



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Multiculturalism, dependent residence status and honour killings. Explaining current Dutch intolerance towards ethnic minorities

Schrover, M.L.J.C.

Citation

Schrover, M. L. J. C. (2013). Multiculturalism, dependent residence status and honour killings. Explaining current Dutch intolerance towards ethnic minorities. In *Gender, migration and categorisation. Making distinctions between migrants in Western Countries, 1945-2010* (pp. 231-253). Amsterdam: AUP. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/59836>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License:

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/59836>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Gender, Migration and Categorisation

Making Distinctions between Migrants
in Western Countries, 1945-2010

Marlou Schrover & Deirdre M. Moloney (eds)

IMISCOE Research

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cover illustration: Hungarian refugees Rozsa and Imre Tölgyesi at home in Numansdorp, 1958. Habetler Collection, IISG Amsterdam

Cover design: Studio Jan de Boer BNO, Amsterdam

Layout: Hanneke Kossen, Amsterdam

Amsterdam University Press English-language titles are distributed in the US and Canada by the University of Chicago Press.

ISBN 978 90 8964 573 9

e-ISBN 978 90 4852 175 3 (pdf)

e-ISBN 978 90 4852 176 0 (ePub)

NUR 741 / 763

© Marlou Schrover and Deirdre M. Moloney / Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2013

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owners and the authors of the book.

10 Multiculturalism, dependent residence status and honour killings

Explaining current Dutch intolerance towards ethnic minorities from a gender perspective (1960-2000)

Marlou Schrover

Introduction

This chapter analyses how issues pertaining to the Turkish minority in the Netherlands have been framed in parliamentary discussions and in newspapers (see also Schrover 2011).¹ It focuses, in particular, on three issues that dominated debates between the 1960s and the 2000s. The issues are described here separately, but they are very much related. They occurred more or less in parallel and influenced one another. The first was the multicultural policy in the Netherlands, which included provisions for granting subsidies to Turkish organisations. Dutch multicultural policy thus stimulated and subsidised differences. In the 1980s, ideas about multiculturalism changed, and organisations lost most of their subsidies. One exception was a Turkish women's organisation. However, that organisation's exceptional position led to a coup which heralded its end. Second was the large-scale publicity campaigns conducted to prevent the deportation of Turkish women with a dependent residence status after they had been left or divorced by their husbands. There was a strong emphasis in the campaigns on the risks these women faced, within the Netherlands and after their return to Turkey. Third was the so-called 'honour killings'. Before the 1970s, Turkish men and women, like Dutch men and women and others, were occasionally involved in crimes of passion and related violence. Until the 1970s, however, these were never framed as honour killings. In the 1970s, newspapers systematically specified whether a perpetrator or a victim was Turkish and ran headlines like, 'Turk kills man', 'Turk shoots man', or 'Jealous Turk kills girlfriend'. In the mid-1970s, the term 'honour killing' entered debates after experts had used this notion to explain and predict violence among Turks in the Netherlands. The leading question of this chapter is how and why the problematisation of these three issues occurred.

Materials and methods

Problematization is the process in which actors (academics, politicians and journalists) analyse a situation, define it as a problem, expand it by attaching issues to it, finally suggesting a solution (Foucault 1984: 388-389). Problematization always serves a purpose. In earlier research I showed how problematization, via an emphasis on the vulnerability of migrant women, enabled rules to be bent without changing them (Schrover 2009a, 2010a, 2011).

This chapter uses records of parliamentary debates and newspaper articles to analyse the discourse on the issues mentioned above and, more specifically, nodal points within it. In general, nodal points appear in the process of articulation and give a discourse stability and coherence (Laclau & Mouffe 1985: 105; Hoving, Dibbits & Schrover 2005). A nodal point is a point in a discourse at which another meaning is defined (De Cillia, Reisigl & Wodak 1999: 157). In this chapter, the three focal issues are regarded as nodal points. Apart from the nodal points, there are routine combinations, for instance, of fairness on the one hand and firmness on the other (Van Dijk 1988, 1989, 1992: 92; Prins 2002). Nodal points and routine combinations form the intersection between discourse analysis and frame analysis. Within text, packets of organised knowledge, called 'frames', 'scripts' or 'topoi', are commonly used. These packets, referred to here as 'frames' for the sake of brevity, are determinants of the inferences necessary to understand sentence connections (Van Dijk 1983: 30; Entman 1996: 77-78). Frames support an argument without constituting it. They make text 'recognisable' and make it possible to omit information, because it is an inherent part of a packet of knowledge (Scheufele 1999; Van Gorp 2005; Matthes & Kohring 2008). Frames play a role in the process of problematization via what is called the 'tactical linkage' of issue areas (such as, e.g., trade, climate, safety or migration), which are clustered in negotiations as 'areas of joint gain' (Rhodes 1997; Betts 2006).

The sections below analyse how in political debates and newspaper articles issues were linked and groups of arguments were clustered. The materials drawn on in this chapter come from three main sources: parliamentary debates, newspaper articles and archives of immigrant organisations. Newspaper articles were collected from all major national newspapers and a large number of regional newspapers in the Netherlands.² The main immigrant organisation archive used was that of the Turkish women's organisation *Hollanda Türkiyeli Kadınlar Birliği* (HTKB).³

Multiculturalism and a Turkish women's organisation

Multicultural policy, as it was introduced in a number of Western countries in the 1960s, stimulated individuals to organise into groups on the basis of perceived cultural similarity. The struggle for recognition by organisations within this policy spurred ethnic group formation, organisation and mobilisation. Ethnic brokers worked to obtain recognition by making cultures or cultural difference visible. Since recognition claims were based on the supposed uniqueness of a group's culture, institutionalisation of multiculturalism led to an overemphasis on differences between groups, underplaying diversity within groups. Because of assumptions about group homogeneity, Dutch authorities encouraged the formation of representative bodies for migrants per country of origin. This not only denied differences within groups, but it also increased competition between groups, which tried to legitimise the claim that they spoke on behalf of the 'community' and thus qualified for funding. In the long run, these policies led to 'cultural freezing' – that is, static ideas about the identity of minority groups and about the Dutch majority society. This denied the fluidity of ethnicity, and the fact that ethnicity can be differently experienced within communities along lines of age, gender and class; while it also ignored the influence of state policies, geopolitical constellations and economic change (Volpp 1996: 1588–1589, 1592; Schrover 2010a).

Okin (1999) has shown that multiculturalism can have negative consequences for immigrant or minority women, since an emphasis on authentic identity and traditional values often implies restricted rights for women. Bhadha (2009: 57) demonstrates that a paradox of multicultural vulnerability may be created when the result of what is meant to be the empowering of groups through multiculturalism policies leads to entrenchment of oppressive elements of cultural traditions, placing women in a worse position than they would be without group recognition within multiculturalism. Okin's point of view has been criticised because it promotes stereotypical views of non-Western women. Gender subordination is constructed as integral only to non-Western cultures (Lutz 1997; McKerl 2007: 198). Non-Western cultures are presented as sexist, frozen and static (Volpp 2001: 1185; McKerl 2007: 204–205). Western representations of the East serve not only to define those who are the objects of the Orientalising gaze, but also the West, which is defined through its opposition to the Rest. The West is defined as modern, democratic and progressive; the Rest are seen as primitive, barbaric and despotic. This representation always serves a purpose. Around 1900, for instance, British suffragettes used the image

of the 'victimised sisters' in India to bolster their own claims. The victimised sisters symbolised what the suffragettes did not wish to be: immobile, secluded in the home and without rights (Volpp 2001: 1195). In the 1970s, white middle-class Western women justified their claims to equality by constructing non-Western women as helpless subjects of barbaric traditionalism. The 'other' was seen as equal only in Christian rhetoric, but never in reality (Doezema 2001: 30).

In the Netherlands, multicultural policy underwent major shifts over time.⁴ Three sets of ideas lay at the basis of the policy. In the first place, a model for living apart together had been developed in a 19th century Dutch colonial context: no conversions, no assimilation, but a pacified segregated coexistence (Snouck Hurgronje 1916; see also the chapter by Van Walsum, Jones & Legêne in this volume). Secondly, there was the consociational model of conflict regulation, known as pillarisation, which characterised Dutch society from the end of the 19th century onwards. Pillarisation linked political parties, civic associations and a wide range of organisations, and immersed individuals in their own (religious) group from the cradle to the grave. A number of groups within Dutch society – most importantly the Catholics, which in the 19th century constituted about half of the population, but encountered obstacles in the political and social domains – achieved emancipation via this form of segregation. The model of 'living apart together' of (denominational) groups dominated Dutch society well into the 1960s. Within it, group rights were granted, for instance, to Orthodox Protestants who were exempted from obligatory inoculations, taxes, insurance and conscription. In the 1960s, the idea of pillarisation gradually lost ground, but its institutional infrastructure survived. It went on to structure the organisation of the new migrants, who came from the 1960s, by ethnicity and religion rather than by class. Provisions dating from the time of pillarisation made it possible, for instance, for migrants to set up their own schools, subsidised by the Dutch government (Schrover 2010b).

Ideas derived from pillarisation made multicultural policies acceptable to the Dutch public, but the initial idea behind multiculturalism was not emancipation via segregation, but to facilitate an easy return of guest workers to their countries of origin (Rijkschroeff, Duyvendak & Pels 2003: 27). A multicultural policy was pursued because it enforced the idea of guest-worker migration as temporary migration. It allowed migrants to function in the Netherlands, while making a return easy. To facilitate a return, it was believed essential that migrants preserved their language, cultural identities and internal group structures (Scholten 2007: 78; Obdeijn & Schrover 2008). Authorities felt that there was no

need to encourage or facilitate integration (Rijkschroeff, Duyvendak & Pels 2003: 22).⁵ The government maintained this idea long after it had become clear that not all guest workers would return, because this made it possible to legitimise continuation of guest-worker recruitment (Bonjour 2008: 11).

Within the multicultural policy, integration was seen as a group process. This led to subsidies for immigrant organisations.⁶ Dutch government policy strongly influenced the number of organisations that were established, their nature, goals and continuity (Penninx & Schrover 2001). Most of the immigrant organisations that were formed were men's organisations. There were a few immigrant women's organisations, of which the Turkish *HTKB* (Hollanda Türkiyeli Kadınlar Birliği) was the most important. Turkish women in the Netherlands set it up in 1974.⁷ It ceased to exist in 1995, but the local Amsterdam branch continued under a slightly different name (*ATKB*). *HTKB* was a spin-off of *HTIB*, an organisation composed of left-wing Turkish men in the Netherlands and which had been set up some years earlier.⁸ Nihat Karaman ran the men's organisation, and his wife, Maviye Karaman Ince, ran the women's organisation (Onderwater 2008; Robert 2009). In 1988, Nihat Karaman was shot dead in front of his house. According to some, the murder was politically motivated, while others attributed it to problems in the private relational sphere.

HTIB and *HTKB* were, especially in their early years, left-wing and strongly orientated towards Turkey. The *HTKB* saw itself as an organisation fighting a class struggle or fighting racism, and less as an organisation fighting for women's rights. Dutch women's organisations, for their part, rarely emphasised what united immigrant and non-immigrant women. Instead, they focused on what they believed divided them. They did little to include immigrant women in their organisations and activities. To the non-migrant women's organisations, migrant women were either invisible or they were victims.⁹

At its height, the *HTKB* had about 600 members and branch organisations in seven Dutch cities.¹⁰ *HTKB* had a support group of Dutch women volunteers, as was customary for many Turkish organisations (and those of other minorities) at the time. In the 1980s, the Dutch government decided to specifically target women's immigrant organisations, of which it felt there were too few. A special programme, *VEM*,¹¹ was set up to encourage and support immigrant women to organise. *VEM* ran as a programme between 1982 and 1990. Immigrant women were believed to be doubly disadvantaged because they were women and migrants (or triply disadvantaged if they were also Muslims). Women could ask for subsidies for a place where they could meet

'safely' without men being present. Most initiatives within the VEM programme came from non-migrant women; only some were joint initiatives of migrant and non-migrant women. Turkish and Moroccan women's organisations took very few initiatives. Migrant women tried to gain more influence through creation of new organisations, but they met with opposition from various sides. In the first place, Dutch women within the immigrant or joint organisations refused to give up their positions. Secondly, subsidisers at the local level did not trust Turkish or Moroccan women when they applied for subsidies without the support of Dutch women, and their requests were turned down more often than those of Dutch women within joint organisations. The Dutch women knew the institutions better, they had a better understanding of how to draft a proposal, and they knew the jargon. As a result, the organisations that were created were hybrid in nature. On several occasions, it was pointed out that the organisations of, or for, migrant women, which were successful in getting subsidies, were artificial organisations (Bilgin et al. 1988).¹²

HTKB provided Dutch language classes, sewing classes and programmes aimed at teaching Turkish women how to ride a bicycle or swim. HTKB worked together with other immigrant women's organisations. In 1980, the Dutch Women's Movement (NVB) took the initiative to organise some of the immigrant women's groups under a joint umbrella organisation. Immigrant women's organisations found this initiative patronising.¹³ The Amsterdam municipal authorities, however, subsidised joint initiatives. Via subsidies, Dutch authorities forced Turkish migrants to organise as Turks, and not as Kurds, left-wing or right-wing Turks, as workers, or as Muslims. When subsidies for all organisations were reduced, tensions increased amongst the rather artificially created organisations.¹⁴ Subsidies for initiatives that had to do with immigrant women continued.¹⁵ In 1993, this led to a coup at the general meeting of the HTKB. A group of 50 women joined the organisation at the meeting, two of them stood as candidates for the board, and they were chosen by the other new members. An emotional meeting followed. At one point the board called in the assistance of the police because of the threatening presence of Turkish men outside of the building. The parties went to court in order to settle their dispute. This heralded the end of the organisation. The story of HTKB illustrates the role of government subsidies in shaping organisations and their goals. Turkish women were first made dependent on non-Turkish volunteers. Subsidies disempowered rather than empowered them. Eventually the end of the subsidies led to violence and conflict, and the end of the organisation.

Women from a repressive culture

I have described the issue of dependent residence status at some length elsewhere (Schrover 2009b, 2010a) and will therefore summarise it here only briefly. Dependent residency was an issue not only in the Netherlands, but also in other Western countries (Sterett 1997; Côté, Kérisit & Côté 2001). The issue arose when in 1975 recruitment of guest workers came to an end. Labour migration was replaced by migration in the context of family formation and reunification (Bonjour 2008). Since the guest workers had been mostly men (Wentholt 1967; Chotkowski 2000; Obdeijn & Schrover 2008), it was mostly women who came within the framework of family reunification. In theory, men who joined their wives could also get dependent residence permits, but since most guest workers had been men, in practice it was mostly women who obtained permits that depended on the residency status of their husbands. Dependent residency thus became a women's issue. Dependent residency meant that a woman could be deported if she left her husband (or was left by her husband) within the waiting period of three years after her arrival in the Netherlands. Dutch women's organisations took up the issue, expanding the framework within which the matter of the waiting period was discussed. Stories about women started with an emphasis on the goal of the campaigns – reduction of the waiting period – but continued as stories about abuse and domestic violence, and about persecution in women's countries of origin. Other issues were linked as well, such as forced or arranged marriages of young girls.¹⁶ The linkages made the problem all the more urgent.

From 1979 onwards, Dutch women's organisations (mostly consisting of non-immigrant, white, middle-class women) agitated against dependent residency. Their campaigns personified the issue. Women who epitomised the matter were singled out. Dutch women's organisations sought out women as figureheads for their media campaigns in shelters for abused and maltreated women. Other organisations had followed similar principles to find the figureheads used in campaigns described by Schacher, Oxford, and Walaardt in this volume. The shelters were willing to cooperate because they did not receive state support for foreign women who had left or had been left by their husbands within the three-year period. Since the number of foreign women in the shelters had increased – at the time of the campaigns they made up half of the residents¹⁷ – a solution to the problem of the waiting period would also solve the precarious financial situation of the shelters.¹⁸

All of the women selected for the media campaigns were Turkish. This choice of cases made the matter both a women's issue and an issue

about the repression of women within Islam. In their campaigns, Dutch women's organisations reproduced 19th-century stereotypes about Islam and about women's dependency within it. Rather surprisingly, Dutch newspapers however, at this time seldom used the word 'Islam', but only the word 'religion'. Emphasis was on the backwardness of Turkish society.¹⁹ Women who were divorced would not be able to survive in Turkish society, according to newspapers.²⁰ The women were said to have shamed and dishonoured their families.²¹ Their (former) husbands and family members were likely to take revenge on the women if they were forced to return to Turkey, the newspapers wrote.²² The arguments and stereotypes used echoed those described by Schacher in this volume for refugees from Turkey decades earlier.

Women's organisations presented three cases of individual women in quick succession. The first woman who was chosen for the campaign got a permit to stay on humanitarian grounds shortly after the start of the campaign.²³ Since no change in policy had been achieved, the women's organisations presented a second case of a woman who was maltreated by her husband and twice ended up in hospital. All Dutch newspapers reported on her situation.²⁴ Turkish women submitted a petition to the government signed by 2,656 people. Fearing a similar 'success' to that in the first case, the women's organisations added a third case.²⁵

In Dutch parliament questions were raised about the number of women encountering such problems, the number of women with a dependent residence status in shelters, and the number of women threatened with deportation. Rather surprisingly, the State Secretary of Justice could not answer any of these questions; data were not available and the activists did not provide them.²⁶ In response to the question about how many women were affected, newspapers provided information about the total numbers of Turkish and Moroccan women in the Netherlands,²⁷ implying that all of them were likely to get into this situation. The shelters used general quantifiers ('many' women).²⁸ The State Secretary of Justice emphasised that women who were in this position would be allowed to stay on humanitarian grounds. There was no need for a change of law, she stressed. The length of the waiting period had been chosen to discourage marriages of convenience. One member of parliament asked if this was a Turkish or Turkish-Moroccan problem, rather than a problem that applied to all migrant women. The answer was no; the women in the shelters were definitely not all Turkish or Moroccan. The fact that this question was raised illustrates the strong association that by then had developed between the issue of dependency and being Turkish.²⁹ Throughout the campaigns, Turkish women in the Nether-

lands were presented as dependent and vulnerable, and Turkish society was portrayed as extremely backward. A Turkish women's organisation in the Netherlands pointed out that the association between a dependent residence status and violence could negatively influence the image of foreign (or Turkish) women, and this would, in the long run, be to the detriment of women. A Turkish social worker later said, 'There were many Dutch volunteers, but it was all very patronising. I was invited to speak [at a meeting of Dutch women] about Turkish women. I immediately noticed that they thought all Turkish women were backward and pathetic. They wanted to hold on to that image' (Tinnemans 1994: 182). Dutch women's organisations pushed forward with their campaigns along the lines criticised by Turkish women.

In 1983, there was a change in policy; women still had to be married at least three years, but they only needed one year of residency in the Netherlands before they could apply for an independent residence permit. The policy change was announced by the Secretary of State at the end of a conference on sexual violence against women and girls, thus linking dependent residence status, the vulnerable position of migrant women, and violence.³⁰ In two of the three cases presented by the campaigners, the women did not meet the criteria of the new law. Therefore, even under the new law they would not have been allowed to stay. For them personally the change of law was of little relevance since they had already been allowed to stay on humanitarian grounds. On a general level, and combined with the fact that it was never clear from the beginning how many women were disadvantaged by the old law, this makes the success of the campaigns questionable. It did, however, strongly present Turkish culture as backward, which in the long run disadvantaged Turkish women in the Netherlands.

Honour killings

Introduction of the term 'honour killings' was preceded by newspaper reports in 1972 about severe riots in Rotterdam, which the Dutch newspapers labelled 'race riots' (Schrover 2011).³¹ The riots started over a housing issue and lasted seven days. Underlying the conflict was Dutch government policy regarding family reunification. Guest workers were only allowed to bring their families if they had suitable housing. Since rental homes were very difficult to get, Turkish guest workers bought cheap houses in rundown neighbourhoods. Turks also bought houses, which they converted to boarding houses for their fellow countrymen. The riots started when a Turkish homeowner tried to evict a Dutch

woman with three young children. Dutch neighbours protested, and Dutch rioters cruised the neighbourhood and smashed the windows of the homes of Turks. Their furniture was thrown onto the street and set on fire.³² Turkish families were forced to flee. A Turk stabbed several Dutch people in self-defence. They had to be treated in hospital. The Dutch rioters complained that Turks were taking over the neighbourhood. They expanded the issue by adding that Turks were harassing Dutch girls, some of whom were no older than 12 or 13. Two Dutch girls were harmed by the Dutch rioters because they were friendly with Turks. The police were photographed standing by idly during the riots, while laughing and doing little to protect Turks. Police, however, did block street entrances to make sure Turks in the neighbourhood did not get support from Turks from elsewhere.³³ Turkish women and children turned to the Turkish consulate for support and advice. The consul and the Turkish minister of foreign affairs intervened, calling upon the Dutch government to protect the Turks and their property.

Newspapers described the Turks efforts to organise to defend themselves and their calls for support. Turkish thugs, according to one of the papers, armed with guns planned to take revenge.³⁴ One Turk was quoted as saying he would behead the whole neighbourhood. Turks who had fled to the roofs of their houses threw roof tiles onto rioters several floors below them.³⁵ Four Turks were arrested, as well as about 60 Dutch rioters.³⁶ Dutch groups, which came out in support of the Turks, stated that the young Dutch rioters did know what they were getting themselves into. The Turks were hard to restrain, they said. Despite the support group's efforts, they might very well become violent and might cut the rioters into seven pieces.³⁷ Newspaper articles supported this view; Turkish women and children had left the neighbourhood, but Turkish men hid in backrooms, listened to the muffled thuds of stones landing in their front rooms, the scattering of glass and the splintering of wood, and waited to crack the skull of every Dutch guy who dared climb the stairs.³⁸

Overall the tone in the newspapers was one of surprise and outrage at the eruption of violence and racial hatred. But the articles also fed an atmosphere of fear. Shortly after the outbreak of the riots, a Turkish man stood to allow a young Dutch woman to sit on a packed train. The woman misunderstood his intentions and started to scream. Somebody pulled the emergency chain, forcing the train to stop, and the chivalrous Turk was arrested.³⁹

The effect of reports about the riots was twofold. In the first place, a possible violent nature of the Turks was emphasised. This idea was reinforced by endless reports in the Dutch newspapers about Turkish

atrocities against Greeks in Cyprus in 1974, and reports about riots in the Netherlands in 1976. Those riots had started after a Turkish man stabbed a Dutch man to death at a fair. During the 1976 riots an extremist right-wing party – the *Nederlandse Volks-Unie* – started a racist campaign. Secondly, there was the surprising nature of the riots. British, French and Turkish newspapers reported on the Dutch race riots. They were quoted at length in Dutch newspapers. The foreign papers expressed surprise that this could happen in a nation like the Netherlands, which was known for its tolerance and hospitality to foreigners.⁴⁰ Dutch newspapers tried to explain the eruption of violence. The Dutch were perhaps not the hospitable or tolerant people they believed themselves to be, according to the papers, but there were also too many Turks and too many Turkish boarding houses in poor neighbourhoods.⁴¹ In offering this explanation, the papers implicitly shifted part of the blame away from the Dutch to the Turks. ‘Too many’ implied ‘too different’. The emphasis on cultural difference was perfectly consistent with the ideas of multicultural policy. It was also consistent with how the issue of honour killings developed.

Generally, culture is invoked to explain forms of violence against immigrant or minority women, while it is not similarly invoked to explain forms of violence that affect non-migrant or non-minority women. In the USA, for instance, the media framed the murder of an Indian woman within an assumed old Indian tradition of dowry murders, rather than presenting the murder as a response to domestic violence common in the USA (Volpp 2001: 1187). In the case of honour killings, violence is allegedly used to restore the honour of the family. The murderer is believed to be chosen by the family at a family conference, after which he plans his murder (which makes it premeditated murder and not manslaughter); he turns himself in after the murder and does not show remorse (Siesling 2006: 24). The assumption is that honour-related violence is tolerated or excused by the members of the family or community.

In the case of honour killings, perpetrators availed of a so-called ‘cultural defence’ (Siesling 2006 103-126). Cultural defence was seldom used in practice, but it did have a strong influence in public and political discourse. Cultural defence is not a doctrine in Dutch law (nor in US law) (Siesling 2006: 66; Korteweg & Yurdakul 2009). Cultural defence implies recognition that customs or mores might differ between countries (or cultures) and that an accused may be aware of differences, but not able to comply with the rules of the country of settlement because of an internalisation of the mores of the country of origin or pressure from a community in the country of settlement. The accused is seen as

having no free will and as not accountable for his actions (diminished responsibility). Attorneys seek sentencing in line with the personal characteristics of the defendant (as in the case of mentally handicapped or children, who cannot be held responsible for their actions). The defence is similar to the *battered woman syndrome defence*, in which it is claimed that women are not accountable for killing their husbands after they suffered years of maltreatment. Culture, however, is different from mental state or age. Cultural cases move the responsibility away from the individual, but also from society. The behaviour of migrants results from their culture (which is presented as static), and that is not something the country of settlement can remedy.

In cultural defence cases there is an emphasis on shame; men are assumed to have killed their daughters, wives or sisters because the women shamed the family with their assumed loose moral behaviour. The culture of the country of origin of the perpetrator (or his forefathers) is contrasted with the more individualistic societies in which he lives and which are believed to care less about honour and shame. In the discourse, a distinction is made between backward cultures (often called 'traditional') and modern cultures. Both are seen as static. Rather surprisingly, little reference is made to the connection between the need to avenge shame on an individual level and the absence of strong central government or that individual-level revenge in the form of feuds and duels was common in European countries from the Middle Ages until the 19th century (Le Vaque-Manty 2006). Avenging shame is presented only as part of the traditions of non-European countries.

Authors have pointed out that advocating use of the cultural defence is problematic because it focuses on the rights of the defendant and fails to protect the victims and the public at large. The argument that 'his culture made him do it' does little to deter others from committing the same act or even to deter the defendant himself from repeating his offence. Nor does it assure victims and other potential victims that society is willing to protect them or to punish the defendant for the harm done by his act (Lambelet Coleman 1996: 1136).

Non-migrant women in the Netherlands are also killed by their husbands, brothers and fathers because of shame or jealousy, but these murders are never discussed in the same way as the so-called honour killings. In 1959, a Dutch man avenged his sister, according to Dutch papers, by killing a man who had slapped her in the face.⁴² Generally when a Dutch man kills his wife, sister or daughter, it is described as a crime of passion or a family tragedy. Furthermore, in the Netherlands (and Germany) honour killings are characterised as a Turkish issue, while in the UK they tend to be associated with the Pakistani commu-

nity. Honour killings were reported in Greece in the late 1960s (Safilios-Rothschild 1969), but murders among Greeks in the Netherlands were not explained from that perspective.

In the 1970s, before the term 'honour killing' was introduced, there were murders in which the perpetrator was Turkish and which took place in the relational sphere.⁴³ In some cases newspapers used the word 'honour', but not the term 'honour killing'. Some cases had characteristics which later might have been described as 'honour killing'. In 1972, a 14-year-old Turkish boy shot and killed a 36-year-old Turkish man. The boy lived with his father, mother and brothers. According to the police, the man was probably the lover of the boy's mother.⁴⁴ In 1973, the public prosecutor in a murder case said that a Turkish drama should be regarded from a Turkish perspective. A Turkish woman had killed her Turkish lover. According to the public prosecutor the Turkish husband should have killed both his wife and her lover, according to Turkish 'adat'.⁴⁵ The Turkish man was a coward, the public prosecutor was quoted as saying in a newspaper. Rather than killing his wife and her lover himself, he had provided his wife with a gun so she could kill her lover, save her honour and prove her loyalty to her husband. The whole affair was called a guest-worker drama, not an honour killing.⁴⁶ In 1975, a Turkish man fatally shot a compatriot, who he believed had raped his wife. The killer declared he had done so to save his honour as a man.⁴⁷ The public prosecutor declared this argument to be absurd and false.⁴⁸ Shortly afterwards, a 18-year-old boy fatally shot his uncle, who had knocked his mother unconscious and tried to take his younger siblings away.⁴⁹ The conflict within the family had started the previous year, when the father had gone to Turkey to find a bride for his son. He had returned with a 16-year-old girl, whom the son regarded as his wife from then on. The father had, however, started an affair with the girl. According to the public prosecutor, his wife and his son had been shamed by these events. The father had gone to Turkey with this young woman, and some time later had summoned his son to join him there. When the boy refused, his father and uncle threatened to kill him. At this point, the court called upon a lawyer from the Turkish consulate in the Netherlands who was an expert in Turkish common law. The expert explained that the family came from Eastern Turkey, where violence occurred when honour was impugned. The boy, who became the head of the family after his father's departure, was bound to protect his mother and younger siblings. The expert referred to a Turkish proverb, which said that soiled honour could only be restored by blood. The public prosecutor did not accept this defence.⁵⁰ One month later, a Turkish man shot and killed his 13-year-old daughter.⁵¹ A year later, a Turkish

woman killed a Turkish man who had followed her by car while she walked to the post office. He had tried to convince her to come with him. When she refused and he persisted, she shot him.⁵² Shortly afterwards a Turkish man shot his wife, who was planning to leave him;⁵³ a young Turkish man died after a fight for an unknown reason;⁵⁴ and a Turkish woman shot her husband dead in the street, because she suspected him of having an affair.⁵⁵

Newspapers, as rule, do not report every murder. Overall the number of murders in this period was about 1 per 100,000 people per year (Leistra & Nieuwbeerta 2003: 21). With a Turkish population of about 100,000 (or 150,000 if children born of Turkish parents in the Netherlands are also included), the percentage was slightly higher than average in the 1970s. Precise statements are difficult to make, because there is no registration according to ethnic group, and murder rates are influenced by the demographic profile of a group. The chance of becoming either a victim or a perpetrator are higher for the age group 18 to 45, and this group was larger among Turks than among the Dutch population as a whole. Newspapers in this period did not compare crime statistics of Turks and non-Turks, but detailed reporting and standard reference to the ethnic background of victims and perpetrators emphasised the idea that there was something specific about the murders that called for an explanation.

The term 'honour killing' was first used in the Netherlands in 1976 when a Turkish boy killed the man who had raped his sister (Ferwerda & Van Leiden 2005). In 1977, a Turkish man was convicted of manslaughter. He had killed another Turkish man to avenge the repeated rape of his 13-year-old daughter. The girl had given birth to a child, thus shaming the family. She would have no other future than work as a prostitute, the father declared in court.⁵⁶ In 1978, a Turkish man smashed the skull of his heavily pregnant wife with a cognac bottle. The murder followed marital problems, because the wife refused to obey the Koran, especially regarding subservience, newspapers wrote.⁵⁷ In 1979, a boy was convicted of murdering his half-sister. His motives were never revealed in court, but he did refer to family honour, which had been violated. The judge was not convinced by this cultural defence (Siesling 2006: 200). That same year, a Turkish woman and mother of four was convicted and sentenced to seven years of imprisonment for killing a distant cousin. He had raped her a few years before and spread gossip about her in the Turkish community. The public prosecutor demanded a severe sentence, precisely because he did see this as honour killing and wanted to deter those with similar plans.⁵⁸ A few days later, two Turkish brothers killed their brother-in-law because he

maltreated their sister, his wife. According to the newspapers this was an honour killing.⁵⁹ A public prosecutor declared that cases of honour killings were likely to increase in the Netherlands. He based this statement, according to Dutch newspapers, on a Dutch academic study by A.H. Nauta. Nauta was of the opinion that the recent killings were the tip of the iceberg.⁶⁰ The study related to Turkey, but was used to explain murders in the Netherlands.

In 1985, there was a murder during a wedding party whereby reference was made to shame and honour. In all of these cases the perpetrators were Turkish. All murders received a lot of publicity. A strong association developed between the phenomenon and migrants from Islamic countries. In 1999, a Turkish woman was killed by her husband, in the presence of her children. The husband suspected her of adultery. The attorney asked that his client be charged with manslaughter, rather than with premeditated murder, because of his cultural background. The judge called the case revolting, particularly because the defendant showed no remorse. Rather than reducing his punishment on cultural grounds, the judge decided to increase the sentence in order to set an example to Dutch society and the Turkish community within it (Siesling 2006: 202). Two other cases followed. In 2003, a Turkish girl was shot by her father, and in 2004, a woman of Turkish origin was killed by her husband. She had fled to a shelter but her husband had managed to find her. The judges did not consider these cases honour killings, but in public and political debates the murders were presented as such, and demonstrations were held and political measures were called for, although it is not clear what the measures should be.

Overall over the past three decades, six court cases were heard in which honour killings played a role. In one case (1999) that fact led the judge to increase the sentence by five additional years. In two cases (2003 and 2004), the judge did view the cases as honour killings. In the three early cases (1976, 1979 and 1985) it is not clear whether the mention of honour had any influence on the outcome of the trial, positive or negative. However, repeated use of the term in the press and parliamentary debates and the intense public attention that all cases received created the impression that honour killings occurred frequently within the Dutch-Turkish community.

It is unclear how many cases of honour killings or honour-related violence there have been in the Netherlands. The same is true for other countries (Kurkiala 2003). There are two reasons for this. In the first place, the term is used to cover a wide array of 'crimes'. There is no registration of honour-related violence by the police, social services or women's shelters. Neither is there consensus about what constitutes honour-

related violence. Secondly, there is no clarity about numbers because judges may use the term honour-related violence, when the perpetrator or attorney does not. Or a perpetrator or attorney may use the term, but the judge may not acknowledge it. The media frequently refer to crimes as 'honour-related' when neither the perpetrator and attorney nor the judge does so. The result is a gross overestimation of numbers.

The subject of honour killings is very much part of recent Dutch public debates. Stories and studies about honour killings only briefly acknowledge that it is unclear how many honour killings actually take place. Reports use vague quantifiers, such as 'many', 'often' and 'frequent', to emphasise that they are common, and they include detailed descriptions of older cases from other countries (mostly Germany). That obscures the fact that these acts did not take place in the Netherlands or that they occurred years ago. The definition of what is an honour killing is currently stretched beyond useful. Honour killings are redefined as honour-related violence, or the physical or physiological violence that stems from a collective mentality and which is a response to (the risk of) the violation of the honour of women, of which the outside world has knowledge or is likely to acquire knowledge. Some researchers stretch the definition so that it includes murder, and also domestic violence, verbal threats, abductions, (extreme) control of men over the mobility of women or girls, forced or arranged marriages, and women being forced into a traditional women's role. Suicides by women and girls are sometimes described as honour-related violence, because the women and girls are believed to have been pushed into suicide by male family members (Bakker 2003).

In 2007, 107 Imams in Turkish mosques in the Netherlands spoke out against honour killings. Their collective stance received wide media coverage. Honour killings are discussed frequently by the media and in parliament. In recent years, numerous books have appeared in the Netherlands about honour killings (Van Eck 2001; Hilterman 2001; Simsek 2006; Van der Zee 2006; Ermers 2007; Özer 2007; Vreeswijk 2008). The press currently labels any violent crime involving men or women of Turkish origin as honour-related. When, in August 2009, a woman who worked at a day-care centre in Amsterdam was murdered, all newspapers wrote about it as an honour killing.⁶¹ The only reason it was classified as such was that she was of Turkish origin as was the perpetrator.

Conclusion

This chapter described, on the basis of an analysis of immigrant organisation archives, parliamentary debates and newspaper articles, three parallel and interwoven issues: changing ideas about multiculturalism, campaigns against dependent resident status and honour killings. Multicultural policy was initially shaped by assumptions about the temporariness of guest-worker migration. Underlying ideas were acceptable because of ideas about living apart together, which had characterised Dutch society until the 1960s. Some groups were targeted by multicultural policy more than other groups. As a result, these groups were more strongly subjected to processes of othering. The most disadvantaged groups could profit more from their supposed victimisation via subsidies in the short run, but they found it difficult to shed that victimhood identity in the long run. Subsidies shaped how migrants presented themselves as communities, led to quests for authenticity, emphasised differences between migrants and non-migrants, and stimulated organisation on the basis of ethnicity. The portrayal of migrant or minority women – especially lower-class, Muslim women – was important in securing and continuing government subsidies. Reduction of subsidies for organisations that did not specifically target women made the Turkish *HTKB* the target of a hostile take-over, which signalled its end, and drove other organisations to push women's issues even more to the foreground. Gender was crucial to how multicultural policy worked out. Fossilisation of ideas and of initiatives – symbolised by the endless subsidies for swimming and cycling lessons for Turkish women, which came to be ridiculed by the radical right – fed the opposition to multiculturalism. Because multiculturalism and racism are both based on essentialist ideas, the shift from one to the other is not surprising. The campaigns against dependent resident status, like multicultural policy, endlessly emphasised victimhood, difference and backwardness of Turks and Turkish society. In addition, intense attention to so-called 'honour killings', in the first place, created the idea that they were very common among Turks, and secondly that honour killings were something very different than Dutch family dramas or crimes of passion. This solidified the othering and static ideas about culture that had resulted from multicultural policies and the campaigns against dependent residence status.

The radical right could easily appropriate gender equality, because of the essentialist assumptions underlying multicultural policy and rhetoric that for decades had constructed migrants or minorities as collectivist, authoritarian, patriarchal and honour-bound (compare Akkerman

& Hagelund 2007; Roggeband & Verloo 2007). The radical right did not have to prove that immigrant women – especially Muslim women – were oppressed. This had, after all, been the justification for decades of Dutch government subsidies and intervention.

This chapter showed that the purpose of the problematisation of what were seen as Turkish issues in the Netherlands shifted over time. Initially the aim was to generate support for the Turkish migrants. Othering was the outcome. This othering later served to substantiate claims that there were unsolvable problems, and this fed into anti-immigrant and racist discourse. This chapter showed how labelling moved from one discourse to another. Multiculturalism, dependent resident status and honour killings were nodal points in the debates. These points, on which discussions focused, were connected to one other in mutually reinforcing debates.

Notes

- 1 The chapter is part of my NWO Vici project (277-53-002).
- 2 My student assistant Daan Loeff helped me to collect the newspaper articles. I thank him for his work.
- 3 International Institute for Social History (Amsterdam), Archive Hollanda Türkiyeli Kadınlar Birliği 1974-1995 10815458_EAD. The archival research was done in part by my master's student Jerney Robert, whom I thank here for her work.
- 4 Proceedings Lower House, session 2003-2004, 28 689, nos. 8-9 Onderzoek integratiebeleid (*Eindverslag van de commissie Blok*).
- 5 Proceedings Lower House, session 2003-2004, 28 689, no. 12, p. 137.
- 6 Proceedings Lower House, session 2003-2004, 28 689, no. 12: Onderzoek Integratiebeleid, Onderzoeksrapport, Aanvullend bronnenonderzoek Verwey-Jonker Instituut, 79.
- 7 Internationaal Institute Social History (Amsterdam) Archive: Hollanda Türkiyeli Kadınlar Birliği 1974-1995 10815458 EAD.
- 8 Hollanda Türkiyeli İşçiler Birliği.
- 9 The same relationship between non-migrant and migrant women's organisations has been found in other countries (Scuzzarello 2008: 16).
- 10 Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Leiden, Nijmegen, The Hague, and Utrecht and a more or less independent branch in Eindhoven (Eindhoven Türkiyeli Kadınlar Birliği).
- 11 VEM stands for *Vrouwen en Minderhedenbeleid* (Women and Minority Policy).
- 12 Proceedings Lower House, session 2003-2004, 28 689, no. 12, p. 184.
- 13 IISG, НТКВ, map 241, Stukken betreffende congres Buitenlandse Vrouwen, notulen werkgroep Buitenlandse Vrouwen, 27-09-1981. IISG, НТКВ, folio 242, Stukken betreffende het Congres van Buitenlandse Vrouwen in Nederland. 1980, notulen van discussiegroep Nederlandse vrouwen.
- 14 *De Volkskrant*, 21 April 1995, p. 6.
- 15 Proceedings Lower House, session 2003-2004, 28 689, no. 12, p. 253.

- 16 NRC, 24 September 1980, p. 3.
- 17 *De Volkskrant*, 7 June 1983.
- 18 *Trouw*, 24 September 1980, p. 10.
- 19 *Het Vrije Volk*, 24 April 1982.
- 20 *Trouw*, 24 September 1980, p. 10; NRC, 24 September 1980, p. 3.
- 21 *Trouw*, 10 March 1980, p. 9; *Het Parool*, 13 August 1981.
- 22 *De Volkskrant*, 17 September 1981, p. 7.
- 23 Proceedings Lower House, session 1981, appendix, p. 573.
- 24 See, e.g., *Het Vrije Volk*, 21 May 1982, *Het Parool*, 21 May 1982, NRC, 21 May 1982.
- 25 *Het Parool*, 12 July 1982.
- 26 Proceedings Lower House, session 1980-1981, 16102, no. 9, pp. 1-6.
- 27 *Trouw*, 10 March 1981, p. 9.
- 28 NRC, 10 March 1981, p. 3.
- 29 Proceedings Lower House, session 1980-1981, 16102, no. 9, pp. 1-6.
- 30 *Algemeen Dagblad*, 9 June 1982.
- 31 *Het Vaderland*, 18 August 1972, p. 1, *Trouw*, 18 August 1972, p. 1.
- 32 NRC, 11 August 1972, p. 12.
- 33 *Het Vaderland*, 11 August 1972.
- 34 *De Telegraaf*, 12 August 1972, p. 1.
- 35 *Het Vrije Volk*, 10 August 1972, p. 1; *Het Vaderland*, 11 August 1972, p. 6.
- 36 NRC, 10 August 1972, p. 2.
- 37 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 14 August 1972, p. 19; *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 14 August 1972, p. 2.
- 38 *De Groene Amsterdammer*, 15-22 August 1972, p. 2.
- 39 *De Telegraaf*, 16 August 1972, p. 5.
- 40 *The Times*, 12 August 1972; articles in Turkish papers were quoted in *Het Vaderland* 15 August 1972, p. 5.
- 41 *Het Vaderland*, 12 August 1972, p. 3.
- 42 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 18 August 1959.
- 43 *Zierikzeesche Nieuwsbode*, 16 April 1964, p. 5; *Het Parool*, 4 June 1969, p. 1; *Vrije Volk*, 4 June 1969, p. 1; *Zierikzeesche Nieuwsbode*, 5 June 1969, p. 7; *Zierikzeesche Nieuwsbode*, 12 November 1979, p. 2; *Zierikzeesche Nieuwsbode* 8 June 1972, p. 7; *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 28 June 1972, p. 2; *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 27 July 1972, p. 5; *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 28 November 1972, p. 1; *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 7 February 1973, p. 3; *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 27 February 1973, p. 3; *Leidse Courant*, 25 October 1975.
- 44 *Leidse Courant*, 25 October 1972; *Zierikzeesche Nieuwsbode*, 26 October 1972.
- 45 *Adat* is a Malayan word for tradition and was used in the Dutch East Indies as the word for traditional law. The Dutch were familiar with the word. The Turkish equivalent is *adet*.
- 46 *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 29 August 1973, p. 3.
- 47 *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 21 May 1975, p. 3.
- 48 *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 3 June 1975, p. 1.
- 49 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 28 July 1975; *Parool*, 28 July 1975, p. 1.
- 50 *Parool*, 1 November 1975, p. 4.
- 51 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 26 August 1975.

- 52 *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 17 November 1976, p. 3.
 53 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 28 February 1977.
 54 *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 14 March 1977, p. 11.
 55 *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 16 December 1977, p. 17.
 56 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 17 November 1977.
 57 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 11 July 1978; *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 11 July 1978, p. 7.
 58 *Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*, 6 April 1979, p. 3.
 59 *De Telegraaf*, 17 April 1979, p. 3.
 60 *Leeuwarder Courant*, 17 August 1979.
 61 *Algemeen Dagblad*, 12 August 2009.

References

- Akkerman, T. & A. Hagelund (2007), "Women and children first!" Anti-immigration parties and gender in Norway and the Netherlands, *Patterns of Prejudice* 41 (2): 197-214.
- Bakker, H. (2003), *Eerwraak in Nederland: Een quickscan van de stand van zaken* Utrecht: TransAct.
- Betts, A. (2006), *Conceptualising interconnections in global governance: The case of refugee protection*, Oxford: RSC Working Paper 38.
- Bhabha, F. (2009), 'Between exclusion and assimilation: Experimentalizing multiculturalism', *McGill Law Journal* 54: 45-90.
- Bilgin, S., A. Kouwenhoven, R. Latumahina & J. Westhoek (1988), *Met één hand kan je niet klappen: Een onderzoek naar organisaties van vrouwen uit etnische minderheidsgroepen in Nederland*. Utrecht & Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, Centrum door Onderzoek Maatschappelijke Tegenstellingen.
- Bonjour, S. (2008), 'Ambtelijke onmin rond gezinnen van gastarbeiders: Beleidsvorming inzake gezinsmigratie in Nederland, 1955-1970', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis* 5 (1): 101-127.
- Chotkowski, M.B. (2000), "Baby's kunnen we niet huisvesten, moeder en kind willen we niet scheiden": De rekrutering door Nederland van vrouwelijke arbeidskrachten uit Joegoslavië, 1966-1979', *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis* 26 (1): 76-103.
- Cillia, R. de, M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (1999), 'The discursive construction of national identities', *Discourse & Society* 10: 149-173.
- Côté, A., M. Kérisit & M. Côté (2001), *Sponsorship ... for better or for worse: The impact of sponsorship on the equality rights of immigrant women*. Ottawa: Status of Women Canada.
- Dijk, T.A. van (1992), 'Discourse and the denial of racism', *Discourse & Society* 3: 87-118.
- Dijk, T.A. van (1989), 'Race, riots and the press: An analysis of editorials in the British press about the 1985 disorders', *Gazette* 43: 229-253.
- Dijk, T.A. van (1988), 'The Tamil panic in the press', in T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *News analysis: Case studies of international and national news in the press*, pp. 215-254. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Dijk, T.A. van (1983), *Minderheden in de media: Een analyse van de berichtgeving over etnische minderheden in de dagbladers*. Amsterdam: Socialistische Uitgeverij Amsterdam.
- Doezema, J. (2001), 'Ouch! Western feminists' "wounded attachment" to the "third world prostitute". *Feminist Review* 67 (Spring): 16-38.
- Eck, C. van (2001), 'Door bloed gezuiverd: Eerwraak bij Turken in Nederland'. PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Entman, R.M. (1996), 'Reporting environmental policy debate: The real media biases', *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 1 (3): 77-92.
- Ermers, R. (2007), *Eer en eerwraak: Definitie en analyse*. Amsterdam: Bulaaq.
- Ferwerda, H.B. & I. van Leiden (2005), *Eerwraak of eerge relateerd geweld? Naar een werkdefinitie*. The Hague: Ministry of Justice.
- Foucault, M. (1984), 'Polemics, politics and problematisations: An interview with Michel Foucault', in P. Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*, pp. 381-390. London: Pantheon Books.
- Gorp, B. van (2005), 'Where is the frame? Victims and intruders in the Belgian press coverage of the asylum issue', *European Journal of Communication* 20 (4): 485-508.
- Hilterman, K. (2001), *Eerwraak*. Houten: Van Holkema & Warendorf.
- Hoving, I., H. Dibbits & M. Schrover (eds) (2005), *Veranderingen van het alledaagse. Cultuur en migratie in Nederland*. Den Haag: SDU.
- Korteweg, A. & G. Yurdakul (2009), 'Islam, gender, and immigrant integration: Boundary drawing in discourses on honour killing in the Netherlands and Germany', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*: 32 (2): 218-238.
- Kurkiala, M. (2003), 'Interpreting honour killings: The story of Fadime Sahindal (1975-2002) in the Swedish press', *Anthropology Today* 19 (1) (February): 6-7.
- Laclau, E. & C. Mouffe (1985), *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London: Verso.
- Lambelet Coleman, D. (1996), 'Individualizing justice through multiculturalism: The liberals' dilemma', *Columbia Law Review* 96 (5) (June): 1093-1167.
- Leistra, G. & P. Nieuwbeerta (2003), *Moord en doodslag in Nederland (1992-2001)*. Amsterdam: Prometheus.
- Le Vaque-Manty, M. (2006), 'Dueling for equality: Masculine honor and the modern politics of dignity', *Political Theory* 34 (6): 715-740.
- Lutz, H. (1997), 'The limits of European-ness: Immigrant women in fortress Europe', *Feminist Review* 57, *Citizenship: Pushing the Boundaries* (Autumn): 93-111.
- Matthes, J. & M. Kohring (2008), 'The content analysis of media frames: Toward improving reliability and validity', *Journal of Communication* 58: 258-279.
- McKerl, M. (2007), 'Multiculturalism, gender and violence', *Culture and Religion* 8 (2): 187-217.
- Obdeijn, H., & M. Schrover (2008), *Komen en gaan: Immigratie en emigratie in Nederland vanaf 1550*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Okin, S. Moller (1999), 'Is multiculturalism bad for women?', in J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (eds), *Is multiculturalism bad for women?* pp. 9-24. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Onderwater, P. (2008), 'Wij zijn geen "zielige vrouwtjes"! Een onderzoek naar de houding van de Turkse vrouwenbeweging in Nederland ten opzichte van het sekse-debat tussen 1970-2008'. Master's thesis, Utrecht University.

- Özer, N. (2007), *Hatice: Een Turks drama*. Amsterdam: Bulaaq.
- Penninx, R. & M. Schrover (2001), *Bastion of bindmiddel: Organisaties van immigranten in historisch perspectief*. Amsterdam: Institute for Migration & Ethnic Studies.
- Prins, B. (2002), 'The nerve to break taboos: New realism in the Dutch discourse on multiculturalism', *JLMI/RLMI* 3 (3 & 4): 363-379.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997), *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Rijkschroeff, R., J.W. Duyvendak & T. Pels (2003), *Bronnenonderzoek integratiebeleid*. Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker Instituut.
- Robert, J. (2009), 'De opkomst en ondergang van Hollanda Türkiyeli Kadınlar Birliği (Turkse vrouwenvereniging in Nederland) 1974-1995: Ruim dertig jaar strijd om mondigheid! Waar ging het mis?' Master's thesis, Leiden University.
- Roggeband, C. & M. Verloo (2007), 'Dutch women are liberated, migrant women are a problem: The evolution of policy frames on gender and migration in the Netherlands, 1995-2005', *Social Policy & Administration* 41 (3) (June): 271-288.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C. (1969), "'Honour" crimes in contemporary Greece', *The British Journal of Sociology* 20 (2) (June): 205-218.
- Scheufele, D.A. (1999), 'Framing as a theory of media effects', *Journal of Communication* 49 (1): 103-122.
- Scholten, P. (2007), *Constructing immigrant policies, research-policy relations and immigrant integration in the Netherlands (1970-2004)*. Arnhem: University of Twente.
- Schrover, M. (2011), *Om de meisjes, voor de meisjes: Een historisch perspectief op problematisering en bagatellisering van onderwerpen die te maken hebben met migratie en integratie*. Leiden: Leiden University.
- Schrover, M. (2010a), 'Why make a difference? Migration policy and making differences between migrant men and women (the Netherlands 1945-2005)', in M. Schrover & E.J. Yeo (eds), *Gender, migration and the public sphere, 1850-2005*, pp. 76-96. New York: Routledge.
- Schrover, M. (2010b), 'Pillarization, multiculturalism and cultural freezing, Dutch migration history and the enforcement of essentialist ideas', *BMGN/LCHR* 125 (2/3): 329-354.
- Schrover, M. (2009a), 'Differences that make all the difference: Gender, migration and vulnerability', in M. Orly, G. Brunet, V. Barusse De Luca, & D. Gauvreau (eds), *A Female demography: Migration, work, fertility, family*, pp. 143-168. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Schrover, M. (2009b), 'Family in Dutch migration policy 1945-2005', *The History of the Family* 14: 191-202.
- Schrover, M. & E.J. Yeo (2010), 'Introduction: Moving the focus to the public sphere', in M. Schrover, & E.J. Yeo (eds), *Gender, migration and the public sphere in interdisciplinary perspective 1850-2005*, pp. 1-13. New York: Routledge.
- Siesling, M. (2006), *Multiculturaliteit en verdediging in strafzaken: Een onderzoek naar de manieren waarop in het Nederlandse strafrecht ruimte wordt gevonden voor het verwerken van de culturele achtergrond van de verdachte*. Utrecht: Boom.

- Simsek, J. (2006), *Alle ogen op haar gericht, eerwraak: Traditioneel geweld tegen Turkse vrouwen en meisjes: een handleiding voor hulpverleners*. Utrecht: Inspraakorgaan Turken in Nederland (IOT).
- Snouck Hurgronje, C. (1916), *Mohammedanism: Lectures on its origin, its religious and political growth, and its present state*. Leiden: Project Gutenberg.
- Sterett, S. (1997), 'Domestic violence and immigration in Britain', *Polar* 20 (2): 63-69.
- Scuzzarello, S. (2008), 'National security versus moral responsibility: an analysis of integration programs in Malmö, Sweden', *Social Politics* 15 (1): 5-31.
- Tinnemans, W. (1994), *Een gouden armband: Een geschiedenis van Mediterrane immigranten in Nederland (1945-1994)*. Utrecht: Nederlands Centrum Buitenlanders.
- Volpp, L. (2001), 'Feminism versus multiculturalism', *Columbia Law Review* 101: 1181-1218.
- Volpp, L. (1996), 'Talking "culture": Gender, race, nation, and the politics of multiculturalism', *Columbia Law Review* 96: 1573-1617.
- Vreeswijk, H. (2008), *Eerwraak*. Antwerpen: Manteau.
- Wentholt, R. (1967), *Buitenlandse gastarbeiders in Nederland*. Leiden: Spruyt.
- Zee, R. van der (2006), *Eerwraak in Nederland*. Antwerpen/Amsterdam: Houtekiet.