Notes

1 A Homesick World?

1. Like the universalist position, this label is used to describe an empirical rather than normative position. Particularists disagree among each other, as do universalists.
2. Others, while agreeing with the latter claim, would emphasize that this longing for homogeneous space will lead to something akin to apartheid.
3. At which point the generic becomes the particular.
4. As Doreen Massey (1995) has argued, this is pertinent to many cosmopolitans: they can have their free-floating lifestyles because others are there to take care of their particular places. One of her most telling examples comes from her study of a group of highly successful male scientists at Cambridge University. ‘These men are able to counterbalance the intense, virtual and actual forms of mobility of their professional lives (in which they daily communicate with colleagues internationally and regularly travel to conferences abroad) with the quieter delights of their secluded domestic lifestyles, in their houses in the Cambridgeshire countryside – which are, of course, maintained for them, in their absence, by their wives. Certainly, one of the other dimensions of differences involved here involves the way in which the burden of Heimat is often carried by the female “home-maker”, in so far as relations to mobility and sedentarism are commonly gendered in one way or another’ (pp. 190–1).

2 Why Feeling at Home Matters

1. See also annotated surveys such as Perkins and Thorns (2003).
2. Methodologically, the way to proceed is to ask when, why and where people do not feel at home.
3. Nowicka seems hesitant to draw the radical conclusion that ‘home’ can be completely de-territorialized since she – in line with the actor–network tradition she is sympathetic to – wants to emphasize the material side of ‘home-making’. If home can be completely ‘de-territorialized’, how then to understand home-making practices which need to take place somewhere? While examining the material side of such an elusive concept as ‘home’ is laudable, it does not follow that people cannot also feel at home in non-material, non-territorialized ‘worlds’. 
4. This fits with Heidegger’s thinking about home: ‘What is it to feel a sense of belonging rather than alienation? In his answer, [Heidegger] suggested that it is a process of communication. Each generation leaves symbols and stories, rooted in time and space. Those of us in subsequent generations learn to belong by receiving and reinterpreting those stories, as well as adding our own’ (Atkins, 2003, p. 10).

3  Losing Home at Home: When Men and Women Feel More at Home at Work

1. In which she writes: ‘One excellent way to raise the value of care is to involve fathers in it. If men shared the care of family members worldwide, care would spread laterally instead of being passed down a social class ladder.... For indeed it is men who have for the most part stepped aside from caring work, and it is with them that the “care drain” truly begins’ (2003, p. 29).

2. This is also evident in Chris Carrington’s (1999) book No Place Like Home: Relationships and Family Life Among Lesbians and Gay Men. Carrington writes that the unequal distribution of tasks inside and outside the home, which he also encounters among lesbian and gay male couples, has nothing to do with gender (since both partners are of the same sex). He shows that extremely egalitarian ideals exist in homosexual relationships regarding the distribution of household chores and, increasingly often, childcare tasks, with both partners attached to life at home, to ‘domesticity’. Nevertheless, the two partners often contribute unequally. How is this possible? Carrington agrees with Hochschild, Gornick and Meyers, and Jacobs and Gerson, that pressure from outside – as expressed in the overpowering need for (more) money – leads to the unequal distribution of the second shift, which is performed mainly by the partner with lower income: ‘Paid employment exerts the greatest influence upon the division of domesticity in most lesbigay families. The number of hours paid work requires, where the work takes place, the length of the commute to work, the pay, the prestige, and difficulty of the work all conflate to encourage a pattern of specialization. The relative resources that each person brings to the relationship from paid work influence the division of labor. In most cases, the person with less earning capacities, or with less occupational prestige, picks up a disproportionate share of domestic labor’ (p. 188).

3. These figures are for 2009.

4. These figures are for 2005.

5. Some American women begin to work part time after the birth of their first child. According to Gerson and Jacobs: ‘The reduced time among working parents is not gender neutral, however. Indeed, husbands work more hours when they have children at home, and their
working hours increase along with the number of children’ (2004a, p. 49).

6. A person is deemed to be economically independent in the Netherlands if he or she earns 70 percent of the net minimum wage.

7. On the other hand, the situation for women is even worse in South European countries. Women in Greece and Spain, for example, spend 69.8 and 67.9 hours, respectively, on work and care, which is considerably more than women in North European countries. This is because they both work more (poor leave arrangements) and care more (poor child day care).

5 Feeling at Home in the Nation? Understanding Dutch Nostalgia

1. Pillarization refers to the division of Dutch society into religious and ideological groups during the first half of the twentieth century. There was a Roman Catholic ‘pillar’, a Protestant pillar that was further divided internally and a neutral or secular pillar. Each had its own schools, societies, political parties, broadcasting organizations, newspapers, hospitals, etc. This vertical split ran through all social classes.

2. The standard deviation of a series of numbers can be understood as their average distance from the average. For example, if the average result of two examinations is five, this can mean that a five was obtained in both examinations or that the respective scores were one and nine. In the first case the standard deviation is zero; in the second it is four.

3. In any election year, sentences and phrases within party programs are coded for 56 separate issues. The space devoted to each is expressed as a percentage. Polarization over authoritarianism is measured by determining the space allotted by each party to the maintenance of law and order, and then subtracting that devoted to minority groups of a non-economic and non-demographic nature. This gives each party a score reflecting how strongly it stresses authoritarianism over libertarianism. We then calculate the polarization between the parties for each election year using the standard deviation. We measure polarization over moral traditionalism by determining the space allotted to negative comments on traditional moral themes such as family, religion and immoral behavior, and then subtracting that devoted to positive comments on these issues. The resulting scores show the extent to which parties value traditional moral values. The standard deviation for each election year reflects the degree of polarization.

6 Conclusion: Inclusive Ways of Feeling at Home?

1. See, on negotiating these boundaries between home and work, the beautiful book by Nippert-Eng (1996).

2. While American readers may wonder why it is even necessary to point this out (see Abrahamson, 2005 [1996]), in Western Europe ‘mixed neighborhoods’ have become something of a policy dogma.


NRC correspondent (2010) Moroccans feel at home in the Netherlands despite negative image [Marokkaan voelt zich thuis in Nederland ondanks imago]. NRC Handelsblad, 29 June, p. 3.
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