

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/21049> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Laarman, Charlotte

Title: Oude onbekenden : het politieke en publieke debat over postkoloniale migranten, 1945-2005

Issue Date: 2013-06-27

English summary

Postcolonial migrants form the largest migrant groups in the Netherlands in the period 1945-2000. The leading question of this study was by whom, when and why discursive strategies were used in political and public debates on the inclusion or exclusion of postcolonial migrants. Which factors influenced the use of these strategies? I analyzed approximately 7,000 newspaper articles (mostly non-digitalized), as well as political debates, television broadcasts and novels.

Decolonization of the Dutch East Indies (present-day Indonesia) in 1949 led to migrations of *Indische* Dutch and Moluccans. The largest numbers arrived in the Netherlands in the 1960s. The decolonization of Surinam in 1974 led to the migration of Afro-Surinamese and Hindustani migrants. Their numbers declined from the 1980s onwards. More recent were the migrations from the Dutch Antilles. Decolonization was not the reason for their migration since the Antilles are still part of the Dutch Kingdom. This study did not centre on the policies (others have written about that), but on the political and public debates that preceded or justified policies.

In analyzed the metaphors, arguments, terminology and words that were used in these debates, to see how these postcolonial migrant groups were perceived in the Netherlands. Were they seen as 'the other' or 'one of us'? Or both? The discursive elements that were used, partly reproduced the colonial discourse. This influenced the government policies that were formulated. The actors that participated in the debates differed per group and period. Postcolonial migrant groups are interesting because there were discussions about their juridical and their discursive citizenship. Analyses of these discussions showed that not only juridical citizenship is pivotal to admittance, but that discursive citizenship is equally, if not more, important. A second reason to study these groups is that they make it possible to look at premigratory influences on admittance, integration and policy making.

This study introduced three hypotheses. First of all, colonial perceptions traveled to the Netherlands with the migrants. Secondly, the fact that these migrants came from former colonies did not only have advantages (e.g. citizenship), but also great disadvantages in admittance and integration processes. I call this the bonus-malus paradox. Lastly, debates on postcolonial juridical and discursive citizenship were indications of where boundaries between ethnic groups were drawn and by whom and why.

In political and public debates actors make strategic choices – consciously or subconsciously – between the different rhetoric resources available to them to justify the change or continuation of government policies. The different actors have a certain amount of 'discursive space', which is the number and variety of discourses that

they can choose from, as is the credibility and familiarity. There is a link between the discursive space actors have and create, and the space there is for the justification of government policy. This discursive space was influenced by preconceived notions of the actors about these groups. Postcolonial migrants were interesting, because what receiving society knew about these groups at arrival was much not only larger but also more diverse than about other migrant groups: postcolonial migrants were no strangers, but at the same time they were the colonial 'other'. This research showed that discursive strategies that originated in the colonial context were reproduced in the postcolonial, postmigratory context. The discourse could be for the same as in the colonial context, but could also be transferred to another group. The *traveling* of discourses could occur between places, periods, and groups. The idea of the reproduction of colonial discourses departs from the fact that although decolonization and migration to the Netherlands were key moments in history, the discourses about the colonial other were entrenched in the way they were perceived. Migration and decolonization did not change that discourse overnight. The functionality of these rhetorics and images did change, due to the changes in the political, social and economic national and international context.

There are five factors that influence the use of certain discourses. These five factors limit or define the discursive space of the actors. There are endless numbers of discourses, but not all are as plausible and convincing.

- 1 The discursive space is limited by knowledge or familiarity. There must be a certain amount of knowledge among the audience to make an argument or metaphor useful and effective. This knowledge was not the same for migrants from the Dutch East Indies, Surinam or the Dutch Antilles. As a consequence, different discursive strategies were used for these groups. Knowledge is not a static but can be enhanced, for instance at moments of conflicts. It could also change under the influence of events and changes outside the Netherlands. The discussions on slavery in the United States fired discussions on slavery in former Dutch colonies and Dutch responsibility for the descendants of slaves. Imperialist nostalgia played a role in discourses, as did shame for atrocities in the colonial past. The colonial past in the Dutch East Indies had more stature and the trauma of losing this colony was much greater than the loss of the West Indies. This influenced the differences between groups of post-colonial migrants in discursive space.
- 2 The discursive space is linked to the space for the justification of government policy. The discourses served a goal, namely implicit or explicit justification of (changes of) the government policies on the admittance and integration of postcolonial migrants. This is not the same for all groups and periods.
- 3 Urgency and competition with other subjects and the possibility for issue linkage. Issue linkage occurred when the admittance of migrants was linked with another problem in receiving society as housing shortages or high unemployment rates. This way migration is made a threat: 'admittance of large number of migrants will increase unemployment'.
- 4 The possibility to use debt and moral obligation of receiving society towards migrants in debates. One thing that sets postcolonial migrants apart from other mi-

grant groups is the shared past that goes back for centuries. 'They are here because we were there', as is the common phrase. This could strengthen the argument that migrant groups must be admitted or helped on moral grounds as a consequence of feelings of guilt for atrocities committed in the colonial past or biological kinship.

- 5 The composition, characteristics and size of the migrant group. A small group can be ignored, a large cannot. One of the characteristics is *passing*: who can pass for Dutch and who can pass for white? The composition of the group determines the success of an active lobby. The extent of the lobby depends on the size of the group that was already in the Netherlands and their education. A large group of well-educated people can actively manipulate and play the media and politicians. Furthermore, the legal status of the group and the situation in their homeland is an important factor: is there a possibility for a safe return to the country they came from? Lastly, the homogeneity of the group: a homogeneous group is better able to lobby actively and effectively.

The preconceived notions about the migrant group in receiving society were important in the use of discursive strategies. This could result in both a postcolonial bonus and malus. The bonus for postcolonial migrant groups was that they were already acquainted to the culture, language and religion of the receiving society, i.e. the former colonizers, and the Dutch nationality that the majority held. Moreover, the Dutch government felt that it was morally obliged to care and support postcolonial migrants as a consequence of pride or shame over the colonial past. What is more, in the Netherlands, the attention in debates on migration and integration has been mostly on the 'problems' of Muslim migrants. Postcolonial migrants were mostly Christians. This was an advantage to some postcolonial migrants at some times. However, the fact that discourses could travel across time and space, made that a postcolonial migrant could also suffer from disadvantages. Firstly, underplaying problems as a consequence of inclusion of these migrant groups could lead to the fact that there was no policy formulated, nor support (financially or otherwise). This postcolonial bonus could backlash and become a postcolonial malus. Secondly, discourses on the indigenous populations or slaves in the colonial context were mostly meant to exclude them from full citizenship and power, although it could also include them into the Dutch community to maintain their loyalty. In the colony, being white and male was constructed as superior and in power, being black was constructed as inferior. These latent notions about black and white did not change because of decolonization and migration. It had also consequences on the debates on the inclusion and exclusion of postcolonial migrants in the postcolonial context. As the colonial images and discourses repeatedly manifested in newspaper article, novels and political debates in colonial times, they became deeply rooted in Dutch thinking of the colonial 'other'. This postcolonial paradox was also apparent in discussions on the legal or discursive citizenship on these migrant groups.