islamiserende van onze cultuur}, despite distancing himself from Geert Wilders, is echoed in the contemporary populist movement. Fortuyn stands out as one of the main figures in the early 2000’s. The sentiment, which he expressed in his book \textit{Tegen de islamiserende van onze cultuur}, despite distancing himself from Geert Wilders, is echoed in the contemporary populist movement. Fortuyn stands out as one of the main figures.

Despite the fact that Bormans and Dekker only implicitly ask students to act within the confines of the school’s value system, these actions are within the idea of Norms and Normativity and can equally be considered as “normal” actions. Which embeds the essay within a national discourse that makes populist ideas accepted as the Norm.

\textit{“Individual freedom, rationality and autonomy” are at the core of the liberal value system, which Bormans and Dekker propose \textit{(Rooted in the Dutch Cultural Archive)}; values that find no further elaboration nor critical discussion. At the same time, these core values are equated with a “modern society”, because in Dekker and Bormans view these values are under threat by Muslim Societies or Communities, that are “struggling with Modernity” \textit{(Rooted in the Dutch Cultural Archive)}. It is difficult to read such explorations without seeing a pattern being reproduced, which can also be a found in Rutte’s open letter. Although, Bormans and Dekker are more explicit when it comes to their view on Islam, which they secure by quoting a theologian, who belongs to the Muslim community itself. I am emphasizing the strategic use of Muslim theorists in this publication because, in the same way in which Black people who are pro Zwarte Piet are utilized in public conversations in order to justify the legitimacy of the racist tradition, Bormans and Dekker instrumentalize Muslim theorists in the same way.

Whilst rejecting a centralized model of strict government within the school, the core question that the authors ask is how to create plurality within an institution or as a “superdiverse” and open institution on the basis of Norms \textit{(Stake in the Unknown)}. Superdiversity here, as I have established in the publication, \textit{Stake in the Unknown} is a way of talking about “Diversity” without addressing the core issues of White Hegemony. In other words, the problem is that Superdiversity tries to address the multiplicity and complexity of Diversity, which is composed of a plethora of different socio-political and historical shifts, that are manifested in the hybridity of our various identities, but a critique of White Privilege and Hegemony. So the core of my critique is that, a thorough engagement with the epistemological and ontological violence that are constantly reproduced through Eurocentric Hegemony remains unquestioned, which is why Superdiversity is another term to cloak the power structures that create systemic exclusion.

\textit{“ACTING NORMAL”}

\textit{Artwork for a totebag to promote Cultural Diversity to students of Willem de Kooning Academy. Design by Mark Mulder (Studio for Visual Pop.Culture), 2014}
It may come as a surprise that I start the introduction to this publication with a discussion of the internal as well as external conversations about the rise of Xenophobia and Islamophobia in this country. But as I have stated before, this is not a time to remain silent. The struggle with Modernity and here I am referring to the enlightenment project from which the liberal value system referred to by Bormans and Dekker, is one, which has been part of the post-colonial critique for decades. I don’t have to mention that apart from the instrumentalization of Muslim voices in the publication any other epistemologies deriving from marginalized voices are missing, but I will return to this point.

The post-colonial theorist Nikita Dhawan poignantly emphasizes my critique in her introduction of her book Decolonizing enlightenment, in which she writes:

“Emancipatory movements for suffrage, abolition of slavery and civil liberties can all be traced back to the Enlightenment, even as it continues to inspire contemporary social and political movements. The Enlightenment idea of individual rights and dignity, it is believed, enables the exercise of political agency and expands individual freedom. However, as has been pointed out by both scholars of Postcolonial Studies as well as Holocaust Studies, Enlightenment’s promise of attaining freedom through the exercise of reason has ironically resulted in domination by reason itself. Along with progress and emancipation, it has brought colonialism, slavery, genocide, and crimes against humanity.”

[DHAWAN 2014, 9]

So the question is, if a truly inclusive institution can uncritically build on the legacy of an epistemological project (which is always in the making) which in and of itself is highly exclusionary or if a decolonial approach should be in place? In the introduction to the essay Borman states that he saw the “liberation of the Maagdenhuis” at the University Amsterdam as “one side”. The liberation that was realized by students of color, who want their learning environment reformed into a decolonial institution is a demand, which derives from the same critique as I have just presented. This means that the epistemic violence that is reproduced through the methods and content within the school has been addressed and criticized. A critique which is from the beginning in the essay by Borman dismissed.

The conversation that we have to have is one that goes to the core of the critique of prevailing colonial paradigms, to the heart of our individual historically formed identities and their relationships to each other, as well as aims to destroy White Hegemony.

WdKA makes a Difference was from the outset a project that was interested in looking into the ways in which White Hegemony has prevailed within the Willem de Kooning Academy. Although the language when I started this project was more centered around the discourse of in- and exclusion (AAUDEI-POKU 2015), the project has shifted due to its design into a stronger investigation into Difference and the role Difference plays in the classroom as well as the intake of students. The distribution of critical knowledge from postcolonial, gender-queer theory, critical race as well as Black Studies within the WdKA to push the boundaries of normativity and initiate decolonial thinking has been the main angle of this project. Although widely unnoticed—because not under the banner WdKA makes a Difference— this project has influenced the art-school in a sustainable way, through the development of the Mini- Visual Culture, an Elective (Kuzevaki) Make a Difference, Thematic Projects in the MFA program, multiple guest lectures in various seminars, an exhibition collaboration with Witte de With as well as Film Screenings and talks.

The team which consisted of various numbers ranging from 1-7, depending on already scarce resources, engaged in monthly readings on subjects such as Inclusive Pedagogy, Critical Whiteness and Decolonial Art Education.

The artist Patricia Kaersenhout held a performative workshop in 2015 and we arranged a Theater of the Oppressed workshop at Formaat, Workplace for Participative Theater in Rotterdam in 2016, which deepened and formed the critical understanding of this group. Our conversations, learning from each other and sharing experiences have informed this publication and its themes, but it has also informed my understanding that social change is relational, by which I mean that without this team, who have been willing to engage with uncomfortable questions this project would not have been realized.

I would therefore like to thank everybody who has been involved in this project: Eva Visser, Liane van der Linden, Teana Boston-Mammah, Rudi Enny, Jan van Heemst, Reinaart Vanhoe, Marleen van Aarendonk, Remko van de Pluijm and Mark Mulder as well as the many students and colleagues who we have been in conversation with. But a project like this, which received no external funding would not have been possible without the support of it’s home base the Research Center Creating 010. It would be a misunderstanding to consider our work as finished and I would, therefore, like to end with a reference to Angela Davis: “Freedom is a constant struggle”.

**“FREEDOM IS A CONSTANT STRUGGLE” — ANGELA DAVIS**
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Research Project WdKA makes a Difference
WdKA makes a Difference is an action based research project interested in the possibilities of decolonial approaches within the Willem de Kooning Academy, which was conducted from January 2015 till December 2016.

PRINCIPLE INVESTIGATOR WdKA MAKES A DIFFERENCE
Applied Research Professor Nana Adusei-Poku
CONTRIBUTORS
Teana Boston-Mammah, Jan van Heemst

Marleen van Arendonk, Rudi Emny, Esma Moukhtar, Mark Mulder, Remko van de Ploijm, Reinaart Vanhoe

WdKA makes a Difference READER
SUPERVISING EDITOR
Nana Adusei-Poku
COPYEDITS
Nana Adusei-Poku
SUPERVISING EDITOR
WdKA makes a Difference WEBSITE
www.wdkamakesadifference.com
DESIGN
Mark Mulder, Studio for Visual Pop.Culture

NANA ADUSEI-POKU

TEANA BOSTON-MAMMAH is a sociologist, she earned a Bachelor’s degree in Sociology at Essex University (UK) and a Master of Urban Studies and Public Policy at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. She is particularly interested in notions of identity in an urban context. The first ten years of her career she worked as a teacher of sociology in London. In the Netherlands, she went on to develop her research and policy advising skills. She worked for over eleven years as a policy advisor / researcher for Scala, a non-profit expertise center for gender and diversity, in Rotterdam. Research areas include: the glass ceiling, emancipation in Rotterdam, radicalisation, fatherhood, sexual diversity and gendered social contacts patterns. From 2012 she has worked as a consultant and researcher for various organisations in Rotterdam, Formaat, Het Peutercollege and the research center Creating 010. In her free time Teana organises, as co-founder of the foundation RotterdamINK, various events, in the context of women’s empowerment issues. Teana is a board member of various nonprofits. Her research on gender and social contact theory in a neighbourhood in South Rotterdam is via Emerald publishers accessible and called “Women and the Gender Gap”.
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JAN VAN HEEMST, here featuring on a student’s t-shirt, is Senior Research Lecturer at the Willem de Kooning Academy, Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences. He completed his PhD in the Humanities, University of Amsterdam. His research centres on Cultural Analysis. What drives him in particular is an analytical interest in the resilience of cultural belongings in our plainly not so post-identitarian twenty-first century world. He is presently addressing the most hotly debated issues of cultural belongings in an exploration of historical configurations and actual representations that make for what appear to be collective commitments to often highly contested causes like class, race, nationality, ethnicity, gender, or, for that matter, religion. Findings will be set forth in a critical manual for advanced BA-students. They will offer major cases for ‘teachable moments’ in higher vocational and/or academic education, i.e. issues that are indisputable relevant for next decade curricula, as they pertain to sensitive topics such as migration, diaspora, tolerance, selfhood, rights, agency, and diversity. Recently Jan van Heemst published a concise History of European Culture (Dutch, Rotterdam, Ad. Donker Publishers, 2012).

MARK MULDER, here shown, is a sociologist, teaching critical theory and has developed a series of Read-Ins that focus on the troubles, theories and politics of identity from feminist and postcolonial perspectives. Recently she started a course for a group of fine arts students on creative writing about their work. In her spare time she is working on a novel, and is an editor for Perdu, a foundation for poetry, literature, art, and performance in Amsterdam, where she also lives.
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ESMA MOUKHTAR studied philosophy at the UvA in Amsterdam. Since then she has worked for several magazines and has written, mostly about art and film, for various publications, catalogues and other media. From 2002 on she has lectured art history, theory and philosophy at the Koninklijke Academie voor Kunst en Vormgeving Den Bosch, the Willem de Kooning Academy, the Gerrit Rietveld Academy, and the Hogeschool van Amsterdam. She has worked a lot with students on thesis research as well, and still does. At the Willem de Kooning Academy she is involved in the Critical Studies minor, teaching critical theory and has developed a series of Read-Ins that focus on the troubles, theories and politics of identity from feminist and postcolonial perspectives. Recently she started a course for a group of fine arts students on creative writing about their work. In her spare time she is working on a novel, and is an editor for Perdu, a foundation for poetry, literature, art, and performance in Amsterdam, where she also lives.