

1-1-2008

From Multiculturalism to Integration or from Marginalization to Assimilation?

Tamara Nisic

Follow this and additional works at: <http://preserve.lehigh.edu/perspectives-v26>

Recommended Citation

Nisic, Tamara, "From Multiculturalism to Integration or from Marginalization to Assimilation?" (2008). *Benelux: integration and individuality*. Paper 2.

<http://preserve.lehigh.edu/perspectives-v26/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Perspectives on Business and Economics at Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in Benelux: integration and individuality by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

FROM MULTICULTURALISM TO INTEGRATION OR FROM MARGINALIZATION TO ASSIMILATION?

Tamara Nisic



Introduction

As the representative of the Dutch Embassy in Washington, D.C., told our Martindale group about the pull for cheap labor from within the Netherlands and the push for a better life among people from the Middle East, I wondered about the consequences of these forces. Is it possible that this push and pull could truly result in a mutually beneficial relationship between Dutch society and immigrants from the Middle East? Or is it more likely that these two forces are incompatible and thus have engendered a division between Dutch society and the immigrants? Investigating the answers to these questions has led me to the conclusion that the immigration and integration issues which the Netherlands faces today partly stem from the tension caused by a desire for cheap labor along with the apparent rejection of non-Dutch culture by many elements of Dutch society.

The Netherlands, long perceived as an open and welcoming society and therefore the country least expected to face immigration problems, has recently found itself at the center of the fiercely debated topic of immigration. At the heart of the problem lies the motivation of government policies regarding immigration and integration. I argue here that the concept of multiculturalism, which arose in government immigration and integration policy during the 1980s, was a more acceptable term for the less acceptable idea of distancing the host population from immigrants who arrived in the Netherlands as a result of 1970s' labor recruitment programs. In the context of Dutch immigration and integration policy, multiculturalism can be defined as an ideology in which cultural differences of minorities are recognized and respected by the host nation. The concept, however, became a tool with which the government developed immigration and inte-

gration policies that actually created and maintained distance between ethnic minorities and the host population.

In the 1990s, the Dutch government recognized that immigrants were lagging behind the native Dutch socioeconomically. This development, along with increasing numbers of immigrants coming into the Netherlands, caused the government to reverse the policy of multiculturalism and replace it with a more assimilationist¹ policy of integration. In an effort to maintain Dutch culture and identity, these policies sought to curb the cultural threat posed by increasing numbers of immigrants by coercing foreigners to become Dutch. In sum, the Dutch government first promoted policies of marginalization under the guise of multiculturalism, and subsequently it enacted assimilationist legislation under the veil of integration. Both of these initiatives were made possible by the justification that they were in the best interests of the immigrants.

In the following analysis I explore government rhetoric and policies toward immigration and integration as they relate to the Netherlands' evolving ideologies. The first section is devoted to showing how the rise of the multiculturalist ideology came about in a time when it was most convenient for the Dutch government. Introduced as a method intended to respect and accommodate incoming ethnic minorities, multiculturalism in effect served as a tool to maintain distance between the native Dutch population and immigrants. The second section explores the later shift toward assimilation and restrictive immigration as a reaction to the failure of policies stemming from multiculturalism, a development which illustrates the Dutch rejection of non-Dutch culture. The concluding section offers insight into the consequences of policies which flowed from both multiculturalism and integration, as well as suggestions on finding a middle ground between these two ideologies.

¹In the context of this paper the term "assimilation" refers to a coercive type of integration wherein the law mandates that immigrants assimilate into the host nation. Whereas some immigrants may choose to integrate into the nation by adopting the host's culture and language, others might choose to do so only partially or not at all. In essence, the term connotes the immigrants' lack of choice about whether or not to integrate into the host nation.

Multiculturalism

Immigration During the 1960s and 1970s

Multiculturalism entered the Dutch political arena as increasing numbers of immigrants entered the country during the 1960s and 1970s. The concept, however, evolved from the Dutch pillarization model, which originated in the late 1800s. Dutch society organized itself into "pillars," in which religious and ideological communities developed their own government-supported institutions such as schools, housing corporations, hospitals, trade unions, and newspapers. (Entzinger, p. 64) The model encouraged individuals to retain their group identity while reducing inter-communal relations. (Entzinger, p. 62) Due to the 1960s focus on "secularization and individualism," the model became increasingly obsolete as communities integrated with each other and institutions which supported the pillars largely disappeared. (Entzinger, p. 64) In the 1980s, however, pillarization resurfaced as the new concept of multiculturalism, which identified immigrants not as individuals but rather as constituents of their ethnic group. (Entzinger, p. 64)

The Netherlands experienced a surge in immigration during the 1960s and 1970s. As Table 1 illustrates, this increase consisted largely of people from former Dutch colonies: namely Indonesia, Suriname, and the Netherlands Antilles. In addition to this, however, increasing numbers of immigrants from the Mediterranean region, particularly from Turkey and Morocco, also began entering the Netherlands.

This increase in immigration from the Mediterranean region largely reflected guest worker programs implemented by the government. The programs were intended to alleviate the labor shortage that was fueled by an economic boom during the 1960s. The Dutch government signed recruitment agreements with Italy, Spain, Portugal, Turkey, Greece, Morocco, Yugoslavia, and Tunisia. (Castles, p. 765) The guest workers were supposed to fill the labor shortage in unattractive jobs that called for physically demanding work but that also paid low wages. (Vellinga, p. 149)

The recruitment venture was perceived as a temporary solution to the labor shortage.

Table 1**Immigration into the Netherlands by Country of Origin (in Thousands)**

Country of Origin	1940	1950	1960	1967	1970	1975	1980	1990	2000
Indonesia	–	–	7.7	3.8	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.0	1.9
Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles	–	–	2.3	4.9	9.1	40.5	22.8	14.9	13.8
Morocco	–	–	–	1.3	6.0	7.9	10.4	9.6	4.5
Turkey	–	–	–	1.6	9.0	12.6	17.1	12.1	5.4
Total immigration from all countries	19.5	70.6	45.4	55.8	90.8	127.3	112.5	117.4	132.9

Source: Netherlands Statistics.

Guest workers were expected to return to their home countries once demand decreased (Castles, p. 765) in what one expert on labor migration, W.R. Bohning, called “socially undesirable jobs.” (p. 156) To ensure that the workers would not become overly attached to the Netherlands, a worker rotation program was implemented in which males were given three-year work permits, after which they had to leave the country. (Vellinga, p. 149) For guest workers who did not fall within this program, the government attempted to discourage their settling in the Netherlands by offering monetary incentives to leave after a few years. (Bohning, p. 159) Since it was the government’s intention for guest workers to stay only temporarily in the Netherlands, their families were restricted from joining them. Some families managed to come into the country, nevertheless. To keep their attachment to the host nation weak and to encourage their eventual return to their home countries, however, the Mother Tongue and Culture Program was set up in 1974 and had as its goal the preservation of home language and culture among the children of guest workers. (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 13)

In addition to government efforts that encouraged the return of immigrants to their home countries, periodic economic downturns were also expected to induce many immigrants to leave the Netherlands. This expectation was not met, however. When jobs became scarce after the oil crisis of 1973, many immigrants, particularly those from Morocco and Turkey, surprisingly elected to stay in the Netherlands despite alarmingly high unemploy-

ment rates. (Caviedes, p. 17) When a government research group, the Scientific Council for Government Policy (SCGP), published a report in 1979 that showed that guest workers from the Mediterranean region were increasingly unlikely to return home, the Dutch government began to acknowledge that many immigrants intended to make the Netherlands their permanent home. (Castles, p. 766)

Multiculturalism in Government Policy: Ethnic Minorities Policy

After the 1979 SCGP report about guest workers, the Dutch government began to create institutions and policies built on multicultural principles in order to address the increasingly permanent nature of immigrants, who eventually became known as ethnic minorities. As I will show below, the multicultural policies which followed were not necessarily ill-intentioned, but they demonstrated a rejection of non-Dutch culture by the government. In particular, in 1983 the government launched what became known as the Ethnic Minorities Policy. In effect, this policy was a way to maintain distance between the targeted ethnic minorities and the host population, but it was also justified as the approach likely to be most beneficial to the immigrants. The Ethnic Minorities Policy had three main goals:

1. to engender a sense of multiculturalism through government support of institutions specific to immigrants, such as ethnic organizations, newspapers, and broadcasting facilities;

2. to bring about equality before the law by granting voting rights to foreign residents as well as implementing anti-discrimination policies;
3. to promote equal opportunity in housing, healthcare, education, and employment. (Entzinger, pp. 63–68)

On the surface, these measures were an attempt to integrate all immigrants into Dutch society while maintaining respect for their cultures. However, the policies were somewhat contradictory in that they targeted only certain ethnic minorities and excluded others. Furthermore, programs which flowed from the Ethnic Minorities Policy (described in the following section) were adopted not as a result of the immigrants' own grievances, but rather were imposed based on what the government decided the immigrants needed. (Entzinger, p. 65)

Programs of the Ethnic Minorities Policy and Their Effects

At worst, the implementation of the Ethnic Minorities Policy further marginalized the targeted minorities and at best did nothing to reverse the discriminatory attitudes in Dutch society. More specifically, those initiatives that focused on education and housing resulted in segregating the immigrants from the native Dutch population. Programs which targeted the education of immigrant children reflected seemingly benign attempts to preserve minority cultures. For example, Hindu and Muslim schools were established, and there was an expansion of mother-tongue teaching programs. (Entzinger, p. 65) Although these mother-tongue teaching programs had begun much earlier (in 1973) to make the reintegration of guest workers' children easier in case they returned to their native country, they were expanded for allegedly the same reason despite the fact that immigrants were no longer leaving the Netherlands. (Vellinga, p. 136) Therefore, the preservation of children's native languages continued to be a way in which the government could maintain distance between the immigrant children and the host nation. Furthermore, the language courses that were offered were criticized as being far too rudimentary, while they also took substantial time away from core classes. (Vasta, p. 717) Additionally, many white families

removed their children from schools that had increasing numbers of minority children, resulting in segregated schools which became known as "black" and "white" schools. (Vasta, p. 720) Although it may not have been the intention of the Ethnic Minorities Policy to create this situation, it was the inevitable consequence of the continuation of policies that began when immigrants were considered to be temporary.

The Ethnic Minorities Policy also focused on attaining equality in housing for immigrants. In the 1960s and 1970s, guest workers had naturally gravitated toward areas with the cheapest housing. In this way they could save as much of their incomes as possible to send remittances to family members still residing in their country of origin. (van Kempen and van Weesep, p. 1816) As a result, neighborhoods became ethnically concentrated. In 1983, 34 percent of Moroccans and 46 percent of Turks were concentrated in the four largest cities in the Netherlands: Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht. (van Kempen and van Weesep, p. 1817) With the implementation of the Ethnic Minorities Policy, the Dutch government began to combat segregation and the inferior housing situation of ethnic minorities by requiring that government-provided housing accommodate a proportion of minorities equal to their proportion in the population. (Entzinger, p. 68) This program was put into place in conjunction with subsidies for improved housing. Some studies reported that the housing situation of immigrants indeed improved as a result of these initiatives. (Entzinger; Penninx) Critics, however, claimed that despite these initiatives real progress did not materialize and that, in fact, the result has been continuing segregation of immigrants in concentrated neighborhoods. A study by van Kempen and van Weesep found that, although policy changes were enacted, immigrants were still unable to substantially improve their housing situation. This was so because their options were limited due to a "characteristically inferior social position" that impeded their efforts to acquire more adequate housing in predominantly Dutch neighborhoods. (p. 1823) Furthermore, the authors found that surprisingly low numbers of immigrants applied for subsidies designed to help them obtain better housing. (van Kempen and van Weesep, p. 1823) Van Kempen

and van Weesep also note that substantial segregation of Turks and Moroccans persisted in the four largest cities in the Netherlands. They utilize a Segregation Index to measure the level of ethnic concentration in these cities. A Segregation Index value of 100 means that a city is completely segregated, and a value of zero means that there is an equal distribution of Dutch people and ethnic minorities. Table 2 shows that segregation not only persisted, but that it actually worsened in the decade after the housing initiatives. It could be argued that this development arose as greater numbers of immigrants came to the Netherlands between 1983 and 1993, and that segregation increased because immigrants seek to live in immigrant enclaves. While this is certainly a factor contributing to the growing concentration of immigrants in certain areas, the van Kempen and van Weesep study also showed that other cities in Western Europe that underwent similar immigration inflows had lower Segregation Index values than Dutch cities.

The Ethnic Minorities Policy also attempted to improve employment opportunities for immigrants. This was necessary because immigrants' job mobility was extremely limited. As one labor migration expert, W.R. Bohning, argues, while immigrants were generally treated as nonpermanent guest workers, their "temporary character . . . [was maintained] by tying workers to certain jobs, restricting their job mobility, [and] requiring renewal of work and residence permit. . . ." (p. 159) The Dutch government attempted to reverse this situation by implementing pro-

grams which sought to improve employment opportunities of immigrants in the 1980s. Also, worker training programs for immigrants have been introduced, but the implementation of these programs has been sporadic and weak. (Vasta, p. 724) Furthermore, immigrants to the Netherlands have encountered obstacles in obtaining certain jobs due to discriminatory hiring processes. (Vasta, p. 723) As a result, later laws introduced in the 1990s attempted to combat such discrimination by requiring employers to release information regarding the makeup of minorities within their workforce. As described by one expert on Dutch immigration policy, Rinus Penninx, these laws have been "purely symbolic" and were erratically implemented, however. (p. 244) As Table 3 shows, unemployment among immigrants, especially Turks and Moroccans (Entzinger, p. 68), was not only higher than that of the native population in 1983, but also continued to be so in the decade after the Ethnic Minorities Policy initiatives. Once again, well-intentioned policies seeking to improve the immigrants' circumstances were ineffective.

To summarize, when immigration began during the 1960s and 1970s, the Netherlands had reluctantly become an immigrant country. (van Amersfoort and Penninx, p. 134) The Ethnic Minorities Policy was a reaction to the recognition that labor migrants were not merely temporary "guests" willing to work and later to return home, but rather were increasingly becoming permanent residents. As Ellie Vasta, a critic of the Ethnic Minorities Policy, puts it, the government's efforts to address this situation

Table 2

Segregation Index (SI) for Moroccans and Turks in the Big Cities, 1983 and 1993

	Amsterdam	Rotterdam	The Hague	Utrecht
Moroccans				
1983	35.3	49.5	–	40.3
1993	38.8	49.9	53.2	42.7
Turks				
1983	35.7	50.7	–	35.7
1993	40.9	53.8	60.4	44.5

Source: van Kempen, Ronald and van Weesep, Jan. "Ethnic Residential Patterns in Dutch Cities: Backgrounds, Shifts and Consequences." *Urban Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 10, 1998, pp. 1813–33.

Table 3
Unemployment Rates (%) in the Netherlands 1983 and 1993

Year	Native Population		Foreigners	
	All	<25 yrs.	All	<25 yrs.
1983	11.3	20.4	24.5	37.2
1993	5.7	9.7	19.6	25.5

Source: Vasta, Ellie. "From Ethnic Minorities to Ethnic Majority Policy: Multiculturalism and the Shift to Assimilationism in the Netherlands." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 5, 2007, pp. 713–40.

can be seen as a continuation of some aspects of pillarization, which generously funded new ethnic and religious minority communities for their own places of worship and [their own] media, and certain types of educational provision on the same basis as preexisting parallel institutional arrangements. (Vasta, p. 216)

In essence, however, the policies supporting these institutional arrangements resulted in further segregation and separation (Joppke, p. 248) without reducing the negative effects that had already been set in motion before the Ethnic Minorities Policy. For this reason, multiculturalism and its political derivative, the Ethnic Minorities Policy, have been criticized for focusing too much on respecting ethnic groups. Although this has been the main criticism, I would add that the failure to implement many of the programs based on the Ethnic Minorities Policy suggests a pattern of merely symbolic attempts to improve the plight of immigrants. As one sociologist, Christian Joppke, has noted, "Under the shadow of official multiculturalism, an 'ethnic underclass' had been allowed to emerge. . . ." (p. 248) And Ellie Vasta goes on to argue that the routine failure of policies built on multicultural principles to achieve their goals and, in particular, the bad performance of labor market and education policies are indications of institutional racism in the Netherlands. (Vasta, p. 730) Therefore, while multiculturalism seemed to be an inclusive and respectful approach toward immigrants in the Netherlands, in essence it epitomized the Dutch rejection of non-Dutch culture. As a result of widespread criticism, the integration policies of the 1990s, to be described in the following section, switched the focus toward encouraging

good citizenship of immigrants. (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 17)

Integration

Integration Policy of Ethnic Minorities

In the 1990s the Dutch government's recognition of the inadequacy of the Ethnic Minorities Policy shifted the political discourse away from multiculturalism and toward integration. The Scientific Council for Government Policy (SCGP) published another report in 1989, summarizing the shortcomings of the previous policy regarding immigrant education and employment while stressing that too much attention was paid to ethnic groups rather than to individuals. From this study emerged a new policy in 1994, called the Integration Policy of Ethnic Minorities. The objectives of the Integration Policy were mainly:

1. to focus less on ethnic groups and more on individuals, specifically those who were lagging socioeconomically behind the general population;
2. to achieve socioeconomic equality through labor market and education initiatives;
3. to move away from multicultural policies and move more toward policies focusing on citizenship and immigrants' independence within the Netherlands (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 17)

The policy document defined integration as "a process leading to the full and equal participation of individuals and groups in society, for which mutual respect for identity is seen as a

necessary condition.” (Entzinger, p. 72) The integration initiatives which followed from this policy, however, acquired an assimilationist character because they made integration into Dutch society more compulsory for immigrants than did the Ethnic Minorities Policy of the 1980s. The shift toward more assimilationist policies revealed the government’s preference for a homogeneous Dutch culture that could not be realized during the previous multiculturalist era. Furthermore, a series of restrictive immigration policies, enacted early in the twenty-first century, especially targeted foreigners who were not from the European Union. These restrictive policies, discussed in the following section, illustrate the increasing effort which the government made to exclude people from certain countries, particularly Turkey and Morocco, from entering the Netherlands. As with multiculturalism, this policy shift once again reflected the Dutch government’s rejection of non-Dutch culture.

To explain further, although immigration had slowed during the 1980s, it increased significantly during the early 1990s when Turkish and Moroccan families as well as more refugees, particularly asylum seekers, were permitted to immigrate to the Netherlands. (Entzinger, p. 69) As a result, the new Integration Policy now targeted this broader range of people coming from non-European countries.

Assimilationist Character of Integration Policy

Since the 1990s Dutch immigration policy has become both more assimilationist and more restrictive. The Council report which led to the new Integration Policy stated that ethnic minorities had become too dependent on public services and that they should instead become more self-sufficient. (Entzinger, p. 70) The solution proposed was to enable the immigrants to participate more fully in Dutch society by the creation of civic integration programs, including compulsory Dutch language courses. The new policies also made it the responsibility of immigrants to become “productive” and “loyal” citizens. As the Dutch Minister for Urban and Integration Policy, Roger van Boxtel, stated:

Members of ethnic minorities can be expected to do their utmost in order to acquire an independent position in our country as soon as possible. This requires them to opt for this society and to take responsibility for making use of the many facilities that our country offers to its new compatriots. Mastering the Dutch language is a crucial aspect of this. (Entzinger, p. 74)

The responsibility of integrating into Dutch society was largely shifted to the immigrants themselves by way of mandatory Dutch language and culture courses which forced immigrants to “opt for” Dutch society. More specifically, a 1998 Law on Civic Integration for Newcomers requires that newly arrived non-European immigrants participate in 600 hours of language and civics courses. (Joppke, p. 248) Fines are levied if the courses are not completed. (Vasta, p. 718) According to Han Entzinger, a proponent of the courses, “The [courses are] meant to improve [immigrants’] chances in the labor market.”² (Entzinger, p. 77) In effect, policies that have been put forth on the grounds of improving the disadvantaged situation of immigrants have, in fact, moved toward forcing immigrants to accept the host nation’s language and culture.

Recently, still more laws have been passed which seek to “homogenize” the Dutch population. In particular, three of these laws make integration compulsory for certain immigrants. The first law, enacted in 2005, requires foreigners to pass civic integration courses upon entering the Netherlands in order to renew or acquire temporary and permanent residence permits. (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 21) The second law, implemented in 2006, expands the requirements for oral and written fluency in Dutch to already settled immigrants as well. (Marinelli, p. 10) A third law, passed in 2007, made it the responsibility of immigrants to pay for the costs of the integration courses, 70 percent of which would be refunded if the test were passed. (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 21) New requirements are being proposed that would oblige

²There was in fact a decline in the immigrant unemployment rate in the second half of the 1990s. (It was still much higher than that for native Dutch, however). This improvement was attributed to the growth of the Dutch economy. (Vasta, p. 719)

already settled immigrants to participate in the civic integration courses. (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 21) The nature of these three laws clearly demonstrates the increasingly assimilationist character of recent Dutch integration policies.

The recent integration policies have also arisen in concert with more restrictive immigration policies that emerged from a new set of laws, collectively referred to as the Integration Policy New Style of 2002. Its initiatives have focused on restricting the admission of new immigrants, as well as forcing the return of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers whose applications to stay in the Netherlands have been denied. (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 22) Furthermore, requirements which stemmed from the Integration Policy New Style use civic integration courses as a method to restrict immigration. (Bruquetas-Callejo et al., p. 22) More specifically, a pre-arrival integration law was passed in 2005, requiring that non-EU nationals seeking permanent residence pass a test on Dutch culture and language. (Marinelli, p. 6) The test, which is to be given through Dutch embassies in foreign countries, exempts the following:

Citizens of the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Suriname (if the person has finished six years [of] elementary school), Japan and nationals of countries with close ties with the EU (Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland) wishing to join their Dutch partner in the Netherlands . . . from [taking] the pre-arrival exam. (Marinelli, p. 6)

Such measures clearly target only certain groups attempting to enter the Netherlands. It is anticipated that, if implemented successfully, the law will apply to 14,000 immigrants, largely from Turkey and Morocco. (Marinelli, p. 6)

Furthermore, new restrictions on family reunification have resulted in a sharp decline in the number of Moroccan and Turkish immigrants. (Marinelli, p. 5) These restrictions include stipulations that sponsors seeking to bring a marriage partner to the Netherlands must be at least 21 years of age and must earn at least 120 percent of the minimum wage. (Marinelli, p. 5) Also, single parents and persons aged 57 to 65 are no longer excluded from these income restrictions. (Marinelli, p. 5) Since certain minorities, particularly those from

Morocco and Turkey, tend to earn less than other immigrant groups such as those from Western Europe, the above provision clearly targets certain groups. The Minister for Aliens' Affairs and Integration, Rita Verdonk, has justified these restrictions on the grounds that they "create more favorable conditions, in which migrants already residing in the Netherlands can integrate more successfully into Dutch society." (Verdonk, as quoted in Marinelli, p. 5) In essence, though, ethnic minority cohesion and unification is being perceived as a threat which needs to be addressed by diluting attachments of minorities to each other and to their homeland.

Conclusion

As a reaction to increasing levels of immigration and to the failure of the earlier Ethnic Minorities Policy, the Dutch have experienced a policy shift away from multiculturalism and toward integration. Once again, however, the Dutch government has promoted policies which ultimately result in the rejection of non-Dutch culture. While the previous policy of multiculturalism created separate institutions to minimize contact between the host population and immigrants, more recent integration policies have required immigrants to acquire more "Dutch" characteristics. By making Dutch language and culture courses compulsory in order to improve the socioeconomic situation of the immigrants, the government is ultimately asking immigrants to "become more Dutch." Furthermore, through more restrictive immigration policies, the Dutch government has, in effect, limited the entry of certain ethnic groups into the Netherlands. And by adopting more compulsory integration policies, the Dutch have attempted to homogenize the diverse population in the Netherlands.

Because many of the problems of the past 25 years have stemmed from the immigration policies of the 1960s and 1970s, it would be prudent for the Netherlands not to employ short-sighted solutions to its current economic difficulties. The country is now facing various problems that come with an aging population, and employers are having difficulty hiring people to work in certain sectors. ("Economic Survey . . .") While employers lobby the Dutch

government to relax immigration policy (Marinelli, p. 3), it is important that policy-makers keep in mind the problems that have accompanied labor immigration in the country's past. Taking these facts into consideration would not only prevent history from repeating itself, but would also keep immigrants from coming into the Netherlands as second-class citizens. As long as people are intentionally brought into the country to perform the least desirable jobs, many will become, and will remain, marginalized. Assimilating immigrants cannot bring them out of a marginalized state because substituting cultural marginalization for socioeconomic marginalization does not fix the real problem —

Dutch society's rejection of non-Dutch peoples. Therefore, if the Dutch truly desire to accommodate immigrants, they must address the problem at its root. Just as immigrants must come to know Dutch culture, perhaps equal effort should be put into fostering a better understanding among Dutch citizens, particularly employers, about the different cultures that reside in the Netherlands today and the contributions they are making. Programs that enhance inter-cultural understanding in schools and communities might serve as the bridge that is needed to overcome the gaps which have resulted in rejectionist policies toward non-Dutch immigrants in the Netherlands.

REFERENCES

- Bohning, W.R. "Immigration Policies of Western European Countries." *International Migration Review*, Special Issue: Policy and Research on Migration: Canadian and World Perspectives, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1974, pp. 155–63. Accessed September 9, 2008.
- Bruquetas-Callejo, M., Garces-Mascareñas, B., Penninx, R., and Scholten, P. "Policymaking Related to Immigration and Integration. The Dutch Case." IMISCOE Country Report: Working Paper, No. 15. Online. www.imiscoe.org/publications/workingpapers/documents/IntegrationPolicymakingDutchcase.pdf. Accessed February 28, 2008.
- Castles, Stephen. "The Guest-Worker in Western Europe—An Obituary." *International Migration Review*, Special Issue: Temporary Worker Programs: Mechanisms, Conditions, Consequences, Vol. 20, No. 4, 1986, pp. 761–78. Accessed October 12, 2008.
- Caviedes, Alex. "Corporatist Birds of a Feather? Labor Migration and Employer Preferences in Austria and the Netherlands." Paper presented at 15th Council for European Studies Conference, 2006. Online. www.europanet.org/pub/papers/Caviedes.pdf. Accessed February 24, 2008.
- "Economic Survey of the Netherlands 2008." *OECD Economic Surveys*. January 31, 2008. Online. www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en_33873108_33873626_39991250_1_1_1_100.html. Accessed March 9, 2008.
- Entzinger, Han. "The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism," in *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship*. Christian Joppke and Ewa Morawska, eds. New York: Palgrave, 2003.
- Joppke, Christian. "The Retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal State: Theory and Policy." *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 55, No. 2, 2004, pp. 237–57.
- Marinelli, Vera. "The Netherlands," in *Current Immigration Debates in Europe: A Publication of the European Migration Dialogue*. Niessen, J., Schibel, Y., and Thompson, C., eds. September 2005. Online. www.migpolgroup.com/multiattachments/3009/DocumentName/EMD_Netherlands_2005.pdf. Accessed February 24, 2007.
- Penninx, Rinus. "Dutch Immigrant Policies before and after the Van Gogh Murder." *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2006, pp. 241–54.
- Statline Database. Netherlands Statistics. Online. statline.cbs.nl. Accessed March 4, 2008.
- van Amersfoort, Hans and Rinus Penninx. "Regulating Migration in Europe: The Dutch Experience, 1960–92." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Strategies for Immigration Control: An International Comparison, Vol. 534, July 1994, pp. 133–46.
- van Kempen, Ronald and Jan van Weesep. "Ethnic Residential Patterns in Dutch Cities: Backgrounds, Shifts and Consequences." *Urban Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 10, 1998, pp. 1813–33.
- Vasta, Ellie. "From Ethnic Minorities to Ethnic Majority Policy: Multiculturalism and the Shift to Assimilationism in the Netherlands." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 5, 2007, pp. 713–40.
- Vellinga, Menno. "The Benelux Countries: Divergent Paths toward Restricted Immigration," in *The Politics of Migration Policies: Settlement and Integration The First World into the 1990s*. Daniel Kubat, ed., 2nd Edition. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1993.