Social Subjecthood? The inclusion of (post)colonial migrants in Dutch, French, and British welfare states, 1945-1970

Wolff, E.A.

Citation

Wolff, E. A. (2024, June 18). *Social Subjecthood?: The inclusion of (post)colonial migrants in Dutch, French, and British welfare states, 1945-1970*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3763857

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3763857

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

3. Methodology and inference

3.1. Logic of inquiry

3.1.1. Qualitative case studies

My project explores the social inclusion of (post)colonial migrants in order to join the conversation in welfare state scholarship about the theoretical relationship(s) between welfare, race, nation-building, solidarity, and culture. It is therefore comfortably situated in the broad field of sociohistorical research; that is, "historical investigation informed by social scientific perspectives."[1] In this chapter, I justify the methodological choices I made with considerable transparency, as qualitative researchers across traditions generally agree on the importance of openly sharing how evidence was collected and analysed.[2]

Qualitative researchers treat the gap between the reality of the social world and the concepts deployed to make sense of it[3] as fertile ground for analysis. For example, Anderson's conclusions regarding the value-laden character of national communities were drawn through careful study of the historical deployment and construction of terms like 'skilled worker,' 'national labour market,' and even 'citizen.'[4] Equally, Cooper argues that British colonial administrators exploited the ambiguity of the word 'development,' which doubled as a reference both to an increase in productive output *and* an improvement in the welfare of colonial citizens, in order to disguise the tenuous relationship between the two.[5] In my case, the instability across time and space of key historical terms, like *repatriate* and *refugee,* underscored the benefits of exploring the conceptual terrain in depth and expanding the types of observations that could be admitted as evidence. This was particularly useful in the descriptive phase, as it was unclear what kind of data existed until I had the chance to visit the archives.

Within the qualitative research tradition, case studies are common. A case is a specific, spatially and temporally delimited context or phenomenon.[6] My project combines synchronic (variation at a single point in time) and diachronic (variation in a single case over time) analysis, and thereby falls within the tradition of comparative-historical analysis, or CHA.[7] CHA has a long pedigree: the first generation of CHA scholars included some of the founding figures of

1 Michael R Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, Qualitative Research Methods Series 31 (Newbury Park, London and New Delhi: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1993), 3.
2 Alan M Jacobs et al., "The Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: Insights and Implications," *Perspectives on Politics* 19, no 1 (March 2021): 184, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001164.
3 This idea comes from (post-)structuralist theory, according to which language is a system of interdependent signs whose relationship to reality is variable and uncertain. For the structuralist thinker, concepts offer clues about individual and collective understanding, but they do not seamlessly transmit an underlying truth. Derrida, "Modern Criticism and Theory; a Reader."
4 Anderson, *Us and Them?*
5 Cooper, *Decolonization and African Society: The Labor Question in French and British Africa*, 206.
6 John Gerring, *Case Study Research* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 19.
7 John Gerring, "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good For?," *American Political Science Review* 98, no 2 (May 2004): 27, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404001182.

the social sciences more broadly, from Alexis de Tocqueville to Karl Marx and Max Weber.[8] After the Second World War, CHA experienced a revival as complex sociopolitical processes such as the civil rights movement, the Cold War and economic modernisation prompted renewed attention to larger scale causal analysis with longer time horizons.[9] CHA allowed me to develop theory at the midrange, which, according to Baldwin, is the only level at which a "satisfactory approach to the welfare state is possible."[10] Further advantages of CHA came from my commitment to historical-interpretivism.

3.1.2. Historical interpretivism

Ontology refers to assumptions about the nature of the social world and, specifically, the operations of cause and effect within it.[11] It concerns what things are made of, and always has implications on *how knowledge of those things ought to be generated* - i.e. epistemology.[12] A central point of ontological contention in the social sciences concerns whether events in the social world are governed by mechanistic, law-like regularity, or whether they stem from meaning-making practices and emerge in a contingent manner. Karl Popper's comparison between a cloud and a clock is illustrative. In Popperian terms, systems can exhibit either the properties of a clock – "regular, orderly and highly predictable" or of a cloud - "highly irregular, disorderly, and more or less unpredictable."[13] I share the belief in a cloud-like world with interpretive scholars and historians, whose distinctive contributions I merge into a single paradigm that I call historical-interpretivism, which comes with distinct epistemological consequences.

In the 1950s, the belief in clock-like regularity of the social world grew in dominance after the influence of the logical positivists, a group of philosophers who developed tools for systematically verifying empirical claims.[14] For today's neopositivists, "all clouds are clocks - even the most cloudy of clouds."[15] The gold standard in this research tradition involves isolating a single causal factor by keeping all other variables constant, something experimental and statistical methods accomplish by exposing one of two equivalent groups to a stimulus (or mathematically manipulating the same).[16] Comparative approaches are attractive to the neopositivist because a single case study is considered unlikely to exhibit sufficient variation for

8 Marcus Kreuzer, "Varieties of Time in Comparative Historical Analysis," in *The Oxford Handbook of Time and Politics*, ed Klaus H Goetz (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).

9 Matthew Lange, *Comparative-Historical Methods* (SAGE Publications Ltd., 2012).

10 Baldwin, *The Politics of Social Solidarity: Class Bases of the European Welfare State 1875-1975*, 39.

11 Hall, "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research," 376.

12 Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics*, 73.

13 Karl R Popper, "Of Clouds and Clocks" (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 207.

14 Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics*, 50 Dvora Yanow, "Interpretation in Policy Analysis: On Methods and Practice.," *Critical Policy Analysis* 1, no 1 (2007): 112.

15 Popper, "Of Clouds and Clocks," 222.

16 Arend Lijphart, "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method," *The American Political Science Review* 65, no 3 (September 1971): 683.

a researcher to observe regular empirical association of two variables.[17] Comparative case studies approximate the experiment when cases are carefully selected based on attributes of interest, like J.S. Mill proposed.[18] If neopositivism reserves a privileged place for comparison, however, it downplays the importance of history. In a clock-like world, the past is not substantively different from the present, but is instead, "quite simply, the time before the present."[19] Studying the past has value mainly because it increases the number of observations of a given study.[20] Context, idiosyncrasy or peculiarities distract from, rather than illuminate, the underlying covering laws.

Historical-interpretivism, meanwhile, rejects any regular association between two isolated variables. It borrows from the interpretivist scholar the assumption that objects acquire properties as they are experienced and made sense of by subjects in a process of individual and collective meaning-making.[21] Unlike natural laws (like gravity), cause and effect in the social world are mediated by reflexive agents. Humans do not mechanically respond to stimuli. Instead, we understand stimuli, interpret their relevance, and react to our interpretation.[22] Any causal mechanism is "parasitic" on human beliefs and practices - if, "at any point, the mechanism [finds] it has lost its necessary support… in the relevant subjects," it loses its causal power.[23] In this way, Du Bois criticises his contemporaries who blame impersonal economic forces, like the development of manufacturing in the North or agrarian feudalism in the South, for the abolition of slavery.[24] Du Bois argues that in a "sweeping mechanistic interpretation" like this, "there is no room for the *real plot of the story*, for the clear mistake and guilt… for the triumph of sheer moral courage and sacrifice… for the hurt and struggle of degraded black millions in their fight for freedom."[25]

In this view, social reality is not reducible to meaning-making, but cannot be explained without it.[26] Additionally, it takes from the historian's ontological toolkit[27] the notion that the past is "not just prior to the present but also different from it."[28] As the novelist L.P. Hartley quipped, "the past is a foreign country, they do things differently there."[29] Time is

17 Derek Beach and Rasmus Brun Pedersen, *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2013).
18 Gary King, Robert O Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994).
19 Zachary Sayre Schiffman, *The Birth of the Past* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 2.
20 Kreuzer, "Varieties of Time in Comparative Historical Analysis," 9.
21 Yanow, "Interpretation in Policy Analysis: On Methods and Practice.," 110.
22 Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests and Identities*, 15.
23 Jason Glynos and David Howarth, *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Science* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 97.
24 W.E.B Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction in America: An Essay Toward the History of the Part Which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1880* (1935; repr., Frank Cass & Co Ltd., 1966).
25 Du Bois, 714.
26 Glynos and Howarth, *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Science*, 13.
27 Of course, the ontologies of a discipline as vast as history do vary; see Herman Paul and Ethan Kleinberg, "Are Historians Ontological Realists? An Exchange," *Rethinking History* 22, no 4 (October 2, 2018): 546–57, https://doi.org/10.1080/13642529.2018.1530820 for an overview of ontological disagreements within the historical field.
28 Schiffman, *The Birth of the Past*, 2.
29 cited in Fraser, *Evolution of the British Welfare State*, 3.

fateful: every action "leaves a historical residue" by changing, no matter how subtly, the context in which it happened and remaining in the memory of those it affects.[30] *When* something happens thus has profound effects on *how* it happens, as well as the magnitude or character of its consequences. For example, the consequences of an action as mundane as failing to nod to a colleague in the hallway will be more severe, for instance, if it followed a set of disparaging or encouraging comments about that person's research in a department meeting.[31] Cause and effect are necessarily context-specific.

A historical-interpretivist ontology has several epistemological implications. First, unravelling local meanings and motivations becomes central to grasping reality.[32] The search for *reasons* joins or crowds out the search for *causes.*[33] For example, although Joan of Arc's death was preceded by heat generated by the combustion of oxygen and hydrocarbons, it can only be *explained* with the beliefs in witchcraft and heresy that motivated her execution.[34] This makes single case studies popular, since meanings are necessarily local and context-specific, and recovering them in sufficient detail requires considerable labour.[35] Simultaneously, historical-interpretivist research must explain why some meanings and beliefs influence social action and others do not[36] by studying material and immaterial cultural, social and political constraints. Cross-case comparison can help in this process by shedding light on how distinct settings affect the production of meaning. In an influential 1980 article, Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers introduce a *contrast-oriented* approach to CHA.[37] Contrast-oriented CHA holds that any event is unique and unprecedented, but uses comparison to illuminate the pertinent features of its uniqueness. Put differently, European feudalism can be "more sharply defined" in comparison with Japanese feudalism.[38] Comparison helps refine theory by demonstrating how case-specific features affect "the working-out of putatively general social processes."[39]

My adherence to historical-interpretivism thus both motivated and required a theoretical framework which emphasises interpretation and ideology alongside material conditions (see section 2.3). My analysis employs comparative tactics at three different levels where contrasts are present. I assume that each case represents a complex system, irreducible to the sum of its parts; that each could be classified in alternative and potentially more fruitful ways, and that comparison necessitates describing each case in discrete terms which will always mask

30 William H Sewell Jr., *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 7.

31 Sewell Jr., 7.

32 Mark Bevir and Rod Rhodes, "Interpretation and Its Others," *Australian Journal of Political Science* 40, no 2 (2005): 170.

33 Markus Haverland and Dvora Yanow, "A Hitchhiker's Guide to the Public Administration Research Universe: Surviving Conversations on Methodologies and Methods," *Public Administration Review* 72, no 3 (2012): 404.

34 Frederick Erickson, "Comments on Causality in Qualitative Inquiry" 18, no 8 (2012): 686.

35 Dvora Yanow, "Interpretive Analysis and Comparative Research," in *Comparative Policy Studies*, ed Isabelle Engeli and Christine Rothmayr Allison (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2014), 146, https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137314154_7.

36 Erickson, "Comments on Causality in Qualitative Inquiry," 686.

37 Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22, no 2 (April 1980): 174–97.

38 cited in Skocpol and Somers, 180.

39 Skocpol and Somers, 178.

a more complex reality. The function of comparison is to ascertain how salient, case-specific features affect a broader social process of encountering (post)colonial migrations in the post-war period. I do not assume that, removed from their context, any given feature will perform in an equivalent manner.

3.2. Case selection

3.2.1. Guiding principles

Historical-interpretivism has two consequences for case selection. The first concerns its importance. For a neopositivist, the ability to isolate relevant causal factors depends on cases exhibiting equivalence along key dimensions, or on one's own ability to control for key differences.[40] Poorly selected cases undermine the conclusions drawn.[41] In contrast, inference in historical-interpretivist research is predominantly powered by "deep insights into the structures and motivations of actors"[42] and other forms of within-case analysis (the details of which I will unpack in section 3.3). Thoughtful case selection still matters, but it is not the foundation upon which inference hinges. The second consequence is that selecting cases by their scores on specific variables is no longer viable. The historian is adamant that societies are complex, dynamic systems that "cannot be broken apart at will into analytically manipulable variables."[43] The interpretivist, meanwhile, is reluctant to establish in advance the location of a case on a given continuum, preferring to remain modest about what can be known at a distance about any given context, and open to the insights and concepts that emerge "from within" throughout the entire research process.[44] The process of case selection, therefore, starts from different principles. I derive four from existing methodological texts and use them in the selection of country-level, programme-level and group-level cases.

First, the historical-interpretivist should locate contexts in which the phenomenon of interest is expected to be socially significant. This is encapsulated by Dvora Yanow's question, *"where [else] might X [the topic of study] be meaningful in key ways?"*[45] Just like in neopositivist research, theoretical priors are required to ascertain this. However, these priors are loose conjectures, analogous to the air photos an archeologist might use before deciding where to dig. Rather than reflecting fixed attributes of a case, theoretical priors are entry points into the in-depth study of local dynamics. The assumption is that the situated meanings of X will differ to some extent across cases, but the magnitude of these differences is left open.[46] The

40 Gerring, *Case Study Research*.
41 Barbara Geddes, "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis* 2 (1990): 131–50.
42 Joachim Blatter and Till Blume, "In Search of Co-Variance, Causal Mechanisms or Congruence? Towards a Plural Understanding of Case Studies," *Swiss Political Science Review* 14, no 2 (2008): 323–24.
43 Skocpol and Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," 193–94.
44 Yanow, "Interpretive Analysis and Comparative Research," 144.
45 Yanow, 149.
46 Yanow, 149.

contrast-oriented comparative historian is equally open to being surprised, inclined to "ask the same or at least similar questions of divergent materials and leave from for divergent answers."[47]

The second guiding principle is to 'case.' Casing is the deliberate process of considering the various concepts to which a unit can speak and reflecting on the advantages and disadvantages of each. For Soss, casing differs from case selection.[48] Case selection implies deciding among a universe of potential units, each relating in some way to the concepts of interest. Soss argues that a single unit will never correspond to only one single conceptual class. For instance, the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 may be an instance ('case') of nuclear deterrence, strong leadership personality, or coercive diplomacy.[49] Every casing brings the unit "into dialogue with a different set of empirical phenomena," creating constraints on the comparisons that are viable.[50] If a researcher intends to case the Cuban Missile Crisis as an instance of nuclear deterrence, then comparing with the Vietnam War or the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (the 'Iran deal') could be suitable. If it is cased as an instance of coercive diplomacy, then a comparison with EU trade sanctions would be more appropriate. The point is to stage a moment of deliberate reflection about the interpretive possibilities that open up when a complex system is classified and compared along a given gradient. A good starting point is Soss' question: "what can be learned from treating this phenomenon as a case of X?"[51]

Third, the contrast-oriented historian reminds us to, where possible, select cases that are expected to contrast with one another in meaningful ways according to the casing decision. This is different from the neopositivist notion of variation, which implies *variables*: distinct features of social reality that can be extracted from context and put in relation with other variables. Contrast, rather than variation, implies "respect[ing] the "historical integrity of each case as a whole."[52] Identifying relevant contrasts across cases can be done in reference to broad themes, orienting questions or even ideal-types that act as "sensitising devices - benchmarks against which to establish the particular features of each case."[53] This is how Geertz justifies his choice to compare Morocco and Indonesia: "their most obvious likeness is... their religious affiliation [but] they stand at the eastern and western extremities of the narrow band of classical Islamic civilisation... they have participated in the history of that civilisation in quite different ways, to quite different degrees, and with quite different results." Rather than a most-different-systems design,[54] Geertz' contrasting cases enable them to "form a kind of commentary on one another's character."[55]

Finally, a fourth principle considers a researcher's ability to meaningfully engage with the material from a case. The researcher should consider their own position in relation to their research and their aptitude at navigating local meanings. An interpretive scholar engages in

---

47 cited in Skocpol and Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," 180.
48 Joe Soss, "On Casing a Study vs Studying a Case," *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 16, no 1 (2018): 23.
49 George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005, 70.
50 Soss, "On Casing a Study vs Studying a Case," 23.
51 Soss, 23.
52 Skocpol and Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," 180.
53 Skocpol and Somers, 178.
54 Gerring, *Case Study Research*.
55 Skocpol and Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," 179.

reflexivity, which means self-consciously evaluating the ways in which their own subjectivity affects the research process.[56] The value of reflexivity stems from the epistemological premise that neutralising subjective bias is impossible and potentially undesirable.[57] Since the historical-interpretivist ontology rests on a world of context-specific truths, researchers of this tradition endeavour to derive knowledge from *within* the context in which it is situated, and are well-served by a familiarity with this context. As Bourdieu considered in the opening to his book, "if I were Japanese I would dislike most of the things that non-Japanese people write about Japan."[58] With this in mind, case selection will likely take seriously any logistical opportunities and constraints that the researcher faces. Language skills, local networks, and access to government documents and officials become relevant.[59] Access is not only a matter of formal permission, but also of interpersonal relationships, for example, the likelihood of establishing rapport with participants in a study that involves interviewing.[60]

3.2.2. Country-level contrasts

At a basic level, country-level case selection was limited to the countries who experienced (post) colonial migration. This could include post-war Japan, which managed repatriations from Manchuria and Korea, and the US, who received migrants from Cuba and the Philippines.[61] Given my interest in speaking to anxieties about immigration into Europe, I considered only European countries. Spain, Belgium, and Italy received migration flows from (former) colonies "of some consequence," but these have remained smaller than their neighbours.[62] In absolute numbers, according to the best available estimates, movement to metropole from colony was most significant in France and the UK (see Table 7). In relative terms, both in share of the total population and in proportion to the number of foreign migrants, the migration was most significant in France, the United Kingdom, Portugal and the Netherlands.

Assuming that social significance is a function of relative and not absolute impact, any four of these countries would be promising places to start my inquiry. However, I lack Portuguese language skills. In contrast, I have lived in France, the UK and the Netherlands, and have sufficient knowledge of French, English and Dutch to read primary sources in their original language. Therefore I was better positioned to conduct in-depth analysis in these country cases. I am confident that conducting a comparable inquiry into the inclusion of migrants from Angola and Mozambique in Portugal between 1974 and 1976[63] would yield theoretically relevant insights, but I leave the pursuit of that lead in the hands of a Portuguese speaker.

---

56 Francisco M Olmos-Vega, "A Practical Guide to Reflexivity in Qualitative Research: AMEE Guide No 149" 45, no 3 (2023): 242.

57 Olmos-Vega, 242.

58 Pierre Bourdieu, *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 1.

59 Kendra L Koivu and Annika Marlen Hinze, "Cases of Convenience? The Divergence of Theory from Practice in Case Selection in Qualitative and Mixed-Methods Research," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50, no 4 (October 2017): 1025, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096517001214.

60 Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow, *Interpretive Research Design*, 0 ed (Routledge, 2013), 58, https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203854907.

61 Bosma, Lucassen, and Oostindie, *Postcolonial Migrants and Identity Politics*, 3.

62 Bosma, Lucassen, and Oostindie, 16.

63 Bosma, Lucassen, and Oostindie, *Postcolonial Migrants and Identity Politics*, 15.

Table 7: numbers of (post)colonial migrants moving to Europe after decolonisation, 1945 - early 1990s (low and high estimates, in thousands)

	Total arrivals[64]	Total "European" arrivals[65]	As share of total population[66] (in reference year)[67]	In proportion to number of foreign migrants[68] (in reference year)
France	1,750 - 2,200	1,400 - 1,700	3,9 per cent	37,9 per cent
United Kingdom	1,730 - 2,250	380 - 500	3,6 per cent	67,6 per cent
Portugal	575 - 750	500 - 600	6,5 per cent	249,5 per cent[69]
The Netherlands	520 - 580	270 - 300	3,9 per cent	112,0 per cent
Belgium	105 - 140	90 - 120	1,2 per cent	14,4 per cent
Spain	180 - 220	170 - 200	0,4 per cent	12,1 per cent
Italy	500 - 630	480 - 580	0,9 per cent	26,6 per cent

As far as 'casing' goes, I contemplated treating these countries with respect to their position on the 'three worlds of welfare capitalism' typology. Esping-Andersen's seminal typology recast welfare states as welfare regimes, defined in terms of how society, state, market, and family interact.[70] Specifically, he was concerned with de-commodification: the extent to which an individual or family's ability to uphold socially acceptable living standards is independent from their participation in the market.[71] Esping-Andersen assessed the scores of 18 countries on a variety of quantitative indicators using OECD data from 1980 (10-35 years *after* the period under study here). One such indicator was the 'combined decommodification' score, which encompassed replacement rate generosity, stringency of eligibility criteria and duration of benefit pay-out for old-age pensions, sickness and unemployment cash benefits. These indicators were used to argue for the existence of 'social democratic' regimes with universal, generous benefits, 'liberal' Beveridgean regimes featuring mainly means-tested social assistance and modest universal transfers for the very poor, and 'conservative' Bismarckian regimes in which

64 Smith, "Introduction," 32.

65 Unspecified definition of 'European,' but likely signifying legal status in colonies Smith, 32.

66 Bosma, Lucassen, and Oostindie, *Postcol*onial Migrants and Identity Politics, 5.

67 The reference years used for columns 3 and 4 are drawn from Bosma and co-authors (2012) who selected the date at which the majority of first-generation (post)colonial migrants had settled. Reference years were as follows: France (1970), the UK (1970), Portugal (1980), the Netherlands (1980), Belgium (2000), Spain (2000), Italy (2000). The share therefore offers insight into the significance of the migration, but not its precise magnitude throughout the entire period at which it occurred.

68 United Nations Population Division, "International Migrant Stock, Total" (The World Bank, 2012), https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SM.POP.TOTL. To calculate, I used the average between the two estimates given in column 1.

69 Note that Portugal was predominantly a sending country until well into the 1970s, explaining the particularly high ratio.

70 Christopher Deeming, "The Lost and the New 'Liberal World' of Welfare Capitalism: A Critical Assessment of Gøsta Esping-Andersen's *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* a Quarter Century Later," *Social Policy and Society* 16, no 3 (July 2017): 405–22, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746415000676.

71 Esping-Andersen, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, 37.

occupation-based insurance schemes predominated.[72] The de-commodification scores of the UK, France and the Netherlands put them into distinct clusters, as Table 8 shows.

Table 8: Clustering welfare regimes by combined de-commodification scores (1980)[73]

Country	De-commodification score
Australia	13.0
United States	13.8
New Zealand	17.1
Canada	22.0
Ireland	23.3
United Kingdom	**23.4**
Italy	24.1
Japan	27.1
France	**27.5**
Germany	27.7
Finland	29.2
Switzerland	29.8
Austria	31.1
Belgium	32.2
Netherlands	**32.4**
Denmark	38.1
Norway	38.3
Sweden	39.1

The typology has consistently provided the foundations for case selection in comparative social policy. However, it is insufficiently granular and 'casing' the UK, France and the Netherlands strictly as instances of the three regimes concealed more than it revealed. Although the UK is usually seen as the most liberal of Europe's welfare regimes,[74] the British welfare state was initially founded on principles that appear social-democratic in their emphasis on universal eligibility. The cornerstone of proposals for post-war British welfare was that "all citizens were included, classified by groups in relation to the causes of economic insecurity and the protection required to meet them."[75] The French welfare regime, meanwhile, is usually classified as a conservative welfare regime in the literature, but, as Manow and Palier argue, is "not

72 Esping-Andersen, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*.
73 Esping-Andersen, 52.
74 Paul Pierson, ed., *The New Politics of the Welfare State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
75 Baldwin, *The Politics of Social Solidarity: Class Bases of the European Welfare State 1875-1975*, 117.

particularly conservative, patriarchic, or Catholic when it comes to family policy."[76] Finally, the Dutch case is often classified as a hybrid between social-democratic and conservative regimes.[77] During the first thirteen years of the post-war period, Dutch social insurance was split into four programmes, all governed by strict eligibility criteria and associated with only modest benefits.[78] This plus a heavy influence of the social partners and confessional parties approximates the ideal-type of the 'conservative' welfare regime. However, the Netherlands has since reached high levels of generosity and social spending (as a social-democratic regime might) whilst retaining an important role for the market in, for example, old-age pensions (as a liberal regime might).[79]

These observations align with the findings of Scruggs and Allan. Replicating and reassessing the 'decommodification index,' they find clear differences between countries but little evidence of clustering, undermining support for distinctive national regimes.[80] For these reasons, I do not treat the Netherlands, France, and the UK as instances of three distinct worlds of welfare. However, I did use the typology as a sensitising device. It drew my attention to at least two types of contrasts that these countries might exhibit. The first are differences in programmatic features of each welfare state. Esping-Andersen's data indicates that, in 1980, the French welfare state was particularly fragmented on occupational lines in comparison to the Netherlands and the UK, while France spent more on means-tested poor relief (as a percentage of total social expenditure) than the UK or the Netherlands. The UK stood alone in offering equal benefit levels.[81] The typology also underlines differences in social cleavages associated with welfare states. In particular, Esping-Andersen saw conservative regimes as protecting traditional status differentials based on family or occupation against the throes of capitalist transformation, while liberal welfare regimes were thought to enshrine the inequalities associated with market participation, and social democratic regimes to minimise them.[82] In these respects, the Netherlands, the UK, and France offered three distinct welfare contexts in which (post)colonial migration was likely to have been significant.

3.2.3. Programme-level contrasts

Existing literature suggests that programme-level differences affect perceived deservingness of recipients. Barr distinguishes between cash transfers that provide poverty relief by redistributing income and wealth across a given population, and those that redistribute wealth

76 Manow and Palier, "A Conservative Welfare State Regime without Christian Democracy?," 146.

77 Bernard Ebbinghaus, "Comparing Welfare State Regimes: Are Typologies an Ideal or Realistic Strategy?," in *European Social Policy Analysis Network* (ESPAnet Conference, Edinburgh, UK, 2012).

78 Dennie Oude Nijhuis, *Religion, Class and the Post-war Development of the Dutch Welfare State* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018).

79 Oude Nijhuis; Ebbinghaus, "Comparing Welfare State Regimes: Are Typologies an Ideal or Realistic Strategy?"

80 Lyle Scruggs and James Allan, "Welfare-State Decommodification in 18 OECD Countries: A Replication and Revision," *Journal of European Social Policy* 16, no 1 (February 2006): 55, https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928706059833.

81 Lyle A Scruggs and James P Allan, "Social Stratification and Welfare Regimes for the 21st Century: Revisiting the 'Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism'" (15th International Conference of Europeanists, Chicago, IL, 2006), 657.

82 Scruggs and Allan, 645.

across the life cycle of individuals.[83] The former generally refers to non-contributory schemes tailored to labour market risks (like unemployment or low income) and financed by general tax revenue, which I refer to as *social assistance* (in Dutch: *bijstand*; in French: *l'assistance* or *l'aide sociale*). The latter are contributory schemes designed to alleviate life-course risks (like sickness and ageing).[84] They are usually financed by the contributions of beneficiaries, which I refer to as *social security* (in Dutch: *sociale zekerheid*; in French: *la sécurité sociale*).[85]

Research shows that recipients of benefits under schemes aimed at mitigating against labour market risks are viewed as less deserving than those falling under schemes devoted to life-course risks. This is true even though health and poverty, for example, share a similar sociodemographic risk profile, suggesting that citizens "appear to reason *as if* exposure to health problems is randomly distributed across social strata."[86] Additionally, the deservingness literature emphasises reciprocity. Contributory schemes, i.e. those financed by the contributions of those they protect, might create the perception that recipients have 'earned' their benefits, unlike non-contributory schemes financed by general revenue, which involve redistribution from middle-class taxpayers to needier beneficiaries. This is one explanation for Suari Andreu and van Vliet's finding that the gap in receipt of benefits between EU migrants and Dutch natives takes only two years to close for contributory transfers but six years for non-contributory transfers.[87]

With this in mind, I opted to limit my scope to the study of two programmes that exhibit clear contrast along these lines: social security and social assistance. Old-age pensions were an attractive focus for the former, as they were the biggest item in the social security budget and "*the* major source of contention in the post-war welfare state debate in developed nations."[88] This implied potentially pronounced salience. Additionally, during the post-war period, the old-age public pension schemes between the UK and the Netherlands, on the one hand, and France, on the other, exhibited contrasts that I was interested in exploring. The UK system was introduced in the National Insurance Act of 1946, and the Dutch system in the General Old Age Act (*Algemene Ouderdomswet,* AOW) exactly one decade later. Both programmes guaranteed universal flat-rate benefits (geared toward providing a minimum level of subsistence), financed mostly by insurance contributions on a Pay-as-You-Go basis with a small, but in the case of the Netherlands, growing, government subsidy, to all national residents.[89] Contributions in the Netherlands were based on earnings, while in the UK they were flat-rate. This allowed the former to have ultimately more redistributive impact, since

83 Barr, *Economics of the Welfare State*, 7.

84 Carsten Jensen, "Labour Market- versus Life Course-Related Social Policies: Understanding Cross-Programme Differences," *Journal of European Public Policy* 19, no 2 (March 2012): 275–91, https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2011.599991.

85 This dichotomy is stylised; sometimes, the alleviation of life-course needs like old age are met by tax-funded programs, and contributory schemes can also be subsidised by the state.

86 Jensen and Petersen, "The Deservingness Heuristic and the Politics of Health Care," 70.

87 Eduard Suari-Andreu and Olaf Van Vliet, "Intra-EU Migration, Public Transfers and Assimilation," *Economica* 90, no 360 (October 2023): 4, https://doi.org/10.1111/ecca.12484.

88 Dennie Oude Nijhuis, *Labor Divided in the Post-war European Welfare State: The Netherlands and the United Kingdom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 63.

89 Oude Nijhuis, 66.

in the UK, contributions were limited to what the poorest could afford.[90] Private pension schemes continued to operate alongside this system.[91] In this project, I evaluated inclusion of (post)colonial migrants under the National Insurance Act in the UK and the AOW in the Netherlands.

Public pensions in the French system, in contrast, were neither universal nor state-run. Although French policymakers initially pushed for universal state-sponsored social security, their ambitions were quickly tempered by resistance from well-paid salaried employees.[92] This group disliked earnings-based contributions that required them to subsidise their lower paid colleagues.[93] Therefore, only about half the population was covered by the general social security regime at the time of its establishment, with pre-existing occupational schemes operating in parallel.[94] That half, however, earned the right to an old-age pension, financed by contributions, at age 65. Their benefits were administered by regional funds known as *caisses régionales* which were managed by the social partners. This was the system I focused on. Pre-existing occupational schemes existed in parallel, institutionalised in subsequent years as a 'special' regime, and in 1956, a tax-financed supplement (*Fonds national de sécurité*, National Solidarity Fund) raised the incomes of retirees whose contributions had been insufficient to ensure an adequate pension. I additionally considered family allowances, which emerged as highly salient and important axes of inclusion. Family allowances were inaugurated by employers in France at the end of the First World War in response to multiple strike waves.[95] By 1932, the state mandated that employers compensate workers for running a family.[96] In the post-war period, this elaborate, employer-run system was integrated into the general social security regime.

In the domain of social assistance, my three country cases again exhibit significant contrasts in the post-war period. The difference between the Netherlands and France, whose system reserved a privileged role for charitable and local actors, and the UK, where national assistance played a larger role, is stark. In the Netherlands, until 1965 social assistance remained regulated under a medieval system of poor relief, according to which responsibility for looking after the needy was concentrated in the hands of religious institutions, charities, and municipal 'poor councils' (*armenraden*) whose role increased with time.[97] In France, the churches, charities, and municipalities which had historically also led efforts to assist the destitute continued to offer in-kind assistance, like servicing retirement homes in the post-war period,[98] although they were overshadowed by the social security regime in many ways and came under increasing

---

90 Oude Nijhuis, 66.

91 Oude Nijhuis, *Religion, Class and the Post-war Development of the Dutch Welfare State*, 106.

92 Baldwin, *The Politics of Social Solidarity: Class Bases of the European Welfare State 1875-1975*, 166.

93 Paul V Dutton, *Origins of the French Welfare State: The Struggle for Social Reform in France, 1914-1947*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 39.

94 Denis Kessler, "Histoire et Avenir Du Système de Retraite En France," *Revue d'économie Financière*, 465-590, Caisse des dépôts et consignations (1991): 473.

95 Dutton, *Origins of the French Welfare State: The Struggle for Social Reform in France, 1914-1947*, 30.

96 Timothy B Smith, *The Two World Wars and Social Policy in France*, vol 1 (Oxford University Press, 2018), 137, https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198779599.003.0005.

97 Marco H.D van Leeuwen, "Armenzorg 1912-1965: Van Centrum Naar Periferie," in *Studies over Zekerheidsarrangementen Risico's, Risicobestrijding En Verzekeringen in Nederland Vanaf de Middeleeuwen.*, ed J van Gerwen and Marco H.D van Leeuwen (Amsterdam: NEHA, 1998).

98 Dutton, *Origins of the French Welfare State: The Struggle for Social Reform in France, 1914-1947*.

purview of the state.[99] In contrast, the UK replaced its Victorian-era poor laws with the 1948 National Assistance Act, which introduced a universal social safety net.[100] Financed by general tax revenue, it provided means-tested financial assistance grants for the unemployed, for those who do not pay insurance contributions and others whose resources are not sufficient to meet their needs. By disregarding some capital and income in its means tests, the programme was relatively generous.[101]

Therefore, in the UK case I was interested in eligibility under the National Assistance Act. In France and the Netherlands, in contrast, access to benefits for a given group was harder to ascertain as it was granted in a highly decentralised manner, contingent on the decision-making practices of local-level agencies. Adjusting to this surprise as historical-interpretivism encourages researchers to do, I approached this challenge in two ways. First, I expanded my scope to consider targeted assistance programmes designed for the specific needs of (post) colonial migrants. Such schemes confer assistance based on membership in a given group rather than on means tests and included the *Rijksgroepregeling Gerepatrieerden* (1961) in the Netherlands and *La loi relative à l'accueil et à la réinstallation des Français d'outre-mer* (1961) in France. Because these were legislated at the national level, I could examine centralised criteria for eligibility. My second strategy was to examine the records of private and municipal archives to shed light on decision-making process at local levels. I could only adopt this strategy in the Netherlands. I did so by consulting the decision-making practices of the Centraal Comité voor Kerkelijk en Particular Initiatief voor Sociale Zorg ten Behoefte van Gerepatrieerden in Utrecht, as well as of three municipalities: Rotterdam, Utrecht, The Hague.

3.2.4. Group-level contrasts

My three country cases collectively received around 5 million migrants from (former) colonies during the second half of the twentieth century. Because I did not want to assume ex ante the constitution of any given people as a coherent group, I selected which experiences to focus on by region of origin.[102] For each case, the critical years of welfare expansion fall squarely within the first two decades after the Second World War. For the UK and France, the legal foundations of the welfare state were established in the first few years after the war, and several major legislative acts of the Dutch welfare state had entered into force by 1965. Thus, I considered the region of origin from which the most socially significant migrations took place during this time period. I estimated social significance using the size of the migration relative to others and the degree of political attention that migration attracted.

99 Frédéric Viguier, "Chapitre 2 L'assistance sociale délégitimée par la Sécurité sociale mais toujours indispensable," in *La cause des pauvres en France*, Académique (Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2020), 53–79, https://www.cairn.info/la-cause-des-pauvres-en-france--9782724625400-p-53.htm.

100 Barr, *Economics of the Welfare State*, 34.

101 Derek Fraser, *Evolution of the British Welfare State: A History of Social Policy since the Industrial Revolution* (London and Basingstoke: MacMillan Education Ltd., 1973), 214.

102 I look for 'region' as opposed to 'country' for several reasons. First, the status of former colonies as 'countries' depends on whether they were independent during the period in question. Also, especially in the UK case, migration from some countries so paralleled that of other countries (as was the case with Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago, for example) that it made sense to consider them in tandem.

In the Netherlands, my focus is on migrants coming from the Netherlands Indies/ Indonesia. In 1945, Dutch colonial possessions included what was then known as the East and West Indies. The East Indies encompassed present-day Indonesia (which also included the Moluccan islands) and Western New Guinea. The West Indies included Suriname on the Latin American continent, as well as the Caribbean islands of the Dutch Antilles: Aruba, Curacao, Bonaire, Saba, Sint-Eustacius and Sint-Maarten.[103] Migration from the East involved the migration of around 300,000 (former) Dutch citizens and subjects between 1945 and 1963,[104] making it by far the most significant migration in numbers from any former colony. The story of Surinamese migration is an important one, but it starts in earnest later. Until the 1970s and the build-up to Surinamese migration, arrivals were persistent, but ad hoc and smaller scale.[105]

Meanwhile, migration from Algeria to (metropolitan) France both before and after its independence was greater in size, concentration and political significance than migration from any other (former) French colony or protectorate. The first such movements started in 1954, after the French defeat at Diên Biên Phu formalised the independence of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos and prompted the migration of some 12,000 French civilians and soldiers to France.[106] This migration triggered minimal state intervention. In 1956, when Tunisia and Morocco gained independence, over 300,000 French from the former protectorates moved to the metropole, prompting a more elaborate system of reception for the newcomers.[107] However, migration from Algeria was by far the most significant numerically, as between 1962 and 1968 almost 900,000 French citizens from Algeria migrated to the metropole.[108] Moreover, Algerian migrants were contributing to the French economy as labour migrants long before Algerian independence in 1962. From 1946 to 1949, 255,000 Algerians arrived in metropolitan France - more than the number of guest worker recruits from all other countries combined - with a further 868,000 arriving in the next six years, far outpacing arrivals of guest workers recruited by the national overseas recruitment agency.[109]

For the UK case, I studied the inclusion of Caribbean migrants. At the end of the Second World War, British empire loosely included 'dominions' like Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and maintained a relationship via the Commonwealth with those who had gained independence: India and Pakistan (1947), Sri Lanka and Myanmar (1948). However, in numbers, migration from the Caribbean (then known as the 'West Indies,' containing nineteen islands and Guyana) outnumbered that of other regions. In 1948, almost 500 passengers on the *SS Empire Windrush* docked in Britain, heralding a new era of migration from the

103 Guno Jones, "What Is New about Dutch Populism? Dutch Colonialism, Hierarchical Citizenship and Contemporary Populist Debates and Policies in the Netherlands," *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 37, no 6 (2016): 608.

104 Wim Willems, "No Sheltering Sky: Migrant Identities of Dutch Nationals from Indonesia," in *Europe's Invisible Migrants* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2003), 33–60.

105 Schuster, *Poortwachters over Immigranten: Het Debat over Immigratie in Het Naoorlogse Groot-Brittannië En Nederland*, 122.

106 Yann Scioldo-Zürcher, "Faire des Français d'Algérie des métropolitains," *Pôle Sud* 24, no 1 (2006): 17, https://doi.org/10.3917/psud.024.0015.

107 Scioldo-Zürcher, 17.

108 Anthony Edo, "Migrations et salaires : le cas des rapatriés d'Algérie," n.d.

109 Marie-Claude Henneresse, "Le Patronat et La Politique Française d'Immigration, 1945-1975" (Paris, L'Institut d'Etudes Politiques, 1979), 73.

Caribbean.[110] From 1955-1960, the Home Office estimated around 160,000 arrivals from the Caribbean compared to 50,000 from India and Pakistan combined.[111] Of this figure, Jamaicans represented about three-quarters of the total.[112] Their salience derived from more than just their numbers. In 1952, when numbers were still modest, racist political campaigns against their immigration were launched.[113] One street-level bureaucrat at the Ministry of Labour and National Service said in 1959 that, "in the last twelve years, a new type of coloured person has arrived in Britain, mainly West Indian immigrants, and it is these who are mainly in mind when the colour problem is discussed today."[114]

It is worth noting that other volumes devoted to analysing the dynamics of migration and integration in this time in the UK, France and the Netherlands selected the same cases, suggesting some degree of consensus around the significance of these migrations. Smith's *Invisible Migrants* focuses on migration from Indonesia when discussing the Dutch case and Algeria when discussing the French,[115] while Lucassen's *The Immigrant Threat* considers Caribbean migrants in the UK and Algerians in France.[116]

3.3. Strategies of inference

3.3.1. Three pillars

Earlier, I described interpretive inferences as powered by local meanings and reasons, rigorously contextualised against the material constraints that their agents faced. Although several formal methods have been developed to meet interpretive research needs, like grounded theory, event structure analysis or critical discourse analysis, researchers approach the overarching challenge of linking empirical findings to theoretical conclusions in different ways, remaining "flexible, iterative and adaptive" to the needs of specific projects.[117] In a review of studies looking at how to perform the 'conceptual leap,' that is the movement from empirics to theory, the authors identify numerous contradictions.[118] Researchers are often encouraged both to make deliberate use of heuristic devices, *and* to sit back and submit to serendipity and chance; to immerse themselves in the data but simultaneously to detach, or to leverage both their experience and theoretical priors *and* naïveté. In this confusion the authors conclude that conceptual leaping

110 Shinder S Thandi, "Postcolonial Migrants in Britain: From Unwelcome Guests to Partial and Segmented Assimilation," ed Ulbe Bosma, Jan Lucassen, and Gert Oostindie, International Studies in Social History (Oxford, New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), 73.

111 El-Enany, *Bordering Britain*, 102.

112 Colin Grant, *Homecoming: Voices of the Windrush Generation* (London: Vintage, 2020), 4.

113 Hansen, *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-War Britain: The Institutional Origins of a Multicultural Nation*, 70.

114 LoTNA-AST 7/1878-Editorial by R.H Woodcock.

115 Smith, "Introduction."

116 Lucassen, *The Immigrant Threat: The Integration of Old and New Migrants in Western Europe since 1850*.

117 Melissa N.P Johnson and Ethan McLean, "Discourse Analysis," in *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, 2020.

118 Malvina Klag and Ann Langley, "Approaching the Conceptual Leap in Qualitative Research," *International Journal of Management Reviews* 15 (2013): 149–66.

is a form of bricolage, “a ‘do-it-yourself’ process of ‘cobbling together’ that one undertakes with [a wide variety of] tools at hand.”[119]

To provide structure to this process of cobbling together, I introduce 3 pillars of a historical-interpretivist strategy: abduction, contextualised self-interpretation, and entangled comparison. Each refers to a technique that underpinned the inference in my project. I derived these pillars from methodological texts as well as by carefully reading works that I locate within the historical-interpretivist tradition, as they contain both descriptive and explanatory accounts of historical outcomes, consider the interaction of ideas/meanings and actions, use comparison but maintain the integrity of each individual case, and study race without attributing it causal power. Taken together, the pillars supply the foundations for a rigorous analysis that is historical and social scientific, descriptive and explanatory, but also transparent and open to critique.

3.3.2. ‘Curious activities’ and abduction

The conventional standard of systematicity involves an unwavering commitment to applying predetermined procedures strictly and at the expense of sensitivity to context or other distractions.[120] The standard of rigour is different for historical-interpretivists. They might still benefit from predetermined rules in choosing where to start; for example, repeating identical search terms in the inventory of available archival holdings for all of their cases. However, they should interpret what they access as an “arbitrary slice or cut from the stream of ongoing activity,”[121] a landing strip in an unknown territory. There is no expectation that they will land on a tower with a clear view of the goings-on below, nor that they understand the dialect or the customs of the people they encounter well enough to converse with them. They should assume instead that they have landed in the middle of a crowded street corner, or in an adjacent field facing away from the episode in which they are interested. The researcher needs to orient themselves in their new environment, and systematicity in this process is not much help. A fixed itinerary for when they will arrive where, or whom they will visit and when, will limit their ability to respond in an agile manner to what they find. They may even find that the objects in view are more relevant for their research question than their intended objects. Indeed, the researcher can only analyse what they find, which they cannot know in advance - and what they analyse shapes what they look for.[122]

Therefore, one standard of rigour relates to how energetically the researcher engages in abduction. If induction is ‘data-driven’ and deduction is ‘theory-driven’ analysis, then abduction is ‘breakdown-driven,’[123] meaning it starts from situations where the ability of existing theory to explain the data breaks down or falls short. Originally introduced to the social sciences by the philosopher and scientist C.S. Peirce, abductive reasoning involves a ‘back

119 Klag and Langley, 161.
120 Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, *Interpretive Research Design*, 27.
121 cited in Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, 65.
122 Hill, 6.
123 Svend Brinkmann, “Doing Without Data,” *Qualitative Inquiry*, Qualitative Data Analysis After Coding, 20, no 6 (2014), https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414530254.

and forth' between theoretical propositions and empirical evidence.[124] The researcher looks for explanations that make the "surprise less surprising,"[125] by asking, "how is it possible?"[126] What conditions, material and otherwise, need to hold for this to make sense? Brinkmann offers the example of someone flailing their arms in a context in which it is unexpected; i.e. not an aerobics class.[127] Upon observation, we might guess that a wasp is attacking them, which would make their behaviour understandable until a better interpretation is available. This is at the crux of abductive reasoning. Conducting research in this way involves taking one's time with the data, resisting the urge to "clean" it from its contradictions, enthusiastically pursuing any leads that emerge and returning regularly to revisit original theoretical propositions. This question needs to be asked in an *iterative* and recursive way, i.e. repetitively, but to changing objects of inquiry as new discoveries are made and the researcher performs "abduction within abduction within abduction."[128] Each new insight "inform[s] and fold[s] back on the others," in a "circle-spiral" of sense-making that continues throughout the entirety of the research.[129] This circular trajectory aligns with the "necessarily provisional and iterative essence of ongoing archival work" according to Hill.[130] Curiosity is paramount because it supplies the fuel for these efforts.

My research started from the surprise that welfare state scholarship cannot explain how massive waves of migration from Europe's colonies coexisted with the evolution of generous welfare states, given existing assumptions about the incompatibility of diversity and solidarity. My original conjecture was that racially distinct (post)colonial migrants were excluded. However, I quickly ran into both conceptual and empirical dead-ends. Conceptually, I was forced to acknowledge that race was not a fixed attribute of any given group, but was assigned, resisted, and variably given meaning. As such, my account made room for *racialisation*. Even more surprisingly, empirically, my findings did not suggest the uniform exclusion of (post) colonial migrants, even on racial grounds. Both discoveries prompted a return to theory and a reevaluation of the ways in which race operates in social phenomena, and a subsequent return to the empirical evidence. I continued this process in an iterative manner until I had a theoretical framework which made the surprise less surprising. The current iteration outlined in Chapter 2 is the fourth version.

3.3.3. Contextualised self-interpretation

Recovering local meanings is an important part of historical-interpretivism, but what exactly does this mean? Some (pure) *subjectivists* assume that people ultimately "know what they are doing" and that we can therefore take their "conscious intentions" as the "ultimate explanation of their activity."[131] In this view, uncovering meanings is as simple as asking people what they

124 Kerry Earl Rinehart, "Abductive Analysis in Qualitative Inquiry," *Qualitative Inquiry* 27, no 2 (February 2021): 303–11, https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800420935912.
125 Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, *Interpretive Research Design*, 28.
126 Brinkmann, "Doing Without Data."
127 Brinkmann.
128 Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, *Interpretive Research Design*, 32.
129 Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, 34.
130 Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, 6.
131 Atkinson, *Bourdieu and after: A Guide to Relational Phenomenology*, 59.

understand or perceive. Others, speaking from an *objectivist* angle, view human behaviour is the result of hidden social structures of which people have no knowledge themselves.[132] Such a perspective, which allows room for false consciousness, renders someone's own interpretations moot.

I follow Bourdieu, whose philosophy fell somewhere in the middle. He argued that agents have a set of assumptions that shape how they behave; for example, they have a sense of what makes a 'man' or 'woman,' or what types of people there are.[133] These assumptions are unlikely to be easily articulated, however, because they are shaped by experiences, upbringing and social conditioning which are difficult to identify, and because they take the form not of formal reasoning but of a practical sense of what is to be done in any situation. Akin to a "'feel' for the game" in sports, Bourdieu called this *habitus*.[134] Habitus grants human action agency but bases it on cognitive schema shaped by social structures. Incumbent upon the researcher interested in meaning-making, therefore, is an excavation of this "feel for the game." They should not expect stated intentions to conform to clear logic, because, as Bourdieu cautions, "practice has a logic which is not that of logic, and thus to apply practical logic to logical logic is to run the risk of destroying the logic one wants to describe with the instrument used to describe it."[135] The researcher must accept that human meaning-making is messy and applied, in the sense of being geared toward action in a specific context.

Bevir and Rhodes offer insight into how exactly to accomplish this with a technique they call "contextualised self-interpretation."[136] As a first step, the researcher pays attention to utterances - what has been said in written or verbal form about the phenomena of interest. As such, Foucault advocated reading archives not as bodies of theoretical or scientific knowledge but as windows into the "regular, daily practice" of local actors.[137] Utterances are treated as windows into the 'self-interpretation' of actors, not as facts. This is common practice in historical research which typically involves archival research. Critical archival studies point out that archives never seamlessly transmit events or stories exactly as they occurred. On one level, they may record events that never happened, or letters that were never sent to their intended recipients.[138] On another level, they only contain records that someone judged "worthy of preservation."[139] Records belonging to the powerful are more likely to be archived, such that archives reflect the power relations of the societies in which they are embedded.[140] State archives in particular are vulnerable to this, given that their creation and organisation was central to modern nation-building efforts.[141] Those who were excluded from these efforts - all too often,

132 Atkinson, 60.
133 Atkinson, 61.
134 Pierre Bourdieu, *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 26.
135 Bourdieu, 82.
136 Glynos and Howarth, *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Science*.
137 Flyvbjerg, "Phronetic Planning: Theoretical and Methodological Reflections," 294.
138 Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, 67.
139 Scott A Frisch et al., "Taking the Road Less Traveled," in *Doing Archival Research in Political Science* (Amherst, New York: Cambria Press, 2012), 2.
140 Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, 17.
141 J J Ghaddar and Michelle Caswell, "'To Go beyond': Towards a Decolonial Archival Praxis," *Archival Science* 19, no 2 (June 1, 2019): 79, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-019-09311-1.

the indigenous or racialised Other - are also excluded from the historical record that these archives are used to construct.[142] Reconstructing history involves struggling "with and against the constraints and silences" that the archive presents.[143] As a result, knowing what is absent from the collection may be as important as knowing what is present.[144] In short, utterances, whether in the archive or elsewhere, reflect the self-interpretation of specific actors, not a perfect picture of events as they transpired.

The researcher then tries to pin down habitus by reconstructing the material and ideological environment in which the speaker spoke. It is impossible to draw up an exhaustive list of relevant contextual factors for this exercise. However, leading discourse analysts highlight several features worth the researcher's attention, such as the personalities and (historical) experiences of speaker and audience, the time and place at which the utterance occurred, the larger event(s) of which it may have been a part (for example an interview, or a sermon) and the purpose it was designed to serve.[145] Periodisation, which involves dissecting the "historical chronology of places into analytically useful periods," usually bounded by noteworthy events,[146] is a useful instrument for identifying relevant aspects of a setting from the historian's toolkit. Finally, the researcher generates narratives which "postulat[e] significant relationships, connections, or similarities" between different contextual elements and utterances.[147] Narratives are evaluated by how well they fit the empirical record in relation to other narratives.

Existing scholarship offers ample examples of the rigorous application of these pillars. For a snapshot from Du Bois' work, see Appendix A.1. For this project, I viewed the archives as a means not only of familiarising myself with key events and personalities, but in order to enter their lifeworlds. I considered the terms and linguistic associations with which they described the phenomena they encountered and the dilemmas they faced. I contextualised these self-interpretations using information available in secondary sources, engaging in periodisation. I was attentive to the personalities and experiences of the speakers when these had been described in secondary literature, or as they emerged from the archival record. For example, a biography of Minister Klompé supplemented my analysis of her choices.[148] I engaged in rigorous efforts to recover the material and ideological landscape of each of my cases (see Chapters 4 and 5). This not only allowed me to assess the 'evidentiary value' of various parts of the archival record,[149] but facilitated a narrative explanation of why things unfolded the way that they did.

---

142 Ghaddar and Caswell, 79.

143 Hartman in Magubane, *Bringing the Empire Home: Race, Class, and Gender in Britain and Colonial South Africa*.

144 Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, 66.

145 Gillian Brown and George Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 39, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511805226.

146 Evan S Lieberman, "Causal Inference in Historical Institutional Analysis: A Specification of Periodization Strategies," *Comparative Political Studies* 34, no 9 (November 2001): 1016.

147 cited in Jason Glynos and David Howarth, "Structure, Agency and Power in Political Analysis: Beyond Contextualised Self-Interpretations," *Political Studies Review* 6 (2008): 158.

148 Gerard Mostert, *Marga Klompé 1912-1986: Een Biografie* (Boom uitgevers Amsterdam, 2011).

149 George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, 99.

3.3.4. Entangled comparison

As I explained in 3.1.2, comparison associated with historical-interpretivism is distinct from that common to neopositivist research, which aims to mimic experimental conditions and isolate the effect of individual variables. A preoccupation with disentanglement can distract from social reality rather than illuminate it. Imagine a bisexual woman of colour from a neighbouring town is denied entry into a nightclub. Researching whether her sexuality, her gender identity, her skin colour or her origins caused her exclusion neither serves her needs particularly well nor offers much insight into her reality. In the real world, none of these factors are manipulable. Moreover, generations of Black feminists have argued that different facets of our identity intersect to shape how we are viewed.[150] They do not have individual additive effects but operate in tandem. Extracting individual features produces a theoretical landscape divorced from the reality that most actors face.

The historical-interpretivist therefore engages in *entangled* comparison, considering complex, whole systems alongside one another and resisting the temptation to entertain counterfactuals (see Appendix A for examples of this analysis). In my project, I assume that each context is distinct, but that the agents within them may be subject to comparable cross-pressures. Controlled comparison is impossible given sizeable differences between settings. For example, Dutch 'repatriates' from present-day Indonesia arrived in the Netherlands almost twenty years before Algerian 'repatriates' arrived in France, and while Caribbeans in the UK migrated in search of job opportunities, most migrants from present-day Indonesia were refugees. Just like Fox, I pay attention instead to geographically and temporally specific experiences and allow for theoretical explanations that foreground different factors to complement rather than compete with each other. Meanwhile, just like Cooper, I embed the comparison in my story-telling, allowing it to highlight distinctive responses to the social phenomena these three countries had in common.

3.4. Data collection

3.4.1. Archival sources

The national archives of each of my three country cases constituted the main sources for my analysis. In line with my commitment to abductive reasoning, consultation was a back-and-forth process that stretched from 2020 to 2023. Archival closures in line with outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic occasionally interrupted this process.

My search began in the archives of public agencies responsible for the implementation of social insurance and assistance. I searched for terms that evoked the experience of (post)colonial migrants. In Dutch and French, I started with the word for 'repatriates' (*gerepatrieerden*,

150 Kimberlé W Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 139 (1989); bell hooks, *Ain't I A Woman* (London: Pluto Press, 1987); Akashia Gloria Hull, Patricia Bell-Scott, and Barbarad Smith, eds., *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave* (New York: Feminist Press, 1982).

rapatriés); in the UK, I started with a more general search for 'colonial' and 'citizens.' From there, I pursued leads as they appeared. I kept an eye out for "large collections of … highly probable relevance to the research project."[151] Existing literature also furnished clues about where to look and key historical details. I made extensive use of inventories and finding aids. I asked archivists in-person or via email (especially during the pandemic) if I was searching for something specific.

The Dutch national archives are in The Hague (*Het Nationaal Archief,* here abbreviated NL-HaNA). I visited these from September 2020 to January 2021. The collections I consulted included the Ministry of Social Work (*Ministerie van Maatschappelijk Werk*) and its successor, the Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work (*Ministerie van Culture, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk*), the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (*Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid*), and the Ministry of Justice and in particular its department on Alien Affairs and Border Control (*Ministerie van Justitie: Vreemdelingenzaken en Grensbewaking*). During this time I learned of other bodies whose archives were also available at the same location. These included the Committee of Coordination for Repatriates (*Coördinatie-Commissie voor Gerepatrieerden*) and the Committee for National Action Supporting for Regrettants from Indonesia (*Stichting Comité Nationale Actie Steunt Spijtoptanten Indonesië*). Via a small column in a periodical, I learned about the exception to the transitional rules for the AOW (see 6.4). With help from archivist Erik Mul, I delved further into this topic by consulting archives like those of the Cabinet of the Queen (*Kabinet der Koningin*) and of the Dutch Senate (*Eerste Kamer der Staten-Generaal*). These were delivered as scans in April 2021. I consulted the archives of the Council for Indonesian Matters (*Raad voor Aangelegenheden met Indonesië*, RAVI) to read the original Werner report. I also requested and obtained permission from the Protestant Church to consult the archives of the Central Committee of Religious and Private Initiative for Repatriates (*Centraal Comité van Kerkelijk en Particulier Initiatief voor Sociale Zorg ten behoeve van gerepatriëerden*, CCKP), which had emerged as a central actor in the reception of repatriates. These archives are in the Utrecht Archives (*Het Utrechts Archief*, NL-UtA), which I visited in August 2021.

The French national archives (*Les Archives Nationales*) have several locations. The Pierrefitte-sur-Seine site (PaAN) contains records of the French state after the revolution. I visited this site from November 2021 to April 2022, starting with the archives of Charles de Gaulle, which contained a large report prepared for De Gaulle detailing everything that the state had done in repatriates' favour. I continued in the collections of the Ministry of Public Health and Population (*Ministère de la Santé Publique et de la Population*) and the Ministry of the Interior (*Ministère de l'Intérieur*). As in the Dutch case, when I learned of new agencies I pursued those leads as well. This led me to the archives of, for example, the National Committee for Muslim French (*Comité national pour les musulmans Français*) and the Reception and Reclassification Service for French People from Indochina and Muslim French (*Service d'accueil et de reclassement des Français d'Indochine et des Français musulmans*).

151 Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, 49.

Up until 1962, Algeria was a department of France. Therefore archives relating to its governance are in the national archives of overseas France (*Archives Nationales d'Outre-mer*, AixAN), located in Aix-en-Provence. I visited these in February 2022 to consult the archives relating to the harmonisation of social security legislation between France and Algeria, located in the archives of the Minister of Algerian Affairs. In May 2023, I returned to France to answer several outstanding questions, for example about the financing structure and activities of the Social Assistance Fund, and to explore a lead regarding the involvement of social security institutions in social assistance-like activities. This brought me to the archives of the General Control of Social Security (*Contrôle général de la sécurité sociale*) and the Ministry of Labour (*Travail et Sécurité sociale*), both housed at the Pierrefitte-sur-Seine site. Finally, having read references to a report penned by Pierre Laroque on Algerian labour migrants in the 1930s, I requested and received access to consult it at the private archives of Julien Charles-André at Sciences Po Centre d'Histoire, Paris (PaSP).

In the UK, I visited the National Archives in Richmond, London (UK-LoNA) in the summer of 2022. I consulted archives relating to "Commonwealth immigrants," as (post) colonial migrant from the Caribbean, India and Pakistan were known in the archival record, stored in the archives of the Colonial Office, Home Office and the Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance. I also read the original version of the Beveridge report.

During analysis, it became obvious that local or municipal governments were key sites at which decisions about inclusion and exclusion took place, particularly in the implementation of social assistance in France and the Netherlands. In April 2023, I therefore returned to collect data from the archives of three different municipalities in the Netherlands: Utrecht, Rotterdam (*Stadsarchief Rotterdam*, NL-StRo) and The Hague (*Haags Gemeentearchief,* NL-HaHG). In May 2023, I returned to France to consult the archives of the department Bouches-du-Rhône (FR-MaAD) which includes Marseille, the city through which well over half of the Algerian repatriates who arrived in 1962 passed.[152]

In general, these collections contained correspondence (mainly letters, with an occasional telegraph, and often between ministries), draft legislation, meeting minutes or financial records of specific committees, records of applicants to a vacancy or a programme, and many reports. My sources are cited transparently and carefully, using the reference codes cited above for each archive and inventory number. This permits "the kind of double-checking" that "the most stringent rules of scientific investigation" require.[153] The archives supplied key historical details about context, clued me in to which actors mattered for which event, and, when read as 'daily practices' of these actors, offered an entry point into their reality.

The appearance and availability of material across cases shaped the structure and focus of my analysis. For example, I found evidence of discrimination in UK sources that I did not find elsewhere; therefore, discrimination features prominently in my analysis of the UK case but not in the Dutch and French cases. Similarly, the coordination of social insurance between metropolitan France and Algerian France received more attention in the archives than did any comparable efforts at coordination between The Netherlands and Indonesia. This is also

152 "Marseille, 1962 : Le Cauchemar Des Rapatriés d'Algérie," *L'Obs*, July 6, 2012.
153 Hill, *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, 71.

because, during the period under study, Algeria was an integral part of France, while Indonesia acquired independence much earlier. These asymmetries are completely compatible with my methodology, which explores contrasts without expecting to hold any historical detail constant.

3.4.2. Other sources: statistics, legislation and parliamentary debates

Drawing inspiration from Fox, who analyses census and relief spending data alongside archives,[154] I occasionally consulted other sources to glean insight into the material conditions and constraints in which historical actors made their decisions. I also needed to access formal legislative acts, since it was sometimes unclear which version of a draft in an archival collection had been passed and implemented and which had not. Edited transcripts of parliamentary debates were helpful when the politics behind a given policy move were unclear. I also used newspaper articles sporadically, to get a sense of how an event was discussed in the mainstream media.

In the Netherlands, welfare spending data is available from the Central Bureau of Statistics, which has digitised five million hand-written and printed pages from the 1800s up until 2000 and made them available online (cbs.nl/historisch). Population censuses are digitised and provide extensive demographic and socio-economic information for the time period in question. I looked at the 12th general population census (31 May 1947), housing, occupation and commuting census (30 June 1956), and the 13th general population census (13 May 1960). All are available on the Data Archiving and Networked Services (DANS) of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) and the Dutch Research Council (NWO) (easy.dans.knaw.nl). Meanwhile, a government-run website (officielebekendmakingen.nl) keeps a record of the *Staatsblad*, the journal which publishes laws and regulation, and parliamentary records. Finally, the Royal Library (*Koninklijke Bibliotheek*) has digitised Dutch newspapers, magazines and radio bulletins from as early as the 17th century (delpher.nl).

In France, comparable statistics are available at the website of the Digital Library of Public Statistics (*Bibliothèque Numérique de la Statistique Publique,* bnsp.insee.fr). This includes population censuses, which were carried out every six to eight years from 1946 to 2004 by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (*L'Institut national de la astatistique et des études économiques,* INSEE). I consulted the general census from 10 March 1946, 1954, and 1962. Meanwhile, the official journal (*Journal Official de la République Française*) is available at Gallica, the digital database of the National Library of France (*Bibliothèque nationale de France;* gallica.bnf.fr). Gallica has also digitised old journals and media outlets. Finally, the period in which I am interested covers both the Fourth (1946-1958) and the Fifth Republic (1958- present day). Complete summaries of National Assembly debates during the Fourth and Fifth Republic are available online (4e.republique.jo-an.fr and archives.assemblee-nationale.fr respectively). Reports of debates in the upper house, of the Fourth Republic (*Conseil de la République*) and of the Fifth (*le Sénat*), are both available on the current website of the Senate (www.senat.fr/seances/seances.html).

154 Fox, *Three Worlds of Relief.*

In the UK, the Hansard is the official record of parliamentary debates, speeches, questions, and answers of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. It is available on the website of the UK Parliament (hansard.parliament.uk). London, Edinburgh and Belfast Gazettes publish legislative acts. Those which were either wholly or partly in force in 1988 are available on the Legislation.gov.uk, which is managed by the National Archives on behalf of the government. This included the three key Commonwealth Immigrants Acts of 1962, 1968 and 1971. Census-taking - which gained popularity after demographic Thomas Malthus published an essay about population growth in 1798 - has taken place every ten years except in 1941 since 1801. The records for the 1951 and 1961 census are available in the library at the Office for National Statistics headquarters in London. Meanwhile, collaboration between British Library and Findmypast has made historical newspaper collections available on the British Newspaper Archive (britishnewspaperarchive.co.uk).

3.5. Nomenclature

3.5.1. Key considerations

In 3.2.4, I explained that I studied group-level contrasts without assuming ex ante the existence of groups. This is challenging: terminology typically implies the existence of something. It is in this sense that Mignolo credits Mahan with "inventing" the Middle East: "there was no Middle East before the name was invented and got us used to 'seeing' that a region existed…"[155] So is it with references to second-generation migrants, which too often creates a category of second-class citizens by lending credence to the idea that migrant status can be passed down across generations, and that national membership has ethnic meaning. Even more, Dahinden argues that the category *migrant* is loaded as it emerged in tandem with the nation-state's project of boundary-making, and with the idea that mobility is abnormal rather than normal.[156]

Dahinden advises that scholars facing this dilemma distinguish between *analytical* and *common-sense* categories. While common-sense categories are used by actors in their day-to-day lives, including to discriminate among each other, analytical categories are used to shed light on social processes. Common-sense categories usually address group boundaries in a "quasi-natural way."[157] For example, in Europe nations were for a long time "facts of nature," representing basic divisions of the human species, not products of complex political processes.[158] When researchers conflate common-sense and analytical categories, Dahinden argues, they risk naturalising the boundaries implied by common-sense categories, reproducing the social inequalities that they engender, and missing the entire internal and external processes through which the community determines these boundaries. Instead, researchers are well-served by approaching both with a critical curiosity, and subsequently choosing analytic categories that

155 Walter Mignolo, *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2021), 122.
156 Dahinden, "A Plea for the 'de-Migranticization' of Research on Migration and Integration," 2213.
157 Dahinden, 2216.
158 Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France*, 5.

illuminate rather than obscure, naturalise or take for granted the social processes through which group membership is worked out.[159]

Generating analytical categories comes with its own set of challenges. Scholars interested in decolonising the academy have emphasised that "names and classifications do not refer to *what there is* but frame what we perceive."[160] Behind each classification is a classifier, and no classifier is neutrally positioned in relation to the subject matter.[161] This matters because, as Tuhiwai Smith describes, the process of classifying has always had consequences for the lived experience of the classifier, as specific (usually European) ways of viewing, classifying, and evaluating the world come to assume dominance.[162] With this in mind, researchers must consider the categories that actors use to describe *themselves* and their relation to the rest of the world.[163] Honouring the 'right to self-determination' entails centring the voices of the communities under study and respecting their cultural and epistemological protocols.[164] Please see Appendix B for an excavation of the vocabulary used by historical state and non-state actors, contemporary observers, and (post)colonial migrants themselves.

3.5.2. Chosen nomenclature

In order to discuss the entire group to which all of these individuals belong, I originally opted for the term *imperial citizen*. However, this aligned poorly with the self-determined categories of the individuals in question (see Appendix B.3). Thereafter I was tempted by a slightly modified version of Goodfellow's term, i.e. "people ... who lived in colonies and former colonies [who] decided to make the journey to the metropole."[165] Of course, the impracticality of committing to such a lengthy designation in a dissertation is obvious. With all this in mind, I opted for *(post)colonial migrant*. It is not a wholly satisfactory term (see 1.1.3). However, the word *migrant* draws attention to the experience of mobility, even if that mobility is intra-imperial. I parenthesise the prefix of *postcolonial* since the Caribbean islands and Algeria had not yet become independent during much of the period under study. In each chapter, I trade this general designation for case-specific analytical categories. Ultimately, I opted for the nomenclature that seemed to align the closest with the self-determined categories of the groups in question. Therefore, for the most part I consider the inclusion of *Algerians, harkis,* and *pieds-noirs* in (metropolitan) France, *Caribbeans* in England, and *Indische Nederlanders* and *Moluccans* in the Dutch case.

Departing from common-sense categories presents one significant challenge for the historical researcher. Because common-sense categories appear (by definition) in the archives,

159 Dahinden, "A Plea for the 'de-Migranticization' of Research on Migration and Integration," 2214.
160 Mignolo, *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations*, 85.
161 Mignolo, 86.
162 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Zed Books, 2021), 50, https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350225282.
163 Mignolo, *The Politics of Decolonial Investigations*, 262.
164 Vivetha Thambinathan and Elizabeth Anne Kinsella, "Decolonizing Methodologies in Qualitative Research: Creating Spaces for Transformative Praxis," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2021, https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211014766.
165 Maya Goodfellow, *Hostile Environment: How Immigrants Became Scapegoats* (London, New York: Verso, 2020), 57–58.

the researcher needs to develop literacy in these categories and translate any key information they transmit about the subject in question into their new analytic categories. For example, I have chosen to translate *Ambonezen* as Moluccans in an effort to respect the diversity of the islands from which Moluccans hailed and my best estimate at self-identification. However, if a letter mentions *Ambonezen*, it is theoretically possible that the writer actually meant to refer only to those Moluccans who came from Ambon. In the face of challenges like these, I did my best to estimate the meaning of the category by identifying the speaker or author of the text in question and considering their interests and social position. Where I was not confident in my estimation, I used common-sense categories in quotes and offered my interpretation transparently. This interpretation is likely imperfect: sceptical readers are invited to return to my sources, the precise inventory numbers of which are cited fully in footnotes.

3.6. Limitations

3.6.1. Missing voices

My research has several limitations. First and foremost is a methodological limitation with ethical dimensions. I aim to evaluate the inclusion of groups to which I do not belong, which I pursued through careful analysis of the archival record along the lines outlined in this chapter. These archival traces, however, were left by public and private welfare agencies with an incentive to exaggerate their inclusive character. Although in each country case, I had exploratory conversations with at least one person whose family had migrated from the region of interest, the voices and perspectives of the individuals whose inclusion was under question were largely missing from my research. This presents both an ethical and an empirical limitation. Ethically, it affects the story that is told about the lives of these community members. This is a story that they have a right to tell for themselves. Although trying to respect the cultural and epistemological vocabularies of your research subjects is important, it is no replacement for their participation and leadership in the research design, analysis and write-up. Tuhwai Smith suggests that researchers who are not from a given community should, when their research is intimately related to these communities, work with them to determine their research needs and priorities and hold themselves accountable to outcomes for these communities.[166] From an empirical perspective, evaluating inclusion is incomplete without the *experience* of the groups whose inclusion is in question. They will not have the same incentive to exaggerate the care that they received, and they will have more intimate knowledge about how welfare officials used their discretion than policymakers do. The risk therefore is that I have engaged in what Shilliam calls a form of "sympathetic ventriloquism."[167]

However, time constraints prevented the collection of data from both archival sources and interviews. My main interest was in how state and non-state agents imagined and reconciled complementary and competing cross-pressures, such as the demand for welfare generosity and the need for solidarity, in the negotiation of redistributive boundaries. Boundary-making

166 Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 249.
167 Shilliam, *Race and the Undeserving Poor: From Abolition to Brexit*, 5.

is a macro-level process that played out in policy circles and at the street level, making the perspective of state officials particularly important for understanding its causes. The preferences, resistance, and interpretations of the migrants themselves no doubt also contributed to the boundary-making process in ways that I did not capture. Future research building on the foundations that my research lays in order to integrate these voices would make an invaluable contribution to our growing body of knowledge about the context-specific ways in which solidarity is created.

3.6.2. Controlled comparison

A second set of limitations relate to the relative strength and reliability of my inferences as a result of having conducted "imperfect" comparisons. The migrations in question take place at different times, with relative peaks in migration occurring in 1951 (in the Netherlands), 1958 (in the UK), and 1962 (in France). Additionally, while whiteness is a relative social position rather than a fixed attribute of any given group, France and the Netherlands welcomed far more migrants whose whiteness was broadly recognised compared to the UK, who largely saw white migration in the opposite direction as hundreds of millions emigrated to its self-governing "Dominion" settler colonies throughout the twentieth century. Finally, the motivation for migration differed across groups, as the French and the British case deal with labour migration, while the French and the Dutch cases deal more with refugees.

For these reasons, there may be concerns about the comparability of the cases I selected. As I described in 3.3, my project does not rely on Mill's methods of induction for its inferential power. Rather, I was interested in how common social processes and dynamics played out in contrasting contexts. Nonetheless, positivist researchers would view this as a limitation, and I can certainly recognise the potential epistemic gains from a more targeted positivist inquiry into cases with more similarities. In particular, the mass exodus of British citizens with Asian origins from Kenya in the mid-1960s could be explored alongside the case of Algerian repatriates, as they are more temporally proximate and both concern refugees. This would be a valuable use of resources which I have left for future researchers.

3.6.3. Generalisability

Positivist-minded readers will be interested in whether the results emerging out of this kind of inquiry are generalisable. Generalisability relates to the extension of research results based on a study of particular individuals, settings, times or institutions, to other individuals, settings, times or institutions.[168] For the positivist researcher, controlled comparisons are important because they allow specific variables to be isolated. Specific variables then form the basis for generalisations, which are delineated by careful attention to the context in which the research was carried out. In a similar enough context, the variable might have the same independent effect that was recorded in the research.

168 Joseph A Maxwell and Margaret Chmiel, "Generalization in and from Qualitative Analysis," in *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, ed Uwe Flick (London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2013).

Interpretive researchers tend to have the opposite concern - whether the results are sufficiently contextualised so as to be locally embedded.[169] Broadly speaking, historical-interpretivists are more intent both to highlight the contingency and context-specificity of any causal mechanisms,[170] and to highlight that any mechanism is "parasitic upon human practices" and beliefs.[171] Foucault, for example, developed new or majorly revised theoretical instruments for each new intellectual project and for each phenomenon he sought to explain.[172] All of these starting points suggest that this kind of research might not be generalisable. This is partly true, but needs nuance.

Historical-interpretivist research is compatible with the development and revision of theoretical propositions, which in turn are very capable of offering analytic leverage on new cases. In other words, *analytic* generalisation is still possible whereby the local, the concrete and the particular move to the abstract 'world of ideas.'[173] In fact, as I suggested in section 3.2.1 on *casing,* historical-interpretivists are interested in deliberating on the benefits of bringing one context into dialogue with another. The difference with positivism is that the theory to be applied in a new context never takes the form of general covering laws that are expected to hold across time and space; but rather, presents a new lens with which to view and interpret, in a curious and abductive manner, local dynamics.

In this case, my empirical findings are specific to their context, and cannot be transplanted onto different or larger populations and cases. I did not seek to uncover a universal law that would explain the relationship between diversity and solidarity across all times and places. However, the theory I build on identity, racialisation, and the consolidation of community and nation can offer suggestions of where else to look for answers. Concepts from the experience of post-war UK, France and the Netherlands can be distilled and used in a different context. With this in mind, any context in which assuring the material welfare of group members requires readjusting or determining the boundaries of the 'sphere of justice'[174] would be a site worth breaking ground. For example, the possibilities for European social citizenship and the future of the European 'denizen' in the context of EU enlargement comes to mind.[175]

---

169 Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, *Interpretive Research Design*, 47.

170 Blatter and Blume, "In Search of Co-Variance, Causal Mechanisms or Congruence? Towards a Plural Understanding of Case Studies," 339.

171 Glynos and Howarth, *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Science*, 97.

172 This is partly why his trajectory of thought can be so difficult to follow; David Garland, "What Is a '"History of the Present"'? On Foucault's Genealogies and Their Critical Preconditions," *Punishment & Society* 16, no 4 (2014): 366, https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1177/1462474514541711.

173 Denise F Polit and Cheryl Tatano Beck, "Generalization in Quantitative and Qualitative Research: Myths and Strategies," *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 47 (2010): 1451–58.

174 Walzer, *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*.

175 Ferrera, *The Boundaries of Welfare: European Integration and the New Spatial Politics of Social Protection*; Hammar, "State, Nation, and Dual Citizenship."