



Country Report on The Netherlands
(written for cluster C9)

**POLICYMAKING RELATED TO IMMIGRATION AND
INTEGRATION:
A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE OF THE DUTCH CASE**

Rinus Penninx (IMES)
Blanca Garcés-Mascreñas (IMES)
Peter Scholten (University of Twente)

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of immigration and integration of immigrants into the Netherlands is relatively recent: some early pioneers published in the 1970s (Verwey-Jonker 1971, van Amersfoort 1974, Heijke 1979, Bovenkerk 1978, Entzinger 1975, Groenendijk 1979, and van Praag 1971) but the expansive growth of this literature took place in the 1980s, following the beginnings of the new 'Ethnic Minorities Policies' (Ministerie van BiZA 1980, 1981, 1983). That growth did not stop in the 1990s: new specialisms were developed, research institutes at Dutch universities were established (ISEO, ERCOMER, IMES) and more diverse funding became available.

The result of these developments is that by 2004 the literature in this field is abundant, most of it written in Dutch, but in recent years, as international comparative research is gaining weight, also in English. Hundreds of researchers, and not only those employed by specialised research institutes, are involved in this area of research and their work covers more and more specialised topics.

A substantial part of that literature relates to policy making, in the sense that it 'advises' policy makers or evaluates the policy implementation and its effects at the national or local level. The more well known of these are the reports of scientific advisory committees, such as the Advisory Committee on Research relating to Ethnic Minorities (ACOM 1979, 1982), the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR 1979, 1989, 2001), the Temporary Advisory Committee on Minorities (TWCM) and the Parliamentary Inquiry Committee (Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid 2004). But also individual scientists have produced PhD-theses and comprehensive monographs on Dutch immigration and integration policies in the course of time (Van Amersfoort 1974/1982, Entzinger 1984, Penninx 1988, Rath 1991, Lucassen/Penninx 1994/1997). There is thus again an abundant literature that describes the content of immigration and integration policies and its development in the course of time, in general and in its sub-domains.

Remarkably, however, there is only a relatively modest part of that literature that analyses *the making of policies* itself: that is analyses, not of the content of policies *per se*, but of the process that has led to these policies, the actors involved and the levels at which they are made. This relates to the fact that scientists from the political and administrative sciences started to address questions around the processes of policy making in these fields rather late. The first publication of a group of political scientists (of the University of Amsterdam) on immigration and integration policies was the one edited by Rob Hoppe in 1987 under the title *Etniciteit, Politiek en Beleid in Nederland* (Ethnicity, Politics and Policy in the Netherlands).

In this review of the Dutch literature we will focus on research that explicitly studies the process of policymaking in one way or another. Stating such an intention leads immediately to problems of delineation. First of all, although many of the studies that focus primarily on content of policies also contain incidental observations on the political context, actors and elements of the process of policymaking, we have decided not to include these studies in this overview. Instead we will outline in paragraph 2 some of the general features of the Dutch policymaking context as a general background for the reader. Secondly, there is the problem of how studies of policymaking processes are done. In the foregoing paragraph it is suggested that the study of such processes is the special field of political and administrative sciences. Although this discipline has developed during the last decades systematic theoretical and methodological approaches

for such studies, other disciplines –such as History, Sociology (of law) or Anthropology– have also made significant contributions. Such studies will also be included in this review.

In order to make the existing literature speak as much as possible for itself, we will review the studies in paragraph 3 according to the special topics they cover: first studies that examine (specific parts of) immigration and admission policies, secondly studies that analyse (aspects of) integration policies, thirdly studies that focus on specific actors and finally studies that concentrate on specific phenomena. In the final paragraph we will draw some conclusions.

2. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE CONTEXT OF POLICYMAKING IN THE NETHERLANDS.

There are several traits that can be considered typical or specific to immigrant policy and the context of policy-making in the Netherlands. These traits can be identified by cross-national comparison, from the 'outside', or from the 'inside' with the knowledge of hindsight. We will highlight the most important ones.

2.1. Reluctant immigration country and early integration policies

Historically, the Netherlands has been a country of immigration for a long time until about the late 18th century (1550-1800). Since 1800 until the 1960s, the Netherlands developed into a country of emigration. After WW II, the Netherlands faced considerable levels of immigration of diverse origin: from its former colonies, labour migration and more recently asylum migration. Continuous net immigration figures made it factually once more a country of immigration since 1967 (Lucassen & Penninx 1997). These facts, however, did not match the perception and the norm. Like in other Western European countries, there was a powerful norm that the Netherlands should not be an immigration country. Immigrant residence was to be temporary because the Netherlands regarded itself as overpopulated. That is why most of the factual immigrants were regarded to be temporarily in the Netherlands, e.g. as 'guest workers'.

This created a tension between the norm of not being a country of immigration and the fact of increasing immigration and permanent immigrant residence in the post-war period (Entzinger 1975). This tension expressed itself most dramatically in a series of terrorist acts in the 1970s (a school-kidnapping, two train hijackings) by youngsters from one particular immigrant group, the Moluccans. This small group of ex-soldiers from the colonial army in the former Dutch East Indies had arrived in the Netherlands in 1951 and by then been 'temporarily' for about 25 years. These acts served as focus-events, drawing attention to their position in the Netherlands and setting in motion a policy revision (Köbben 1979). Eventually, this policy revision led to the recognition of permanent residence of particular immigrant groups and consequently to a policy aimed at the integration of these groups in the early 1980s: the 'Ethnic Minorities Policy'. After Sweden (mid 1970s), the Netherlands was hereby one of the first Western-European countries to develop such an integration policy.

However, this shift of policy towards integration did not imply that the permanency of immigration as such was recognized. Indeed, the immigration of immigrant groups was seen as a historically unique event and further immigration was to be restricted or prevented. It took until the early 1990s that this assumption shifted somewhat and policies started to reckon with permanent immigration as well as permanent immigrant residence. Following a study from the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR 1989), the government started to develop a policy for the reception and civic integration of a continuous flux of newcomers, which eventually resulted in the Law on the Civic Integration of Newcomers (1998). All newcomers were now to follow civic integration programs, containing courses in Dutch language and orientation on Dutch society. Nevertheless, until today the Netherlands is still a

‘reluctant’ country of immigration, and the observation that immigration is permanent is still surrounded by public and political controversy.

Ever since the recognition of the need for integration policy in the early 1980s, the Netherlands has been struggling to find the right policy. Several policy approaches have come and gone over the past decades. In the 1980s, the ‘Ethnic Minorities Policy’ tended toward a multiculturalist approach *avant la lettre*, focusing on ‘ethnic’ or ‘cultural minorities’ as collectives, promoting socio-economic participation and combating discrimination as well as supporting group emancipation of minority groups (Minorities Memorandum, Ministerie van BiZa 1983). While focusing on integration in Dutch society instead of in an eventual return to the countries of origin, this policy still left considerable leeway for immigrant cultural identities. At the beginning of the 1990s, there was a distinct change in policy focus and policy goals. In a renewed ‘Integration Policy’, a more citizenship oriented (or ‘republicanist’) approach was adopted, focusing on ‘good citizenship’ of individual immigrants (Contours Memorandum, Ministerie van BiZa 1994). The main policy goals were now to promote equal participation of immigrants in the socio-economic sphere, housing, education and labour, and to facilitate the initial integration of newcomers by providing civic integration courses. A new ‘turning point’ is signalled in Dutch integration policy by Entzinger (2003) after the turn of the millennium. He finds a growing emphasis on communitarian values in relation to immigrant integration demanding a greater extent of adaptation to Dutch norms and values. In terms of official government policy, this has led to the formulation of an ‘Integration Policy New Style’ (Ministerie van Justitie, 2003). Instead of focusing on ‘good citizenship’, the goal of this Integration Policy New Style would be to promote ‘common citizenship’, or a sort of citizenship based on common norms and values.

2.2. A top-down, centrally organized policy

Apart from the content of policies described above, their form and institutional organisation also have some specific characteristics. First of all, integration policies started in the early 1980s as a national policy to be implemented top-down. Although cities and local authorities have been brought into play in the course of time and have taken on important functions in implementing policies, integration policies have mainly been a national matter.

Secondly, integration policies have been regarded from the beginning as comprehensive, thus involving practically all governmental services and in need of a strong central coordination. This central coordination point was located within the Ministry of Home Affairs. In order to maintain the unitary character of policy, the Department for the Coordination of Integration of Minorities implemented both the horizontal coordination across the various ministries involved and the vertical coordination across the national and local levels of government.

The top-down structure of policy and the central coordination of it was not without problems. Although the Ministry of Home Affairs is a relatively powerful department, it proved difficult to instigate the various departments to implement parts of the centrally coordinated integration policy (Molleman 2003). In addition, the formulation of an integration policy on the national level had to be followed by a top-down translation of policy into local integration policies. In the 1980s (see e.g. Ministerie van BiZa 1983) and especially the 1990s, many cities effectively established

their local integration policies. However, at moments this translation proved very difficult (Scholten & Snel 2005). Local policy practices, once established, were often very resistant to change 'from above'. Moreover, as many problems of integration are manifested most clearly at the local level, local governments often developed their own strategies and agendas for coping with integration problems, which has occasionally led to conflicts between national and local governments. However, in spite of these problems, a consensus has remained until today about the need for a centrally coordinated, unitary integration policy.

In the European context this Dutch (and Swedish) pattern is exceptional. A more usual pattern has been that the European cities have formulated at some point in time explicit and pro-active integration policies, often in the absence of national policies, using their own instruments and resources and thereby making pressure for such national policies (see Penninx *et al.* 2004).

2.3. Political support: from depoliticisation to polarisation

The new Ethnic Minorities Policy of the early 1980s received wide support. A broad political consensus among the elite of all political parties endorsed the new policy developments. That consensus was symbolized by the fact that a right wing Liberal/Christian-Democratic government coalition appointed a socialist (of the oppositional Labour Party) as head of the Coordination Department within the Ministry of Home Affairs.

This consensus did not mean that there were no diverging conceptions about integration (see also Fermin in 3.2). Such diverging conceptions, however, were at that time not explicitly played out. Conflict avoidance and depoliticization were dominant in this domain (De Beus 1998). When in the early 1980s, several extreme-right parties had managed to enter local and national political arenas, this tendency of avoidance and depoliticisation also led to a 'cordon sanitaire' against extreme-right parties that wanted to 'play the race card'. Immigrant integration was considered an issue 'too hot to handle' for politics and therefore banned from the political arena by a political taboo (Vuijsje 1986) or a gentlemen's agreement among the main political parties not to raise the immigrant issue. Issues of immigration and immigrant integration were rather resolved through technocratic compromise (Rath 2001), resorting to science-based policy advice as a motor of policy development, or by co-opting ethnic elites (Guiraudon 1998), or involving ethnic leaders in special advisory bodies to ensure a broad consensus.

Especially during the 1980s, immigration and integration issues were effectively depoliticised, providing stability to the Ethnic Minorities Policy. However, in the early 1990s, the public and political debate opened up. One of the major triggers was a speech by Frits Bolkestein, then the leader of the Liberal Party and of the opposition in Dutch parliament. He suggested that Islam was a threat to liberal-democracy and a hindrance for integration of immigrants and that immigrant integration should be handled with more courage. Such a new framing awoke a 'silent majority' that was weary of multiculturalism but did not have the courage to speak out until then (Entzinger 2003). In response, political parties started to take more explicit positions on this policy issue, breaking with the politics of avoidance. A discourse of 'New Realism' (Prins 1997) emerged which tried to break with 'taboos' and engage in debate and confrontation with immigrants 'as a signal that they are taken seriously'.

At the beginning of the 21st century, an unprecedented politicisation of this policy area took place. This was partly a consequence of a series of international and national events and developments that triggered attention to immigrant integration. Internationally, the attacks of 11th September 2001 in the United States and 11th March 2004 in Madrid, and the War on Terrorism had their effect on the national debate on Muslim immigrants. Nationally, a series of events further heated the debate on immigrant integration. Already in 2000, a national debate emerged on what was labelled the 'Multicultural Disaster' (Scheffer 2000) and the so-called failure of integration policies. In 2001, there was much indignation about the statements of a Moroccan imam (El-Moumni) on homosexuals. These different elements of dissatisfaction and fear were skilfully brought together in a populist political vision by Pim Fortuyn in 2001 and 2002. He made strong statements about the failure of integration and about Islam in particular (calling Islam a 'backward' culture). Fortuyn was murdered, just before the parliamentary elections of May 2002. His newly established LPF-party, however, won a landslide victory, gaining 26 out of the 150 seats in parliament. The new government coalition including the LPF was short lived (less than 100 days) and the LPF was reduced to only 8 seats in the new elections of early 2003. However, the consequences have lasted till today. Other political parties have to a large extent taken over the issues of immigration and integration in their political programmes and a 'new integration policy' has been led by a special minister for immigration and integration of the Liberal Party, Rita Verdonk.

In 2004, the popular film maker Theo van Gogh was murdered by an Islamic fundamentalist, and a parliamentarian of Muslim origin, Ayaan Hirsi Ali, was threatened because they had made a short film that was felt to be insulting to Islam. These international and national events have turned immigrant integration from a depoliticised issue to one of the most politicised policy issues of this moment.

2.4. The research-policy nexus

A corollary of the initial de-politicisation was the strong call of politicians and policy makers on science-based policy advice for policy development. Scientific research provided an important venue for policy development outside the political arena and hence avoided politicisation. This explains why, especially from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s, there was a strongly institutionalised research-policy nexus. In 1979, a report from the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR 1979) provided an important impetus for the development of the Minorities Policy in the 1980s. Its analyses, conclusions and recommendations had a very direct and substantial effect on form and content of the Minorities Policy. In fact, it was in a Reply Memorandum (Ministerie van BiZa 1980) to this policy advice that the government for the first time elaborated the contours of a Dutch integration policy. In the early 1990s, a second report from the WRR (Immigrant Policy, WRR 1989) also played an important role in the changes in the integration policy. In 2001, the WRR issued a third report on immigrant policy (The Netherlands as Immigration Society, WRR 2001) but thus far its impact has been limited. In addition, the Social and Cultural Planning Office (SCP) has been publishing biannual Minority Reports since 1986, which not only provide data on the social position of immigrants, but to a certain extent also contain policy advice and at some moments have played an important role in focusing public and political attention to issues of immigrant integration (see e.g. SCP 2001a and b).

Another aspect of the research-policy nexus is that the government has played an important role in stimulating and coordinating research, particularly in the period 1976-1990. An Advisory Committee on Minorities Research (ACOM) was installed by the Culture Department in 1976 in order to coordinate and integrate research on ethnic or cultural minorities. The ACOM brought together the most important researchers in this area and played an important role in the coordination of research on minorities as well as in its diffusion to policy-makers. After the ACOM was discontinued in 1990, a Temporary Scientific Advisory Committee on Minorities (TWCM) filled in the void from 1992 to 1996. However, the TWCM did not coordinate research but brought together experts and policymakers in a forum that should use existing scientific research for policymaking (Penninx, 2005).

In recent years this research-policy nexus has become severely criticised. A parliamentary research committee (Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid 2004), established in 2003 to evaluate the integration policy, commissioned an extensive study from a research institute, the Verwey-Jonker Institute. Related to this study, severe criticism emerged, first from a member within the parliamentary committee itself and from several prominent politicians, and later on also from the press (Sommer 2002) and the public. The allegation was essentially that the researchers concerned had been too closely involved in policymaking before to be able to evaluate that policy adequately. They were supposed to be biased towards a particular policy perspective, especially the multiculturalist perspective. This criticism seems to be indicative of a larger trend of de-institutionalisation of the research-policy nexus over the last five to ten years.

The research-policy nexus has become more fragmented or loosely organized, populated by various bodies such as Knowledge Centre for Urban Policies, the Advisory Committee on Aliens Affairs, the Council for Social Development, the Social and Cultural Planning Office, the Central Planning Bureau. The influence of these bodies appears to be limited in comparison to the influence of the WRR and the ACOM in the 1970s and 1980s. Politicians and policymakers follow a 'pick and choose' strategy selecting or ignoring research that fits their political-ideological stances (Penninx 2005). For example, a report from the Scientific Council for Government Policy in 2001 had very limited influence on policy (in sharp contrast to its two earlier reports), whereas the 2003 edition of the biannual Minorities Report from the Social and Cultural Planning Office did have significant influence on the policy changes of the last few years.

2.5. Co-optation of ethnic elites

A final specific characteristic of Dutch policymaking is the co-optation of ethnic elites (Guiraudon 1998). Until the 1970s the interests of immigrant groups were mainly represented by organizations that acted on their behalf: general welfare-organizations or organizations that were especially interested in immigrants, such as churches. However, since the beginning of the Ethnic Minorities Policy in the 1980s immigrant groups were ideally represented by organizations from their own groups, the so-called minority organizations. At some moments, these organizations had a considerable say in policy development. For example, the Draft Minorities Memorandum (Ministerie van BiZa

1981) was subjected to a round of consultation with, among others, minority organizations and welfare organizations, before being finalized in 1983 (Urbanus 1983).

In 1985, a National Advisory and Consultation Body (LAO) was established in which the most important minority organizations were represented. The LAO was to advise government on issues of immigrant integration and to be consulted in the context of administrative issues related to the integration policy. In 1997, the LAO was replaced by the LOM, the National Consultation Body for Minorities. This meant that its advisory function was restricted whereas its role changed into that of a consultative body. More and more, the function of minority organizations seems to change into providing an access point for consultation in the case of events such as the Rushdie affair, 11th September and the statements of El-Moumni (Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid 2004: 516).

This habit of consultation and negotiation with representatives of minority groups seems to be a remainder of the Dutch tradition of pillarism. Until about the 1960s, most of Dutch society was structured according to four – mainly religious – pillars with their own identities and their own organizations. Politics and policy-making in this pillarized society was mostly an issue of negotiation between the elites of the various pillars. The system of representation and consultation of ethnic elites appears to be a typical Dutch reflex to societal cleavages, although there is no historical continuity: the de-pillarization of society had already taken place in the course of the 1960s well before the establishment of the integration policy.

Parallel to this specific institutional interface there is another way in which immigrants have been included in the political system. As one of the first countries in Europe, immigrants who had stayed in the Netherlands for at least five years were granted the right to vote and to be elected on the local level in 1985. This led to a significant representation of local politicians of immigrant origin in the larger cities. In addition, possibilities for naturalisation were expanded in the 1980s, for example by broadening the cases in which dual nationality was allowed for. This has resulted not only in a relatively large number of naturalisations, but indirectly also to a substantial representation of MP's of immigrant origin in the Dutch national parliament.

3. SPECIFIC STUDIES ON THE MAKING OF POLICIES

3.1. Policy studies in the field of immigration and admission

A quick overview of research about policymaking *per se* shows that very little has been published in the field of immigration and admission policies in the Netherlands. Moreover, the few studies in this area have not necessarily been done primarily as immigration studies. Sometimes they have focused on (part of) immigration policies from a completely different perspective. The result is a very fragmentary set of researches that gives important insights but fails in capturing the whole issue. In the following paragraphs we will present the most important literature in this field. Again our goal is not to give a comprehensive overview on what has been done on immigration and admission policies in the Netherlands but rather to present those studies that have empirically and systematically researched elements of the policymaking and/or implementation process.

One of the first analyses on immigration policies in the Netherlands is Ringeling's PhD-thesis (1978) *Beleidsvrijheid van ambtenaren. Het spijtoptantenprobleem als illustratie van de activiteiten van ambtenaren bij de uitvoering van beleid*. In this study admission policies for a specific group are approached from the viewpoint of public administration. Ringeling's goal is not to consider migration policies as such but his central question is what the role of discretionary power of civil servants is in implementing a policy. With this aim he examines the Dutch policy towards "option regretters" (*spijtoptanten*) in the period between 1956 and 1968. "Option regretters" were inhabitants of Indonesia who had opted for the Indonesian nationality in 1949-1951, after Indonesia had become independent. At that moment the Netherlands allowed the so-called 'repatriates', in their majority Indische Nederlanders or Indo-Dutch of mixed Indonesian-Dutch descent, to come to the Netherlands on the basis of their Dutch citizenship. The deterioration of the relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands together with economic and social frustrations led some of those who had opted for the Indonesian nationality to regret their choice and ask the Dutch government to be admitted into the Netherlands. Although in the beginning a cautious attitude was adopted towards the claim of the "option regretters", the requests for admission were gradually considered more leniently as a result of shifting interpretations of the rules. This was possible partially due to the unclear basis of the policy and the monopolistic position of the implementing organisation. In this regard, the policy was changed although the instructions remained the same. At the end, Ringeling concludes that a certain amount of discretion is desirable because it enables officials to adapt the policy to individual cases and to achieve a balance between the requirements ensuing from the policy programme and the needs of the clients. At the same time, it is suggested that discretionary power should be curtailed by the requirement of legal security of the citizens concerned and the democratic checking of implementation decisions.

A comparable study focussing on discretionary power of policy implementers is Groenendaal's PhD-thesis (1986) *Dilemma's van regelgeving; de regularisatie van illegale buitenlandse werknemers 1975-1985* in which he analyses the so-called regularisation of illegal migrants in the Netherlands from 1975 to 1985. Groenendaal examines the dilemma which policy makers face when formulating a measure by which

certain rights and benefits are to be allocated: should the measure benefit those who in the opinion of the conceivers or of their superiors have (the most) rights to profit from it, or should the organisational and financial possibilities available at that moment be prioritized? Taking this dilemma into account, regulation appears to offer policymakers a check on the nature and size of the allocation both in terms of justice and controllability. Secondly, the author deals with the effects of regulation on the officials who have to implement it. Discussing the factors that affected application of the regularisation measure, it is shown that the manner in which the regularisation was accomplished varied. This implies that the use of substantive norms and instructions does not automatically lead to a consistent and controlled application of rules. Thirdly, Groenendael considers the external control on a policy measure and in particular the significance of regulation in this respect. The control on the regularisation was done by both testing the policy itself and questioning decisions based upon it. Finally, the author wonders whether socially underprivileged groups are helped if governments implement the allocation of rights and benefits by means of detailed substantive criteria and instructions. Like Ringeling, Groenendael concludes that a policy carried out by discretion seems to be more advantageous for them as more attention can be given to the individual and circumstantial aspects of their case.

Focusing directly on the policymaking process, Ten Doesschate's PhD-thesis (1993) *Asielbeleid en belangen. Het Nederlandse toelatingsbeleid ten aanzien van vluchtelingen in de jaren 1968-1982* examines the factors that determined refugee admission policies and their relative influence from 1968 to 1982. His research focuses particularly on the role of six factors: external relations, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the labour market, integration opportunities, law and interest organisations for refugees. After describing and analysing the juridical bases of admission policies and their implementation, the author stresses two main conclusions. On the one hand, not all factors have unambiguously worked in one direction. In fact only three out of the six factors worked exclusively in a liberal or restrictive manner: while interest organisations and the UNHCR urged constantly for more generous admission policies, the integration opportunities were always used as an argument to urge for restrictive policies. On the other hand, the relative influence of the factors changed over time. In this regard the year 1976 was an important turning point for the relative meaning of the factors: while before 1976 the external relations and the labour market were of decisive influence, after 1976 law -in the meaning of legal regulations and judicial sentences- became the central factor for the direction of policies.

From a long-term perspective, Leenders' PhD-thesis (1993) *Ongenode gasten. Van traditioneel asielrecht naar immigratiebeleid* also focuses on the factors that have affected immigration policies. However, rather than analysing the role of different factors/actors in determining one kind of immigration policy in a specific period of time, she focuses on the effects that the growth of the nation state has had on the progressive definition and enforcement of immigration policies in general. The question that articulates her research is why foreigner and refugee policies in the Netherlands between 1815 and 1938 changed so drastically. While in the beginning of the 19th century the "alien problem" appears to be marginal, in the beginning of the 20th century restrictive aliens' policies were not only formulated but also enforced. To explain this change Leenders stresses three main factors. In the first place, the problems encountered in 1938 were incomparably larger than those encountered in 1815. German-Jewish and political refugees were arriving in large numbers and this occurred during an economic recession. In the second place, the consolidation of the nation-state led to the clear

demarcation of borders: judicially, through legal specification of the grounds for Dutch citizenship and admission of aliens; economically, through adoption of measures to protect the national employment market; and politically, through accentuation of the country's position in an international framework. In the third place, the growth of the nation-state permitted a better organised bureaucracy and a more specialised, professional apparatus for the enforcement of aliens' policies.

Although immigration policies have often been analysed from legal, administrative or political perspectives, other approaches are not only possible but also essential in order to capture all their complexity. In this regard, the PhD-thesis by Schuster (1999) *Poortwachters over immigranten. Het debat over immigratie in het naoorlogse Groot-Brittannië en Nederland* stands out for its anthropological approach to postwar immigration policies in the Netherlands and Great Britain. This book is not about the legal side of immigration policies, the way in which admission regulation has been executed in practice or the technical aspects of immigration legislation. Instead it focuses on the manner in which the government has talked and argued about postwar immigration. In this regard, what Schuster examines are not the physical or legal barriers of the nation states but their symbolic and ideological borders and how these have determined who is and who is not part of the nation. This process of symbolic exclusion is analysed particularly through the processes of racialisation and sexualisation of immigrant bodies. The book pretends not only to consider how the other is defined and classified but also how through this process the limits of the nation-state are reinforced.

In recent years, the issue of migration policies has been treated by different national institutions such as the WRR (Scientific Council for Government Policy), the SER (the Socio-Economic Council), the CPB (Central Planning Bureau), the VNO-NCW (National Employers Association) and the FNV (largest Federation of Trade Unions) as well as by international institutions such as the European Union, the OECD and the World Bank. The research-policy nexus has in this case led to promote new studies on migration policies. Although these studies focus on policy rather than on the policymaking process, we want to highlight two particular researches for their possible implications (or not, which is also relevant) in the policymaking process.

In their research *A migration policy for the future. Possibilities and limitations* (Doomernik et al. 1997), requested by the Temporary Scientific Committee on Minorities Policy (TWCMP), Doomernik et al. survey the international migration literature and examine whether policy instruments developed by the Dutch state to deal with migratory developments could have broader implications for future migration policy developments. After analysing the changing context in which international migration takes place, migration policies and the factors that generate migration, the authors stress that there are two fundamental impediments which frustrate present policies: 1) the instruments of control appear to be almost exclusively legal ones and the major part of immigration to the Netherlands escapes from this control; and 2) processes of international migration start in other places and hence the government can only exercise a direct influence on a limited number of variables. The main conclusion is that migration policy is by its very nature an international matter and must therefore take shape increasingly at the international level.

On the other hand, the IMES and the Centrum voor Migratierecht van de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen were asked by the Advisory Commission for Foreigners' Affairs (ACVZ) to make a literature study *Arbeidsimmigratie naar Nederland. Regulering en demografische en economische aspecten in internationaal vergelijk* (Lange et al. 2003) to report about the state of the art in labour immigration

regulations and the debate around it. The final goal was to advise about the question whether the immigration legislation would need more differentiation in order to regulate and facilitate different forms of labour immigration. After analysing the Dutch regulations about labour migration in comparison with those in Germany, Canada, UK, Norway and Spain and covering the debate about demographic and economic aspects and brain drain, the report concludes that while the temporality of labour migration is not very useful when talking about high skilled immigrants, in the case of low skilled immigrants this temporality is easier to maintain -for example by establishing bilateral agreements with countries of origin- although their settlement cannot always be avoided.

3.2. Policy studies in the field of integration

The literature on policymaking in the field of integration is clearly dominated by studies at the national level. Moreover, in contrast to what we said for policy studies on immigration and admission, it has mainly been done within the framework of migration research and especially from the view point of political and legal (sociology of law) studies. While this has yielded a more uniform set of researches, it has also limited the scope of the approaches. In the following paragraphs, we will review the main researches on policymaking regarding naturalisation, reception of asylum seekers, minorities policies, the introduction of local voting rights and positive discrimination.

The main study on the policymaking of naturalisation policies is Heijs' book (1995) *Van vreemdeling tot Nederlanders; de verlening van het Nederlanderschap aan vreemdelingen 1813-1992*. From an historical perspective, the author characterises the development of the granting of the Dutch citizenship to foreigners by the shift from a liberal legislation since 1813 to a more restrictive legislation since WW I and then back again to a more liberal one since 1953. This process is explained in relation to the political ideals of the nation-state and equality as well as the role performed both by foreigners and the government. In relation to the first, while from 1813 to WW II most of the political debate around naturalisation was influenced by the ideal of the nation-state, since the 1950s the ideal of equality gained a major centrality. In relation to the second, Heijs points out that the increase in the number of naturalisations until the 1950s was tightly related to the interest that foreigners had in naturalisation while since then it must be understood in relation to the role of the state.

Regarding the reception of asylum seekers, Puts' research (1991) *De gefragmenteerde overheid. Interdepartementale conflicten bij de totstandkoming van de Regeling Opvang Asielzoekers* is of special interest. In this book he analyses a process of policymaking that started in 1986 and resulted in the announcement of the Regulation for Reception of Asylum Seekers (ROA) by the Minister of Welfare, Public Health and Culture in 1987. The starting point of this research is that the national government is not a monolithic but a fragmented organisation. From this perspective, Puts deals with two main questions: which positions did the implicated departments take and how can these positions be explained? And in which way were potential conflicts between departments solved? To explain the behaviour of the departments, Puts highlights the influence of ministers, interest groups, local governments, members of both parliament and congress, laws and the aspirations of the civil servants in order to make their policies controllable. Regarding the way in which conflicts were solved, he argues that the departments finally agreed on a number of compromises thanks to different decision

making rules (political and administrative as well as formal and informal forms of coordination between departments) and external factors to the interdepartmental decision making (political initiatives or the influence of the so called ‘triggers’, which are, in most of the cases, crises that show the unsustainability of particular situations).

In relation to the minorities policies, we should distinguish between research done for policy advice (reports of the Scientific Council for Government Policy) and research done on the reactions to and developments of these policies (Urbanus 1983, Fermin 1997). The first report of the Scientific Council for Government Policy, called *Ethnic Minorities* (WRR 1979), analyses the social position of and official Dutch policy towards the three largest categories of Dutch ethnic minorities: foreign workers from the Mediterranean region, Surinamese and Antillean Dutch and Moluccans. Although at first glance post-war official policy towards ethnic minorities appeared to have a lack of any common denominator, this report shows that one of the most important principles underlying Dutch policy since WWII is that the Netherlands was an over-populated country and that it could not afford to become an immigration country. To the extent that groups did come to the Netherlands, their arrival was regarded and labelled as temporary and immigration policies were largely confined to reception and follow-up assistance in the welfare sector. According to the report, this could ultimately lead to ‘minority formation’ and to second rank citizens. In consequence, it advises that immigrants should be given an adequate place in society on the basis of political participation, socio-economic equality and to a certain extent cultural and religious equity by explicit and targeted integration policies. This is – in the eyes of this first WRR report – not only to the advantage of the immigrants themselves, but a necessity for Dutch society as a whole.

The second report (WRR 1989), entitled *Immigrant Policy*, documents two important developments for the position of immigrants in Dutch society during the 1980s. First, despite a restrictive admission policy, the level of immigration had remained almost unchanged and consequently contributed towards a sharp rise in the number of immigrants in the Netherlands. Secondly, the dramatic rise in unemployment had hit the largest immigrant groups particularly severely. Three main changes are proposed: 1) the shift from a group-oriented approach towards combating deprivation to an approach focusing on individual integration. This also implies to give priority to general policies rather than target group measures; 2) the role of work rather than welfare as a precondition for immigrant integration. This leads to emphasise employment, education and adult education as the three main areas of integration policy; and 3) the use of the term immigrants rather than ethnic minorities to disassociate cultural difference from low socio-economic position.

The third report (WRR 2001), entitled *The Netherlands as immigration society*, insists that immigration is part and parcel of the contemporary Dutch society. After examining the social consequences of a permanent and relatively high level of immigration and a growing diversity of immigrants, it states that the perspective of an immigrant society calls for an effective co-ordination of government policy in the fields of immigration, integration and social state. Concretely, it proposes: 1) a proactive and differentiated admission policy covering more than just asylum migration; and 2) the need to concentrate on strengthening the individual self-reliance of all residents. This imposes demands on the immigrants on the one hand, and on the accessibility of the public and social institutions of the Dutch social state on the other.

In the field of research on minorities’ policies, one of the first studies is Urbanus’ book (1983) *Reacties op de ontwerp-Minderhedennota. Een analyse van de commentaren op de ontwerp-Minderhedennota*. This study analyses the comments and

reactions to the Draft Minorities Report (Ministerie 1981) as expressed by organisations of minority groups, church organisations, trade unions, professional social care organisations, advice councils, government departments and municipalities. The reactions are structured around three central issues (immigration as temporary or permanent phenomenon; content, function and role of cultural identity in position improvement of minority groups; and integration of immigrants in the Dutch society) and five different domains (admission policies, political participation, education, housing and welfare). To the question whether more assimilationist or pluralistic opinions are dominant for each group and in each area, Urbanus argues that many critics as well as the government itself embrace both positions. In other words, most of them do not take unilateral positions in the dilemma whether and to what extent the integration process should be open to cultural diversity and what should be the role of the state in this.

The first book that considers ethnicity, policy and minorities' policy from the perspective of political and administrative studies is the one edited by Hoppe (1987) *Etniciteit, Politiek en Beleid in Nederland*. The main question all the chapters try to answer is which are the causes and consequences of the appearance of ethnicity as a factor in the political arena. More particularly, each chapter deals with the following issues: the way in which Dutch political system has approached the ethnicity problem and shaped the Dutch minority policy (Hoppe); the political ideology of the minority policy in times of economic stagnation and downfall (Engberink); the policy and practice of political participation in the Netherlands and abroad (Klijn and Maas); the attempts to construct policies in conjunction between the national state and local governments in disadvantaged areas (Arends); and the administrative problems of the execution of policies of the local minority policy in Amsterdam (Klijn). In the first chapter (under the same title as the edited book: *Ethnicity, Politics and Policy in the Netherlands*), Hoppe develops the thesis that in the Netherlands ethnicity (concretely the growing multi-ethnicity of the state through migration) is systematically de-politicised. De-politicisation means here: removing the controversial load through (pseudo-) scientific or administrative (re)definition of problem, or keeping them away or moving them prematurely from the political agenda for administrative handling. He summarizes advantages and disadvantages of de-politicisation. Finally, Hoppe concludes that the science of policy analysis could make a meaningful contribution through "frame-reflective policy analysis".

More recently, Fermin (1997) has examined in his PhD-thesis *Nederlandse politieke partijen over minderhedenbeleid 1977-1995* the attitudes of the Dutch political parties towards multi-ethnic society and minorities' policy from 1977 to 1995. In general terms, he shows a general shift from a preference for strategies combining individual and collective integration of minorities in the 1980s to a preference for more obligatory and more limited forms of socio-economic and individual integration in the 1990s with a heavy accent on labour market participation. Regarding the main differences between parties, it documents a big cleavage: while the conservative liberal VVD, the radical liberal D66, the Labour Party PvdA and the small-left wing parties give preference to the issue of socio-economic distribution and inequality, both the denominational parties and the anti-immigrant parties place the socio-cultural dimension of integration at the forefront.

In another PhD-study on minorities policy, '*Minderhedenbeleid en moraal: Erkenning van culturele identiteit in het perspectief van de liberale moraal*', Struijs (1998) examines how immigrant cultural identities are recognized in policy. From the perspective of political philosophy, she examines how the recognition of cultural

identities is legitimised by liberal morality. Liberal morality involves particular principles, such as autonomy (freedom to act), equality (equal freedom to act as others) and also 'neutrality' of government in terms of individual morality (government should confine itself to public morality). Struijs observes a problem with the justification of government policies based on liberal morality, as this morality need not be shared by minority groups. This means that liberal morality is imposed on minority groups, which is by itself incompatible with this liberal morality. In addition, she argues that policies based on liberal morality can be in conflict with the principle of neutrality; issues of public morality cannot be separated from individual morality, which means that cultural identities cannot be simply reduced to the private sphere but need to be reckoned with in the public sphere as well. Struijs argues that these tensions in liberal morality should be recognized and that more attention should be given to its consequences for cultural diversity, in some cases necessitating specific group rights. However, developments in the Integration Policy in the 1990s tended toward the opposite direction: the recognition of cultural diversity shifted to the background, whereas compliance to generic principles of liberal morality shifted to the foreground. General policies, based on the idea of equal citizenship with minimal recognition of cultural diversity, have now become the rule.

Regarding the policymaking process around the political participation of immigrants in local elections, Jacobs' PhD-thesis (1998) *Nieuwkomers in the politiek. Het parlementair debat omtrent kiesrecht voor vreemdelingen in Nederland en België (1970-1997)* analyses how the issue of voting rights for non-nationals has been addressed in parliament in the Netherlands and Belgium between the early 1970s and the late 1990s. The final goal of his research is to show which "discourses" dominated (and competed with each other) in the debate on political participation of foreign residents during this period. Jacobs argues that the debate was mainly articulated by two main questions: is the fact that foreign residents are not entitled to vote and stand as a candidate in elections a "democratic deficit"? and do certain conditions and particularly certain demands towards foreign residents need to be fulfilled to have a viable multicultural society in which allochthones politically participate? At the intersection of these two dilemmas distinct discourses were created. The inclusion of foreign residents in Dutch municipal elections in 1985 and their permanent exclusion in Belgium, however, was not the result of a genuine compromise on the argumentative level or the dominance of one specific type of reasoning. Instead, Jacobs concludes that the differences on the outcomes were due to the possibility or impossibility to build up discourse coalitions in favour of enfranchisement within the respective political fields at specific strategic moments of the debate. In the case of the Netherlands the possibility to create this coalition was an unintended consequence of the terrorist activities of Moluccan youngsters and the common hope (both from left and right wing parties) that enfranchisement could serve as a symbolic means to show that the government was doing something with regard to the societal position of non-nationals.

Finally, two studies (Sloot 1986; Jonkers 2003) have examined the definition and implementation of positive discrimination policies in the Netherlands. From a comparative perspective, Sloot's PhD-thesis (1986) *Positieve discriminatie. Maatschappelijke ongelijkheid en rechtsontwikkeling in the Verenigde Staten en in Nederland* describes and analyses the development of positive discrimination in the United States and the Netherlands. First of all, he defines the concept of discrimination in the framework of "distributive justice" and, using the criterium race as the paradigm example, distinguishes two kinds of negative and positive discrimination: direct and indirect. Secondly, describing the development of positive discrimination in the United States and the Netherlands, he points out some important differences. In contrast to the

United States, in the Netherlands policies have focused on the mode of indirect positive discrimination within the framework of the Dutch welfare state and the standard legitimation has been social backwardness instead of the elimination of the effects of past discrimination. Moreover, positive discrimination in the Netherlands has been implemented through political and bureaucratic mechanisms rather than through the intervention of the courts. Finally, positive discrimination has not evoked so much public controversy as in the United States.

On a more concrete level, Jonkers' PhD-thesis (2003) *Diskwalificatie van Wetgeving; de totstandkoming en uitvoering van de Wet bevordering evenredige arbeidsdeelname allochtonen (Wbeaa)* studies the development and implementation of a positive discrimination policy that forced employers to stimulate the proportional participation of ethnic minorities within their workforce. In contrast with the federal Canadian Employment Act, which was seen as a vehicle of taking action against any kind of unfair treatment of individual ethnic minorities, this act was a fierce response to rising unemployment of ethnic minorities. Shortly after its implementation, however, it was vehemently resisted by employers and employees. According to Jonkers, negative expectancies of parties involved in the development process of the Wbeaa have influenced the way both they themselves and the addressees of the law dealt with the Wbeaa after its introduction. These expectancies resulted in labelling the Wbeaa as symbolic legislation and in disqualification of the act. This finally led the Wbeaa to be dependent on the commitment of several monitoring groups and enforcement agencies and become object of a kind of self-subversion of both addressees and interest groups.

3.3. Studies focussing on specific actors

3.3.1. The institutionalisation of Islam

Scholars at first paid little attention to the religious aspects of migration and their sociological significance. Immigrants were mainly seen as guest workers, foreigners or ethnic minorities. Later on, some studies focused on their religion and cultural identity. Most of them were about Muslims, the development of their identity, the formation of their organisations and other aspects of the culture or structure of their religious communities. In recent years, some researches have focused on the way in which the host societies create opportunities for the development of Muslim institutions and how they interact with Muslim organisations in the process of institutionalisation of Islam. In the Netherlands this has mainly been done by Rath et al. (2001) and, focusing on cases of mosque building, by Buijs (1998), Lindo (1999) and Maussen (2005a, 2005b).

In the book *Western Europe and its Islam* (2001), Rath et al. describe and analyse the process of institutionalisation of Islam in so far as the established society is involved or experiences its effects. By analysing the Dutch case at the national and local level (focusing on the cases of Rotterdam and Utrecht) and comparing it to Belgium and the United Kingdom, they seek to determine the extent to which different factors and agents (foreign powers and international Muslim organisations, legislation, the judiciary, government, organisations based on religious or ideological principles, organisations based on general principles and other relevant institutions) as well as the ideological context shape the emergence of Muslim institutions in different spheres, particularly those of religion, education and politics (See also Rath *et al.* 1999).

At the local level, Buijs (1998) and Lindo (1999) analyse the institutionalisation of Islam in the Netherlands by considering the processes and conflicts behind the establishment of a Turkish mosque in Rotterdam and Amsterdam. In both cases, different social developments are addressed: the settlement of the immigrants in the Netherlands, the social transformation of neighbourhoods, the institutionalisation of new religious communities and the changing government policies towards immigrants and religion. Of particular importance is the question to what extent and in what way the newcomers should integrate into the Dutch society. According to both scholars the main difference lies between Turkish Muslim organisations, which assign a central meaning to the collectiveness of the group, and local governments, which stress the principle of individual equal treatment.

Buijs' research on the establishment of the Kocatepe mosque in Rotterdam from 1971 to 1996 presents the institutionalisation of Islam as an interactive social process in which very different actors with different ideologies try to shape the development of a multicultural society. Particularly, he focuses on four main trends: the development of a new religious community in a depillarised society, the way in which newcomers have to integrate into the existing society, the shaping of a multicultural society on neighbourhood level and the impact of government politics. Regarding the establishment of the Ayasofya mosque in Amsterdam from 1994 to 1996, Lindo highlights the role that normative notions play in the conflict between the municipal district and the Muslim organisation. Rather than presenting them as closed and invariable concepts, he stresses how normative notions are used as discursive possibilities in order to realise particular social and political goals.

From a more comparative perspective and focusing on the discourse level, Maussen (2005a) argues in his PhD-thesis *Constructing Mosques: Negotiating Islam and cultural diversity in the Netherlands and France (1900-2004)* that public discussions on the establishment of mosques in Western Europe are contentious processes of meaning production around Islamic presence. On the one hand, by comparing discussions on mosques in the Netherlands and France in the 20th century, he distinguishes three different and consecutive regimes for the regulation of Islamic presence in Europe: colonialism, arrangements for 'guest workers' and citizenship. On the other hand, by analysing thirty years of contentious discussions on mosque establishment in Marseilles and Rotterdam, he shows the interplay of various frames to ascribe meaning to mosques (the 'Mosque as Refuge', the 'Central Mosque', the 'Ethno-religious community centre', the 'Neighbourhood Mosque' and the 'Modern Mosque') that function as nodal points that link together specific ideas about cultural diversity, Islam and immigrant incorporation. This thesis demonstrates how these frames emerged and developed differently in discussions in Rotterdam and Marseilles and how the meaning of religious regimes –based respectively on 'principled pluralism' in the Netherlands and on 'strict separation between State and Church' in France– have varied across the different regimes of regulation of Islamic presence (i.e. colonialism, arrangements for 'guest workers' and citizenship).

Focusing on the literature on Islam and mosque establishment in France, the Netherlands, Germany and Great Britain, Maussen (2005b) distinguishes three different research perspectives (studies on Muslim religious practice, studies on the institutionalisation of Islam and studies that focus on negotiations on emblems of Islam and cultural diversity) that have discursively constructed and interpreted transformations of Islam and Islamic practice in Western Europe. From this perspective, it becomes clear how academic researchers have actively contributed to the production

and development of vocabularies and interpretations to talk and think about Islam and mosques in the West. By consequence many overlapping concepts and interpretations prevail in academic, policy and political discourses on Islam. This leads Maussen to conclude that academic researches should constantly try and reflect critically upon their own contributions to the process of making Muslim presence in Western Europe meaningful.

3.3.2. *The institutional research-policy-making nexus*

Two main themes can be discerned in the literature on the research-policy nexus in the Netherlands. The first concerns the organization of the science-policy nexus and the role of scientific research and scientific knowledge in policy development: what institutional form do relations across the science-policy nexus take, what have been the implications in terms of policy influence of scientific research and what has been the influence of government funding and research programming on scientific research. The second theme concerns primarily the substantive character of the science-policy nexus: what types of knowledge and expertise are exchanged across the science-policy nexus and what implications does the organization of the research-policy nexus have for the development of scientific knowledge as well as the substantive development of policies. In the following we discuss some of the most important literature regarding these two themes.

The institutional research-policy nexus

An extensive study of relations across the research-policy nexus was made by Penninx (1992): *‘Wie betaalt en wie bepaalt?’* (‘Who pays and who decides?’). It analyses the influence of research on policy development and the influence of policy on research for the period until 1990. Penninx relates the development and role of research to stages in the ‘life-cycle’ of policies (pp.22-24); first, the recognition and definition of a policy problem, then the formulation of policies, followed by the implementation of policies and the evaluation of policy. Until the 1970s, both researchers and policy-makers paid little attention to the position of immigrants, as both researchers and policy-makers than still presumed that (most) immigrants were to stay only temporarily. However, roughly between 1975 and 1980, research started to play a leading role in defining the policy problem and developing relevant knowledge. In this stage, the number of researches started to increase, also under influence of government research coordination. In this context, Penninx points at the institutionalised character of the research-policy nexus. On the one hand, a research council that was established by the Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work, the Advisory Committee on Minorities Research (ACOM), coordinated most of the immigrant research. On the other hand, a government think-tank, the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR), provided a venue for the problem-defining role of research. A policy study from the WRR (‘Ethnic Minorities’, 1979) provided a ‘policy-oriented synthesis of the state of the art of knowledge and a systematic confrontation of knowledge with policy’ (1992, pp.20) that laid the basis of the Minorities Policy. However, in following stages of the policy life cycle, such as the development of concrete policies and the implementation and effectuation of policies in the 1980s, the role of research became more instrumental. As researchers had generally accepted the policy goals, the focus of research shifted to more instrumental research such as the evaluation of specific policy programmes and

measures. The fundamental premises and goals of policy remained largely unquestioned.

In their study on the role of policy and science in controversies on immigrant minority language instruction, *'Het Partiële Gelijk'*, Lucassen and Köbben (1992) reach similar conclusions. First of all, they show how in four decades of minority language instruction, in spite of continuity in terms of policy programmes, there has been great discontinuity in the definition of its function. Initially (1970s), minority language instruction would have facilitated return-migration, then (1980s) it would have helped immigrants to gain a positive self-image and still later (1990s) its main function would be to help Dutch language apprehension by first mastering the own, 'native' language (pp.120, 129). Lucassen and Köbben argue that these redefinitions of the function of minority language instruction were led primarily by political considerations and sensitivities (p.128), whereas the role of research was mainly to legitimise political positions or changing preferences or to apply these positions to more concrete problems or situations (pp. 154). Like Penninx, they mark an absence of fundamental research aimed at testing policy premises and positions regarding the function of minority language instruction. Whenever research did set out to test fundamental policy ideas, its role in policy development would have been mostly marginal or it had even been ignored (p. 155). In contrast to Penninx, they argue that problem-defining stage toward the Minorities Policy was largely a matter of responses to ad-hoc developments that changed the views and ideas of both policy-makers and researchers; such as the Moluccan terrorist acts in the 1970s, the rise of anti-immigrant parties and the massive immigration of Surinamese in the mid-1970s (pp.84-85). Research would have mainly legitimised ongoing policy changes, rather than promoting new insights.

The substantive research-policy nexus

In his PhD-research, entitled in translation *'Minorisation; the social construction of ethnic minorities'*, Rath (1991) analyses the consequences of the organization of the research-policy nexus for the development of scientific knowledge and research itself. He agrees with Penninx, Lucassen and Köbben on the government-dominated, institutionalized research-policy nexus and the subordinate role of scientific research in policy development but, on top of that, Rath argues that this has led to a particular one-sidedness in terms of scientific perspectives. According to Rath, a combination of government interference with minorities research and a strong policy-orientation among minorities researchers would have led to the dominance of one particular paradigm, 'the Minorities Paradigm', and the exclusion of other perspectives, such as nationalist and Marxist perspectives. Central to this minorities paradigm is the social categorization of 'ethnic minorities' based on socio-cultural differences. This contrasts with other countries such as Great Britain where immigrants are categorized based on racial features. According to Rath, the 'Minorities Paradigm' is a product of the close relations between policy and research. These close relations between policy and research would be indicative of a typical Dutch trait of solving controversial and sensitive issues through 'technocratic compromise', delegating policy issues to government-supported researchers, combined with a strong policy-orientation among Dutch social scientists. By accentuating and problematising cultural differences, the 'Minorities Paradigm', or the social construction of 'ethnic minorities', would have contributed to 'minorisation' of immigrants by placing minorities outside the imagined community of Dutch society. As such, the minorities paradigm would have hampered rather than stimulated the social integration of immigrants in the Netherlands.

In her PhD-study, *'The Standpoint in Question: Situated Knowledges and the Dutch Minorities Discourse'*, Prins (1997) analyses what can be seen as the downfall of the Minorities Paradigm as analysed by Rath. In her study, Prins observes the rise of 'New Realism' in both the realms of research and policy. New Realism represents a mode of discourse that claims to represent reality 'as it is', without the burden of taboos or distorting values and interests. This realist discourse would be a representation of typical Dutch 'virtues', such as honesty, courage and soberness. Instead of avoiding debate and conflict, New Realism would be a discourse that engages with immigrants into serious debate, as a signal that these immigrants are taken 'seriously', and to appeal to the civic duties of individual migrants. Moreover, it would represent the opinions of the 'ordinary citizen' which had thus far been ignored. Prins observes a rise of 'New Realism' at the end of the 1980s, for example in the report from the Scientific Council for Government Policy ('Immigrant Policy', WRR 1989), and most importantly in 1992 in the context of the National Minorities Debate. In the early 1990s, with the development of the Integration Policy, it would also have become a dominant mode of policy discourse. Prins argues that New Realism, as all modes of discourse, does not just represent reality 'as it is' but also transforms reality; it has 'performative effects', shaping and changing reality through how it is discussed and interpreted. The performative effect of 'New Realism' would be to reiterate the dividing line between indigenous Dutch and 'the others'. In this way, the discourse of New Realism has a 'power' that works in the disadvantage of migrants.

3.3.3. Trade unions and migration and integration

Since European trade unions have been one of the potentially influential and powerful institutions within Western economies, in many cases they have played an important role in the socio-economic decision-making process regarding migration and integration. In the Netherlands their position with regard to the newcomers has been researched by Jongh et al. (1984), Penninx & Roosblad (2000), and Roosblad (2002). Although on a very different level, these studies have all dealt with the dilemmas confronted by trade unions regarding immigration and immigrant workers.

The book by Jongh et al. (1984) *FNV-ers aan het woord over buitenlandse werknemers* describes the main positions of the members of the largest Dutch trade union (FNV) regarding foreign workers. By analysing the discussions raised by the internal document "Together, better than separately", issued in 1982, the authors make the following observations. First of all, most of the interviewed members were against positive action for immigrants and defended the same treatment both for national and foreign workers. Secondly, most of them saw cultural differences, and particularly those of Muslim workers, as a problem for a fruitful collaboration. The main dilemma was whether a trade union should treat national and foreign workers equally or should set up different schemes for the particular interests of foreign workers.

From a European comparative perspective, Roosblad (2002) examines in *Vakbonden en immigranten in Nederland, 1960-1997* the policies of Dutch trade unions, their arguments to justify these policies and their actual behaviour with regard to the immigration of workers and the presence of immigrant workers in the period from 1960 to 1997. Following the analytical framework set up by Penninx & Roosblad (2000) in *Trade unions, immigration and immigrants in Europe 1960-1993*, her research is articulated around three main dilemmas: 1) should trade unions cooperate with

employers and authorities in the employment of foreign workers or should they resist? 2) should trade unions include them fully in their ranks or exclude them as a special category? and 3) should they advocate and implement special measures for these immigrants or should they insist on general, equal treatment for all workers? To the first dilemma, Dutch trade unions responded by getting substantially involved in the socio-economic decision-making and policy formulation. Regarding the second dilemma, their position was that of inclusion although in practice immigrant membership has remained relatively low. In relation to the third dilemma, Dutch trade unions had to admit in the course of time that the specific situation and characteristics of migrant workers required special attention and policies. However, as pointed out by the study of Jongh et al. (1984) in relation to positive action policies, the position of the union leaders regarding the equal versus special treatment dilemma did not always correspond with that of the members (work floor level) of the same trade unions.

3.4. Studies focussing on specific phenomena

Dreef's and Berveling's PhD-theses are of special interest for their particular perspectives. First of all, in contrast to most of the studies reviewed here, they focus on particular phenomena at the local level. Secondly, they approach the policymaking process from other perspectives that are not specifically within the framework of migration studies. In other words, their research objectives are not the immigration and integration policymaking processes themselves but other phenomena –such as the development of the garment industry or the local power distribution– that interact with and affect them.

Dreef's PhD-thesis (2004) *Politiek, migranten en informele economie. Politieke en bestuurlijke ontwikkelingen ten aanzien van de Amsterdamse confectieateliers 1980-1997* describes the political, administrative and institutional context of the genesis, expansion and demise of the Amsterdam garment industry in the last two decades of the 20th century. Focusing on the “belief systems” held by the main political actors, Dreef analyses how politics affected the development of the Amsterdam garment industry. While from 1983 to 1993 a policy of toleration predominated in the Amsterdam local policy arena in order to promote employment opportunities for ethnic minority residents regardless their legal status, in the 1990s the Dutch national government started to combat it arguing that the employment of illegal workers was a distortion of competition that should be straightened by the government. By comparing this process with the politics pursued towards garment workshops in two boroughs of London, Dreef concludes that in Amsterdam the welfare economic reasoning –with its organisation, consultation and rules– was one of the main causes of the end of the Amsterdam garment industry and therefore affected negatively immigrant employment.

In his PhD-thesis, entitled *Het stempel op de besluitvorming. Macht, invloed en besluitvorming op twee Amsterdamse beleidsterreinen*, Berveling (1994) offers insight into the way power and influence are distributed in the city of Amsterdam. The research is guided by two main questions: 1) to what extent it is possible to predict outcomes of decision-making; and 2) how are power and influence distributed among organisations in two policy domains: urban development and minorities policy. According to Berveling, in the urban development domain the alderman responsible, the social democratic party PvdA and the Physical Planning Department (civil service) appear to be the dominant actors. In the minorities policy domain the main actors are the

alderman responsible, the mayor, the PvdA and the Green Left (the most left-of-centre party). This leads Berveling to conclude that in both domains political actors (the aldermen and the parties within the council) possess the strongest positional power. In other words, these domains are clearly dominated by a political elite.

4. CONCLUSION

What conclusions can be drawn from this concise literature review? How can we explain what has been studied and why? Which are the main areas and aspects that need further research? Is it possible to explain why they have not been systematically analysed? In order to answer these questions, we will go back to the general observations on the context of policymaking in the Netherlands in paragraph 2 and show that there is a direct relationship between the specific traits pointed out to characterise the immigrant and integration policymaking in the Netherlands (paragraph 2) and the existing literature on this area (paragraph 3). This is true not only for the research for policy but also for PhD-theses, which form an important part of the literature.

The relative early recognition of the need for an integration policy and the paradox of implementing integration policies while regarding itself as a non-immigrant country have two basic consequences for the literature on the policymaking process in this area. First of all, it explains the fact that most of the studies focus on *integration rather than immigration*. Indeed, the beginnings of the new “Ethnic Minorities Policies” in the early 1980s was followed by an expansive growth of the literature on the position of immigrants in the Dutch society, specifically the target groups of integration policies, and on these policies themselves. At the same time, the commonly accepted idea that the Netherlands was and still is not an immigration country has led to the neglect of the study on immigration policies. In other words, restrictive immigration policies have often been seen as non-policies and, in consequence, the literature on immigration policymaking is relatively scarce.

Secondly, it also explains the dominance of what Rath (1991) has called the *minorities paradigm*. Most of the literature was developed following the implementation of the Minorities Policies, which defined ethnic minorities in social-cultural terms and in relation to socio-economic deprivation. These policies and their funding of research have contributed to the hegemony of this paradigm. Although this is particularly true for research on integration processes, which has mainly been done from sociology and anthropology, the same pattern can be identified for the literature on integration policymaking, which has mainly been done from the viewpoint of political and legal (particularly sociology of law) studies. In contrast, the research on immigration policymaking is as diverse as scarce. As we have shown in paragraph 3.1. no single dominant paradigm exists and studies include different disciplinary perspectives: from public administration, political and legal studies to history and anthropology. Moreover, in contrast to integration, there has been no institutionalisation of immigration studies. This explains why, as in the case of Ringeling’s or Schuster’s books, immigration policymaking has often been studied as part of researches that had other goals than the study of immigration policies.

Also the specific characteristic of Dutch integration policies as national policies with a top-down structure and a strong central coordination is echoed in research. This centrality of national policies has led scholars to focus on the *national level* rather than on the regional or local level. This is particularly true for studies on the integration policymaking rather than on integration itself. This is easy to explain. While the definition of integration policies has mainly taken place at the national level, its implementation and particularly the integration processes themselves are necessarily embedded at the local or regional level. In the context of the literature reviewed here,

only those researches on mosque establishment (Buijs 1998; Lindo 1999; Maussen 2005) and on specific phenomena (Berveling 1994; Dreef 2004) are directly focused on the local level.

The dominance of centrally coordinated national policies in a strong welfare state has also led to marginalize possible (non-governmental) actors, such as trade unions or churches, in the integration policymaking process. This marginalisation has in practice determined the *marginalisation of non-governmental actors in the research literature*. The particularities of the policymaking process (with its inclusions and exclusions) have hence determined who comes in the picture and thus who is studied. The main consequence is that most of the researches have focused on the national government, with its different institutions and departments as well as the different political parties within the parliament. In contrast, little research has been done, for instance, on the role of churches, trade unions or NGO's in the definition of integration policies. Comparisons of the Netherlands with the Federal Republic of Germany (where integration policies have been developed only recently) reveal that in the FRG these actors not only have been more prominent in integration processes of immigrants (see Penninx/Roosblad 2000) but also have had a major presence in the literature about integration policymaking.

The third and fourth traits of integration policymaking in the Netherlands, i.e. depoliticisation and polarisation, and the research-policy-nexus, are mutually related. Indeed, the initially strong tendency to conflict avoidance and depoliticization went hand in hand with a strongly institutionalised research-policy nexus: a depoliticising political context was not only open for research input in all its forms (from framing and instrumentation to evaluation), but also used it for depoliticization of immigrant integration by resorting to science-based policy advice for policy development. This has had two main consequences regarding the literature on integration policymaking until recently. On the one hand, as pointed out in paragraph 3.3.2, the research-policy nexus has promoted the extent of research but also reduced the scope of the approaches. Indeed, after the establishment Ethnic Minorities policies in the early 1980s, this nexus has led an important part of the scientific research to accept policy goals and adopt a more *instrumental role*. As Lucassen and Köbben (1992) argue, the role of research has mostly been to legitimise political positions or changing preferences or to apply these positions to more concrete problems or situations. On the other hand, since much of the research was oriented towards evaluation and legitimisation of policies, most of it has focused on *integration policies and processes rather than on the policymaking itself*. Thus the strongly institutionalised research-policy nexus did not help to promote research on the policymaking, that is, on the way policies were set, developed and implemented. Only in recent years, immigration and integration policymaking has begun to be object of research.

A final Dutch trait is the co-optation of ethnic elites. As shown in paragraph 2, this has been done through the creation of minority organisations and advisory or consultation bodies but also by the extension of local voting rights to denizens and the inclusion of immigrants into the national political system by the granting of citizenship. These particular forms of immigrant inclusion in Dutch politics explains *the emphasis on research on immigrant political participation and immigrant organisations*. The IMES (UvA) has developed one of the main programs in this area. Supervised by Meindert Fennema and Jean Tillie, it has focused on how the presence of immigrants is perceived in politics, how this affects their status and how far minorities are able to (politically) participate in local politics. The IMES also led cross-national comparative studies that studied the role of integration policies, that of mediators of immigrant origin

and of ethnic organisations on political participation of immigrants in different European cities. One of the main goals has been to determine how differences in political and discursive structures affect the political participation of immigrants. In the new national integration policy, the topics of immigrant organization and political participation are not defined as priorities anymore. The funding for this kind of research thus comes from other sources, like the Dutch Science Foundation and local governments. Consequently, research on these topics is far less policy-driven than before.

Having described the main trends of the literature on the immigration and integration policymaking in the Netherlands, what are the topics and areas that need further research? Following the arguments developed above, we will focus on four main aspects: immigration policymaking, integration policymaking at the local and regional level, the relationship between (the) welfare (state) and immigration and integration policies, and finally the impact of the increasing politicisation on the immigration and integration policymaking.

Regarding the *immigration policymaking*, more research should be done on specific subdomains of immigration policies, such as family reunification, asylum and labour immigration. Such studies should include the main actors as well as factors that have determined their definition and implementation. They should also systematically include the relationship between immigration and integration policies. This relation has been problematic in two different ways in the Netherlands. In the first period it was problematic because an integration policy was designed without adequately formulating a consistent and pro-active immigration policy. In the recent period it is problematic because integration measures and requirements for aspiring immigrants are explicitly used as an instrument for restrictive admission. We argue that indeed these fields of policymaking cannot be regarded as separated and isolated. They constantly interact intendedly or unintendedly. This interaction should not only be studied empirically but policymaking in the two fields should be coordinated from the beginning to be sound and solid.

Since most of the research on integration policymaking has focused on the national level, there is a *lack of studies on the local and regional level*. More systematic analysis of how local authorities and cities deal with immigration and integration is needed. Two particular focuses are important. The first is on the content of local integration policies, their definition and framing, and the way they are developed and implemented in interaction between local governments and the main social and political actors. The second focus is the interaction between local or regional authorities and the national government in the definition but also in the implementation of integration policies. Of particular interest is to analyse the top-down translation of the national integration policy into local policies as well as the coordination and overlapping of these two policy frameworks, and the tensions, negotiations and compromises involved. Indeed, local policy practices have often been resistant to change “from above” or, as we have recently seen in relation to (refused) asylum seekers, local authorities have sometimes positioned themselves opposing the implementation of particular national policies.

There is also a need for research on *the impact of the welfare state on the immigration and integration policymaking*. First of all, immigration policies are often perceived as contradictory or even a threat to the welfare state. The inclusive character and the minimum standards for all inhabitants of the latter has often led to argue in favour of restrictive immigration policies. At the same time, however, others argue the other way around: the increasing practice of exclusion of immigrants from the welfare

state has not implied more open immigration policies. So there is the empirical question: how the welfare state does determine immigration policies? And there is the political-normative question: how the dilemma should be solved? Secondly, as we have posited above, strong welfare states like Sweden and the Netherlands have led such states to play the major role in the definition and implementation of integration policies. It would be important to do more research on how this has influenced the role of other political and social actors, such as churches, trade unions and NGO's, in the integration policymaking, and how the recent austerity measures of the welfare state lead to the return of civil society actors in the process. Particularly, it would be of special interest to analyse how the increasing exclusion of (refused) asylum seekers and undocumented migrants from the welfare state has led non-governmental organisations to (re-)assume tasks like reception, language courses, social and legal assistance that are not being done anymore by the state.

In recent years, the *politicisation of immigration and integration* has become a central issue that should also be further researched. It would be of special interest to analyse how the political polarisation has affected the research-policy-nexus. Because of the absence of a recent study on the research-policy nexus, it remains unclear whether and how the role of research in policy development has changed.

Finally, we conclude with a more general recommendation: a plea for more comparative research as the best instrument for building up systematic knowledge. Research at the national, regional and local level should be systematically compared in order to demonstrate how the political opportunity structure shapes policymaking processes. Such comparisons may be of a different nature (in time, in space, across levels, cross-national and combinations of these) depending on the research question. Although in recent years we have seen a growth of comparative studies, most of them focus on integration rather than on immigration and integration policymaking. These researches are important to understand differences in the policy outcomes as well as integration processes. However, to understand how these differences come about, that is, how the interaction of different actors and factors lead to different policy outcomes and integration processes, it is essential to introduce systematically comparative studies of policymaking itself.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACOM (Adviescommissie Onderzoek Culturele Minderheden) (1979)
Advies onderzoek minderheden, Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij.
- ACOM (Adviescommissie Onderzoek Culturele Minderheden) (1982)
Naar een betere organisatie van het minderhedenonderzoek; een advies van de ACOM aan de Ministers van Binnenlandse Zaken en CRM, Leiden: ACOM.
- Amersfoort, J.M.M. van, (1974)
Immigratie en minderheidsvorming: een analyse van de Nederlandse situatie 1945-1973, Alphen a/d Rijn: Samsom.
- Amersfoort, H. van, (1982)
Immigration and the formation of minority groups: the Dutch experience 1945-1975, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berveling, J. (1994)
Het stempel op de besluitvorming. Macht, invloed en besluitvorming op twee Amsterdamse beleidsterreinen, Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- Beus, J. de (1998)
De cultus van vermijding. Visies op migrantenpolitiek in Nederland, Utrecht: FORUM.
- Blok-Committee (2004): see Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid (2004).
- Bovenkerk, F. (red.), (1978)
Omdat zij anders zijn; patronen van rasdiscriminatie in Nederland, Meppel/Amsterdam: Boom.
- Buys, F.J. (1998)
Een moskee in de wijk. De vestiging van de Kocatepe moskee in Rotterdam-Zuid, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Doesschate, J-W.ten (1993)
Asielbeleid en belangen. Het Nederlandse toelatingsbeleid ten aanzien van vluchtelingen in de jaren 1968-1982. Ph-D-thesis, Nijmegen: Instituut voor Rechtsociologie.
- Doomernik, J., R. Penninx & H. van Amersfoort (1997)
A migration policy for the future. Possibilities and limitations, Brussels: Migration Policy Group ((MPG).
- Dreef, M. (2004)
Politiek, migranten en informele economie. Politieke en bestuurlijke ontwikkelingen ten aanzien van de Amsterdamse confectieateliers, 1980-1997. Ph-D-thesis, Amsterdam: IMES.
- Entzinger, H.B. (1975)
‘Nederland immigratieland?’ in: *Beleid en Maatschappij*, 2 (1975) 12, 326-336.
- Entzinger, H.B. (1984)
Het minderhedenbeleid; dilemma's voor de overheid in Nederland en zes andere immigratielanden in Europa, Meppel/Amsterdam: Boom.
- Entzinger, H. (2003)
‘The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism: The Case of the Netherlands’ in C. Joppke. and E. Morawska (Eds.) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, Hampshire: Palgrave, pp. 59-86.
- Fermin, A. (1997)
Nederlandse politieke partijen over minderhedenbeleid 1977-1995. Proefschrift Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.
- Groenendael, T. van, (1986)
Dilemma's van regelgeving; de regularisatie van illegale buitenlandse werknemers 1975-1985, Alphen a/d Rijn/Utrecht: Samsom-Tjeenk Willink-NCB.

- Groenendijk, C.A., (1979)
 'Van gastarbeider tot medeburger' in: *Beleid en Maatschappij*, (1979) 2, 52-63.
- Guiraudon, V. (1998)
 'Citizenship Rights for Non-Citizens: France, Germany and the Netherlands' in C. Joppke (Ed.) *Challenge to the Nation-State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heijke, J.A.M., (1979)
Sociaal-economische aspecten van gastarbeid, Rotterdam: NEI.
- Heijs, E., (1995)
Van vreemdeling tot Nederlanders; de verlening van het Nederlanderschap aan vreemdelingen 1813-1992, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Hoppe, R. (1987)
 'Etniciteit, Politiek en Beleid' in R. Hoppe (ed.), *Etniciteit, Politiek en Beleid. Veertig jaar minderhedenbeleid: van onbedoelde beleidsevolutie tot gefrustreerde beleidsopvolging*, Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.
- Jacobs, D. (1998)
Nieuwkomers in de Politiek. Het parlementair debat omtrent kiesrecht voor vreemdelingen in Nederland en België (1979-1997), Gent: Academia Press.
- Jongh, R. de, M. van der Laan and J. Rath, (1984)
FNV-ers aan het woord over buitenlandse werknemers, Leiden: COMT.
- Jonkers, P., (2003)
Diskwalificatie van Wetgeving: de totstandkoming en uitvoering van de Wet Bevordering evenredige arbeidsdeelname Allochtonen (Wbeaa), Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Köbben, A. (1979)
 'De gijzelingsakties van Zuidmolukkers en hun effecten op de samenleving' in: *Transactie*, 8 (1979) 2, 147-154.
- Lange, T. de, S.R. Verbeek, R. Cholewinski & J.M.J. Doornik (2003)
Arbeidsimmigratie naar Nederland. Regulering en demografische en economische aspecten in internationaal vergelijk, Den Haag: Adviescommissie voor Vreemdelingenzaken.
- Leenders, M. (1993)
Ongenode gasten. Van traditioneel asielrecht naar immigratiebeleid, 1815-1938, Hilversum: Verloren.
- Lucassen, L. & A.J.F. Köbben (1992)
Het Partiële Gelijk: Controverses over het onderwijs in de eigen taal en cultuur en de rol daarbij van beleid en wetenschap, 1951-1991, Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Lucassen, J. & R. Penninx (1994)
Nieuwkomers, Nakomelingen, Nederlanders. Immigranten in Nederland, 1550-1993, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Lucassen, J. & R. Penninx, (1997)
Newcomers, immigrants and their descendants in the Netherlands 1550-1995, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.
- Maussen, M. (2005a)
Constructing Mosques: Negotiating Islam and Cultural Diversity in The Netherlands and France (1900-2004), PhD thesis.
- Maussen, M. (2005b)
 Making Muslim Presence Meaningful: Studies on Islam and Mosques in Western Europe, in *ASSR working papers series*, May 2005.
- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken (1980)
Regeringsreactie op het rapport "Etnische minderheden" van de Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid, Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken
- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken (1981)
Ontwerp-minderhedennota, Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken
- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken (1983)
Minderhedennota, Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij, (Handelingen Tweede Kamer 1982-83, 16102, nr. 21).

- Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken (1994)
Contours Memorandum Integration Policy, Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken.
- Ministerie van Justities (2003) Brief van de Minister van Vreemdelingenzaken en Integratie. TK 2003-2004, 29203, no.1.
- Molleman, H. (2003)
 ‘Het minderhedenbeleid in retrospectief’ in *Socialisme & Democratie*, (2003) 1/2.
- Penninx, R. (1988)
Minderheidsvorming en emancipatie. Balans van kennisverwerving ten aanzien van immigranten en woonwagengebwoners 1967-1987, Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.
- Penninx, R. (1992)
Wie betaalt en wie bepaalt? Onderzoeksbeleid van de overheid m.b.t. minderheden en de invloed van onderzoek op beleid, Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken.
- Penninx, R. (2005)
 ‘Bridges between research and policy? The case of post-war immigration and integration policies in the Netherlands’, forthcoming in the Special Thematic Issue of the UNESCO/International Journal on Multicultural Societies (www.unesco.org/shs/ijms).
- Penninx, R., K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (eds.) (2004)
Citizenship in European cities. Immigrants, local politics and integration policies, Aldershot/Burlington: Ashgate.
- Penninx, R. & J. Roosblad (eds.) (2000)
Trade unions, immigration, and immigrants in Europe, 1960-1993. A comparative study of the attitudes and actions of trade unions in seven West European countries, New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Praag, C.S. van, (1971)
 ‘Het overheidsbeleid inzake allochtone groepen’ in H. Verwey-Jonker (red.), *Allochtonen in Nederland*, Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij.
- Prins, B. (1997)
The Standpoint in Question: Situated Knowledges and the Dutch Minorities Discourse. Ph.D.Thesis, Utrecht University.
- Puts, J. (1991)
De gefragmenteerde overheid. Interdepartementale conflicten bij de totstandkoming van de Regeling Opvang Asielzoekers, Nijmegen: Faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid.
- Rath, J. (1991)
Minorisering: de sociale constructie van 'etnische minderheden, Amsterdam: SUA.
- Rath, J. (2001)
 ‘Research on Immigrant Ethnic Minorities in the Netherlands’ in Ratcliffe, (Ed.) *The politics of social science research. Race, ethnicity and social change*, New York: Palgrave.
- Rath, J., R. Penninx, K. Groenendijk & A. Meyer (2001)
Western Europe and its Islam, Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Ringeling, A.B. (1978)
Beleidsvrijheid van ambtenaren. Het spijtoptantenprobleem als illustratie van de activiteiten van ambtenaren bij de uitvoering van beleid, Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.
- Roosblad, J. (2002)
Vakbonden en immigranten in Nederland (1960-1997), Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Scheffer, P. (2000)
 ‘Het multiculturele drama’ in *NRC/Handelsblad* (29 January, 2000).
- Scholten, P. & E. Snel (forthcoming, 2005)
 ‘Van Gastarbeiders tot het Multiculturele Drama; het integratiebeleid als hardnekkig beleidsprobleem’ in Arentsen & Trommel (Eds.) *Hardnekkige beleidsproblemen*, Amsterdam: Boom.
- Schuster, J. (1999)
Poortwachters over immigranten. Het debat over immigratie in het naoorlogse Groot-Brittannië en Nederland, Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

- SCP (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau) (2001a)
Vorderingen op school. Rapportage minderheden 2001, Den Haag: SCP.
- SCP (Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau) (2001b)
Meer werk. Rapportage minderheden 2001, Den Haag: SCP.
- Sloot, B.
Positieve discriminatie: maatschappelijke ongelijkheid en rechtsonwikkeling in de Verenigde Staten en in Nederland, Proefschrift, RU Leiden.
- Sommer, M. (2002)
 ‘Makelaars in Minderheden’ in *De Volkskrant*, December 28th, 2002.
- Struijs, A. (1998)
Minderhedenbeleid en moraal: erkenning van culturele identiteit in het perspectief van de liberale moraal, Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid (Commissie Blok) (2004)
Bruggen bouwen. Eindrapport van de Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid, Den Haag: SDU (Handelingen Tweede Kamer 2003-04, 28689, nrs 8-9).
- Urbanus, R.(1983)
Reacties op de ontwerp-Minderhedennota. een analyse van de commentaren op de ontwerp-Minderhedennota, Leiden: COMT.
- Verwey-Jonker, H. (red.) (1971)
Allochtonen in Nederland, Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij.
- Vuijsje, H. (1986)
Vermoorde Onschuld: Etnisch verschil als Hollands taboe, Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- WRR (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid) (1979)
Etnische minderheden, Rapport 17, Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij. Also published in English: Scientific Council for Government Policy (1980)
Ethnic minorities, Report 17, The Hague: State Publishers.
- WRR (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid) (1989)
Allochtonenbeleid, Rapport 36, Den Haag: SDU.
 Also published in English: Scientific Council for Government Policy (1979)
Ethnic minorities, Report 17, The Hague: Scientific Council for Government Policy.
- WRR (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid) (2001)
Nederland als immigratiesamenleving. Den Haag: SDU.