This actually didn't happen at all; the first-generation immigrants stayed with their kids who had grown up in the new country. However, while these children (the second generation) grew up within the Dutch culture, the first-generation immigrants did not mentally adopt Holland as their new home, inadvertently creating enclaves where they could feel comfortable among themselves, but not connecting with broader Dutch society. This larger social drama was played out on a local scale in this particular part of the city.

Later, the Amsterdam Historic Museum coordinated a project to collect stories about this neighborhood by interviewing the older Dutch population, to give a sense of depth to the place (what could be called "a deep map" [Heat-Moon 1999]). A website was created in which these anecdotes were displayed (http://www.geheugenvanoost.nl), and was advertised locally. In the end, people from the Turkish and Moroccan communities also got involved, relating their own experiences of arriving and living in the area. When they started recounting stories about their life in the places they had come from, the project staff realized that they did not come from "Turkey" or "Morocco," but that each community was rooted in just a few specific villages in rural areas of those countries. The older Dutch population could relate to these stories of rural life—they were not that different from their own family histories one or two generations back, when their own ancestors moved to the city from the Dutch countryside. The network of stories expressed many more common values than anyone could have imagined, and created avenues for further contact and understanding. This made a real difference in defusing tensions and improving the capacity of the neighborhood to deal with any problems that might arise—including vandalism and loitering teenagers. Years later, this particular website is still active, with stories now spanning the whole city.

Several features of this modest project deserve to be highlighted. First of all, the issues were approached on a human level and directly impacted the everyday life of the area. Second, the approach was proactive: the problems addressed in this project were not defined in terms of unsafety and the need to tackle small-scale crimes, nor did they focus solely on troublemakers. Third, by concentrating on common human values and intense interaction with the people, existing community groups could be connected, strengthened, and harnessed for a common good.

From this project, we can learn that in this kind of open, complex, dynamic, and networked problem situation there probably are no direct, quick fixes, and that