

Breaking Down the White Walls: The Dutch from Indonesia.

Wim Willems

The Other Dutch

In March 1996 an exhibition was held in the Dutch Consulate General in Melbourne, Victoria. It focused on the backgrounds of *the other Dutch*, by whom were meant the Dutch migrants from the former Dutch colony, the Netherlands-Indies (now Indonesia).¹ Photographs, artefacts, books, documents, household articles and costumes were shown to give an overall impression of the way people lived in the days before World War II. Also shown were videos with images of the cherished old days. It was the first time during their stay in Australia that migrants with a Dutch-Indonesian heritage publicly showed who they are and where they come from. The club that had taken the initiative to organise this exhibition is called *Tempo Doeloe*, founded in 1989. It now has approximately 200 members who were born, worked or fought in what is today called Indonesia.² Their club magazine appears six times per year and the club has all kind of social activities such as *perkumpulans* (social meetings), picnics and tours. They have ties with the Dutch community in Australia, as well as with group members who live in needy circumstances in Indonesia. According to their statutes they express their group-culture in the so-called old-*Indische* style, with a strong emphasis on hospitality, cordiality, tolerance and helping each other. They hold on to some typical Dutch customs, like *Sinterklaas*, although under the influence of the Anglo-Saxon Australian society, Christmas has become more important, but at their gatherings they mainly eat Indonesian food and they sometimes listen to *krontjong*-songs, which

are deeply embedded in the Dutch-Indonesian popular culture. In their lifestyle and their amusements they seem to combine a mixture of group-cultural characteristics.

Do we have to interpret these activities as a sign of ethnic revival amongst the Dutch from Indonesia,³ or is it the expression of a vague group-awareness in some circles of the first generation of these migrants? It is hard to say, for the people themselves have never been questioned about their lives in Australia and the evolution of their settlement process. They seem to make up a hidden category in the Australian population as a whole and in the field of migration and ethnic studies they have never attracted any attention. That is, up until recently.⁴ Apart from this neglect, they also are hard to find in the official censuses, for migrants born in Indonesia are categorised as Indonesians. Nonetheless from one Australian census, that of 1986, it is possible to deduce the Indonesia-born with Dutch ancestry.⁵

One can wonder, why it is so important to make a difference between the Dutch from the Netherlands and the Dutch from the former colony in the East-Indies. I would like to argue that the main reason for doing so is connected with the social-cultural, or maybe, we even have to say, with the ethnic dimension. The case is, so to speak, that the Dutch in Indonesia were split by a colour-line. People of mixed descent, the so-called Eurasians, did not occupy the same place in the social stratification of the colonial society, and definitely were not looked upon by Australian authorities in the same way as the 'white Dutch'.

Again, the data of the census from 1986 enable us to illustrate this issue more clearly. Most of the 5057 migrants from Indonesia with a Dutch ancestry came to Australia

between 1947 and 1966, while the lion's share of the Asiatic-Indonesians came after 1972. This is also true for the Chinese-Indonesians who emigrated to Australia. This is largely due to the fact that Asian immigrants were not very welcome in Australia up until the beginning of the 1970s. One can imagine that this immigration-policy also had an important effect on the coloured Dutch who tried to emigrate to Australia, directly from Indonesia or indirectly via the Netherlands. In this chapter I will try to explain why the white walls to keep out people with an Asian background, were built up by the Australian Government, how the Dutch policy-makers reacted to this excluding mechanism, what discussion about this subject took place through time, and why the walls began to crumble.⁶

Building up white walls

Let us start with a short account of the historical background of the Australian immigration-policies towards people of non-European descent.⁷ Substantial numbers of Asian immigrants did not come to Australia until the gold rushes of the 1850's. Those that then came were mainly Chinese gold seekers, not intending permanent settlement. Indeed, their determination to take home all the gold they found was one of the factors which aroused the hostility of other Australians. There was further factor, the Chinese lived on the gold-fields as closed communities. Suspicion and ill feeling were rife, reaching the stage of violence more than once. Legislation to control their entry came too late to prevent serious social disturbances.

The recruitment of Pacific Islanders as indentured labourers for the Queensland cane-fields, beginning in 1863 and continuing over a period of 40 years, also caused very

serious concern as the colonies developed towards federation and nationhood.

Recruitment, employment and living conditions aroused ever-increasing controversy finally leading to government controls. Opposition grew against the entry of any workers who were ready to accept low employment and living standards. Then in 1877 a steamship company employing Chinese on coastal ships at considerably less than Australian seamen's rates of pay; and a subsequent seamen's strike led to widespread and intense hostility against foreign cheap labour.

These and other elements in Australian history introduced into the movement towards federation a general demand for a national immigration policy. A policy of virtual exclusion of non-European immigrants was adopted with almost complete unanimity by all parties in the new Federal Parliament. The Immigration Restriction Act passed in 1901 embodied provisions enabling the executive government to implement this policy, including the device of the 'dictation test' which could be given in any European language at the discretion of customs officers.⁸ The test was rarely, if ever, given to white would be immigrants and, as intended by the legislators, it was carefully given to prospective Asian immigrants in a language of which they had no knowledge. The policy remained essentially unchanged until after World War II. The only provision for Asian people wishing to enter Australia was for temporary entry as visitors, students, merchants and assistants in Asian businesses.

After the War Australia started to open its doors to European immigrants wider than ever before.⁹ The government aimed for an annual population increase of two percent, half from natural increase, half from immigration. This meant an influx of 70,000 migrants a year, though double that number would be arriving by 1949. It was hoped

that there would be ten British migrants for every foreign migrant.¹⁰ The country looked upon itself as a British community, living under British standards and by the methods and ideals of British parliamentary democracy. However, unable to attract sufficient British immigrants immediately after the War, the Australian Government introduced a Displaced Persons Program in 1947, aimed at accepting 50,000 refugees yearly.¹¹ It also established the Department of Immigration and a special division to register, control and assimilate all non-British members of the community. The aim was to prevent their concentration in particular areas or industries. Migrants previously known as ‘white aliens’ were officially referred to as ‘New Australians’, although on the streets of Australian cities they were still referred to disparagingly as “wogs” and “dagoes.” The newcomers were expected to leave their language and their culture behind when stepping ashore on Australian soil. These expectations were clearly spelled out in official welcoming material.¹² Fear of Asian newcomers revived, because they were supposed to be unable to assimilate in the Anglo-Saxon Australian society. Australian Government policy time and again stressed that Japanese and Chinese migrants would cause minority-problems, pointing to western countries which had large numbers of colonial migrants. Therefore, Asian immigration was actively held small. This restrictive immigration policy was partly due to negative reactions of the labour unions, which stressed the possibility that Asian workers would ruin the market by accepting low wages.

(I think it is necessary to add here that the same exclusion-policy towards the ‘Asiatic race’ was pursued in New Zealand and Canada, two other popular immigrant-countries for the Dutch in the 1950s and 1960s. The same held true for Jews, who, at least up until 1953, were not welcome in Australia.¹³)

What effect did this attitude have on the way Australian policy-makers looked upon Dutch migrants, especially the ones who came from Indonesia? The first emigration-agreement between the Netherlands and Australia dated from the end of 1946 and was intended for skilled and agricultural workers. The aim was to encourage fifty Dutch persons per month to move to Australia. However, until 1950 only a few individuals answered to this call, because it was hard to find a sponsor in Australia to take responsibility for ensuring them assistance in finding work and housing. Up till 1955 special provisions, such as assistance with the cost of the journey to Australia were made by the Australian Government for allied-ex-service-men (those being in national service between September 1939 and 15 August 1945) and for members of the Resistance. However, they had to meet one condition: being of pure European descent. And, if we may go on the paperwork, exceptions were not made.

The Dutch Government in the Netherlands also established incentives to emigrate for demobilised employees of the Royal Land Forces and the Royal Navy in Indonesia, which had to be disbanded after the transfer of sovereignty from the Dutch to the new Indonesian government in December 1949.¹⁴ Although people had to make their own decision, these incentives were rather attractive and extended to vocational training, payment of the journey and a subsidy for the settlement. The Dutch Government's reason for encouraging emigration was that the national labour market at the end of the 1940s were not very good, so those ex servicemen who could emigrate to countries with expanding labour markets should be encouraged to do so. In practice the interest in emigration to Australia amongst ex-servicemen fell short to what the Dutch Government hoped for, partly due to the position Australia had taken in the Dutch-

Indonesian conflict. Besides, many wanted to repatriate to The Netherlands first, to recover from the war years.

Among Dutch civilians in Indonesia the wish to emigrate was much stronger. Their social and economic position in the new Indonesian society became more and more insecure and therefore many were anxious to escape to Australia or New Zealand. The Indonesian government let them go gladly. At the Ministerial level in The Netherlands some also saw the advantages of a direct emigration to countries other than The Netherlands, as this meant a lesser load for the emergency-programme set up in the homeland for the thousands and thousands of repatriating Dutch fleeing from an Indonesian society that acted with increasing hostility towards them.. The *Assisted Migration Agreement* Australia and The Netherlands entered into in February 1951, in which arrangements were laid down, for amongst other things, the sharing of costs of emigration, facilitated some emigration of the Dutch from Indonesia to Australia.¹⁵ On the other hand, the selection-criteria imposed by the Australian civil servants of the Department of Immigration were rather difficult for some people to meet. The screening of potential candidates was rigorous. Health, political background, social abilities and family-history, all these factors played a role in the decision about admission. Of special importance was someone's outward appearance, the colour of the skin and external features. In respect of meeting the selection criteria the Dutch from Indonesia made up a complicated category. They were European, but not all of them of a 'pure origin', to follow the idiom of those days.

Non pure European origins

Officially the Australian Government did not pursue a White Immigration Policy - which would be contrary to the international emigration-agreements - and for that reason even the Australian consulates were not given written instructions.¹⁶ However, Dutch civil servants of the emigration department experienced in their contacts with the Australian Embassy in The Hague that off-the-record a colour-bar did actually exist, especially in the case of people with a partly Asian background. As early as 1950, Australian immigration officers, as we know from their own recollections, were informed that so-called Eurasians did not, on the whole, prove a very desirable type of migrant and conditions regarding their admission to Australia were tightened up. Henceforth, they would have to show that they were approximately 75% or more of European descent, that they were fully European in upbringing and outlook and tended to be European rather than non European in appearance. Prospective immigrants were required to produce documentary evidence of their origins, including sometimes photographs of their grandparents. If three out of four of them were white, then the person might be admitted. In doubtful cases, particularly when the facial complexion of the applicant suggested a non-European background, the immigration officer would resort to a rough rule of thumb by imagining how they would fit into the street scene of an Australian city.¹⁷ So, family-trees were decisive. Not that this made life easier. For in reality it was quite difficult and often even impossible to meet this demand for documentation. First of all, because a lot of documents from the Dutch Registry Offices had been lost during the Japanese occupation of Indonesia and also because it was very hard to detect the administrative traces of one's ancestors in the modern state of Indonesia, due to complicated bureaucratic procedures. And even then, people who produced proof of being, so to speak, say 89% of European blood could be refused by the Australians because of his or her non-European looks. Facial appearance had to do

the trick. As a consequence, coloured Dutch who looked and acted very European, could be accepted. In this respect the Dutch policy-makers for long time acted very pragmatically in their negotiations with the Australian Immigration-Department about the admission of individuals in this category that was so hard to adequately define.

How did the bureaucratic machine in which people ended up operate? This can be illustrated by means of the personal file of J.J.S. (born in 1909, married, three children), who in September 1951 tried to emigrate from Indonesia to Australia through the procedures established for allied ex- servicemen. The first delay he encountered was that he asked for application forms in the wrong town. Two months later he wrote to the Dutch authorities asking for copies of his discharge papers. However, his draft card had been lost. The only written proof he had of his service record was a salary-payment from the army. The civil servants from the Dutch Commissioner's office in Indonesia thereupon advised him to contact the ministry in The Netherlands for confirmation concerning his whereabouts during the Japanese occupation. He did so. The next step was a trip to Jakarta, to get new application forms. By now it was May. S. and his wife then had to apply again at the office in Jakarta for an emigration-report to be made. S. was told to supply two passport photographs, but then the emigration office insisted that they needed one more of him, three of his wife (of the right size!) and three of each of his children. S was told that on August 25 the Commissioner would visit Bangka, where the family lived, and he was prepared to make up the report on the spot. S. received a stencil with the conditions with which Dutch Eurasians had to comply. On September 26, 1952 he sent a letter to the commissioner in Palembang with information about his ancestors. In a reply a month later he was told that he had to send more material about his descent, because the selection criteria had been tightened. S. had to show which of

his parents and grandparents were of pure European origin and which were of 'mixed blood'. In the latter case he had to report what percentage they were of complete European descent. His quick written reply went as follows. All the (grand)parents of S. himself were of pure European origin. With regards to his wife: grandparents from the father's side of French descent, from the mother's side the grandfather of pure European origin, born in the Netherlands; the grandmother more than 50% of complete European origin, so the mother more than 75%. The conclusion: Mrs. S. was 90% pure European origin. The visiting Commissioner also had been told that the appearance of the wife, her way of life and general development would not cause any problems. A last obstacle was raised when S. had immediately to produce a certificate for housing accommodation in Australia, which he had sent before, signed by a Commonwealth Officer. He uttered his indignation in a letter, but also came up with a new certificate. In March 1952 he had, because of this administrative delay of six months, be obliged to prolong his contract as a short-service volunteer. On 9 December 1952 he was told that the certificate appeared to be in his file all the time. No excuses. Nevertheless, the family was classified as 'western orientated' at last and considered suitable for emigration.

Reading through the emigration-files, built up by the Dutch Commissioner's offices in Indonesia and now in the archives of the Ministries in the Netherlands, one can only conclude that the colour of a person's skin really could be an insurmountable disadvantage when applying to immigrate to Australia. Education, character, reliability and professional skills were, in the end, no match for a dark physical appearance. Only when a white relative of an applicant already resident in Australia offered to act as a sponsor and take full responsibility for the prospective immigrant could the colour bar

be neutralised. The Australian Embassy even recommended this strategy, which, if followed, most of the time led to success.

Knocking on white walls

From the beginning of the 1950s Dutch policymakers were not very happy with the ambivalent position of the Australian Department of Immigration. What was the situation? Officially, Australia's immigration policy did not discriminate on the ground of race. The Australian Government pleaded only for the right to decide for themselves who they admitted to their country: only immigrants who were needed by the labour market! Besides that, so the argument went, they had to fit in the homogeneous, monocultural Australian society. The country wanted to remain free from minority-problems and the idea was that people from 'another race' would certainly cause trouble, as was the case in other parts of the world, such as the United States. Time and again Dutch civil servants stressed that their countrymen from Indonesia, even though they were coloured, belonged to the 'European stock'.¹⁸ At the same time they did their best not to alienate the Australian authorities, for a policy of confrontation could have repercussions for the thousands of Dutch emigrants who were yearly welcomed in Australia. So one had to be opportunistic and choose the lesser of two evils. Every *Non Pure European Origin* (the NPEO's, as they were called in internal reports) who slipped in with the rest, was a welcome bonus.

The Australian attitude towards people with a (partly) Asian background, nevertheless, kept on being a thorn in the flesh of the Dutch policymakers. In the course of the years the Dutch press now and then attacked the racial selection-criteria and the way in which

Dutch civil servants uncritically co-operated with it.¹⁹ After such events the Dutch ambassador in Canberra (or his emigration-attaché) usually was asked to contact the persons in charge of the Immigration Department to enquire if the Australian position had become more liberal. But the times were not changing very fast. In 1960, when official meetings had started to draft a new migration and settlement treaty between The Netherlands and Australia, which would regulate free passenger travel (entered into on 1 June 1965)²⁰, the subject of coloured Dutch was on the agenda again. It would remain so in the decade to come.

The issue was inextricably interwoven with the widening of the gap between the racial ideology in Australia on the one hand and the denial of a racially motivated politics on the other. In this regard it was what happened during the Citizenship Convention of 1959, where the leading Australian medical researcher Sir Macfarlane Burnet gave a lecture about immigration and race mixture from a genetic angle that was very revealing. In Burnet's opinion much was to be said for allowing into the country as much non-European genetic material as the community could safely assimilate. He argued that interracial marriages should be encouraged as they resulted in the best characteristics of each parent being inherited by their children.²¹ A practical approach to this, he thought, was to establish the rule that the spouse of any Australian citizen of European blood would be automatically admissible to citizenship, irrespective of race or nationality. Reading the press reports of his statements, it becomes clear that his words led to strong opposition,²² not surprisingly as his opinions undermined the established political and social convictions of the Australian society. On that level the notion prevailed that the genetic advantages Burnet talked about, vanished in comparison with the social and economic dangers attached to interracial marriages, especially between the European

and the coloured race. But these opinions were not wholly in tune with the spirit of the age, as would become evident.

We can see a discreet shift in policy-making behind the diplomatic curtains reflected in the internal reports between The Netherlands and Australia. During the course of 1962 it became clear that the Department of Immigration was willing to act more liberally towards individuals with a mixed background. Although, it was added, the official policy would, for the moment, not undergo any changes. As a result, it was not possible to bring the new attitude to the notice of the parties concerned, at least not in public.²³

The only space that Dutch civil servants saw for themselves was to advise people who were refused admittance to try again. Most of them were aware of proceeding in a kind of twilight zone. If the expanding Australian possibilities became public knowledge, the Australian Government would react furiously, with a resulting restrictive effect on the official immigration policy. On the other hand the Dutch emigration-attaché realised that the liberalising tendency would end if nobody knew about it. At this stage the subject also got priority at a ministerial level in The Netherlands, but at first it was decided not to interfere with the internal affairs of Australia. The prevailing opinion was that the effects on Dutch with a mixed descent who wanted to migrate to that country directly from the Netherlands could only be negative.

The next step forward was made during the official visit to Australia of Dutch Minister Veldkamp of Social Affairs, who was also responsible for emigration, especially in talks he had with the new Australian Minister of Immigration, Hubert Opperman, about the liberalisation of the selection-criteria towards emigrants of a mixed Indonesian-Dutch descent.²⁴ Veldkamp stressed the necessity of equal treatment for this category of

Dutchmen, because they were completely assimilated to the European way of life and did not display the characteristics of a minority group at all. Besides this refutation of the traditional arguments against the admission of Asians, the Dutch delegation also pointed out that the Eurasians who migrated to Australia directly from New Guinea (which became Indonesian in 1963), were smoothly integrated into Australian society. Opperman showed respect for this line of reasoning, but in return asked for some understanding, especially in the light of a possible creation of a precedent, which would allow immigrants of mixed English-Indian descent and the *burghers* from Ceylon (descendants of the Dutch colonists in that country) to come and knock on the doors of the Commonwealth. Nevertheless, he would transfer the subject from the administrative to the governmental level and promised to aim for a different policy. He kept his word. In the House of Representatives in 1965 he stressed that applicants would be judged on grounds such as compassionate reasons for emigration, for example close family relationship to someone already resident in Australia and a person's general ability to make a contribution to the new country's progress. References to descent and appearance seemed to belong to the past. A new direction was embarked on.

The walls tumble down

The Directorate for Emigration in the Netherlands, however, was not reassured. How severe would the social selection be, especially in regard to coloured migrants? Did the reversal of policy on the governmental level really lead to a lenient attitude in practice? These questions would be a *leitmotiv* in the internal reports during the years to come. All the time the Dutch aimed to proceed tactfully and pragmatically in individual cases

- always aim at the best result! - and, because of the delicacy of the political situation in Australia, to confine discussions about principles to the official level.

In March 1966 an official turn in the immigration policy took place at last. Opperman introduced two major changes. First, non-Europeans who were already in Australia with a temporary permits, but were likely to stay indefinitely, no longer had to wait 15 years before applying for permanent resident status and for Australian citizenship. They would be able to apply after five years residence. This ended a situation often criticised for its effect on individuals and families. Second, applications for entry by well qualified people wishing to settle in Australia would be considered on the basis of their suitability as settlers, their ability to integrate readily, and their having qualifications which were positively useful to the immigration country. They would be able, after five years' stay on temporary permits, be able to apply for permanent resident status and citizenship. They also were permitted to bring their immediate families with them on first arrival. Opperman added that no annual quota were contemplated. The number of people entering would be *somewhat larger than previously*, but would stay controlled by the careful assessment of individual qualifications, and the basic aim of *preserving a homogeneous population* would be maintained.²⁵

What did this mean for the Dutch Eurasians? Not really an improvement, judging by the alarming reports of the Dutch civil servants of the Emigration Department at the end of the 1960s. Of the applicants who tried to get admission under the 1965 migration-scheme, a bilateral agreement for assisted passage, in 1968/69 about 75% were rejected. An analysis showed that dark people, who were supposed to be more than 25% Indonesian, were still not accepted, and definitely not financially supported with their

passage and settlement, as were white Dutch migrants. The entry-policy could be liberalised, this was not true for the assistance-policy. A mixed descent still was a stigma.

In January 1971 an Englishman of 'non pure European origin' filed a complaint against the Australian Government with the *British Race Relations Board*, because he was rejected as a migrant due to his mixed descent. The Australian press attacked the rather awkward defence by the Australian Minister of Immigration.²⁶ The Prime Minister thereupon stated that his country aimed at a policy that gave access to more and more people of different backgrounds, so that in the end it would turn into a truly multiracial society. At the same time a survey among the people of Sydney and Melbourne about their acceptance of coloured migrants showed that 75% of them unreservedly, or with some reservations, held the opinion that this category was just as acceptable to them as other migrants.²⁷ These critical comments about the existing immigration-policy brought the Federal Conference of the Australian Labour Party, in the opposition at that time, to change its position and to state explicitly that discrimination based on race, skin colour or nationality was no longer acceptable. They were supported by the media. On the left as well as on the right politicians were concerned about Australia's humanitarian image in the world. Another factor prompting change was the growing assertion that Australia was part of Asia, which found expression in economic treaties with Asian allies. At last the white walls were crumbling, although the restrictive immigration-policy would still linger on for years. But for the Dutch Eurasians, who were by then already fairly integrated in their respective countries of settlement, mainly the Netherlands and the United States, it had become too late to take real advantage of the slow transformation of Australia into a modern, more multicultural society.

1... See the catalogue of this exhibition by Eve ten Brummelaar *The Other Dutch. A short history of those Dutch-Australians, who spent their youth in the Dutch East Indies*, Published by the Dutch Australian Centre Ltd, August 1995. Ten Brummelaar has also made a compilation of her talks for the Dutch Language Programme on SBS radio and her chats for the magazine *The Dutch Weekly*, published as *You can't eat Grass*, Sydney, February 1996.

2... There are also Dutch-Indonesian groups in Sydney, Brisbane (*Dino*), in Cairns (*Melati*) and there are contacts with *The Indo* in the USA. This information was supplied to me in a letter from 16 October 1996 by L.H. Voermans-de Siso, secretary and editor of *Tempo Doeloe*.

3... An indicator of a still existing Dutch identity in this category is that more than half of the Indonesia-Dutch in the 1986 Census still spoke Dutch at home, while 42% appear to have adopted English.

4... At the Faculty of Arts, Deakin University, Victoria, my colleagues Joost Côté and Loes Westerbeek recently started an interview-project focussing on people with a Dutch-Indonesian background. See their article *Border Signs: Language and Identity and Indische Mensen in Australia* (Melbourne 1997). There are plans for a joint-venture with the University of Amsterdam, where the author of this chapter is working on a study about the Dutch from Indonesia in the period after 1945.

5... See the *Cross Tabulations from Australian Bureau of Statistics, Census 1986, Country of Birth: Indonesia X Ancestry*. These data were put at my disposal by Dr Janet Penny from Penny Research Pty. Ltd. in Brighton, Victoria who was so kind to extract cross-tabulations for all the ancestry groups, birthplace Indonesia. My colleague Rick

Wolff was a great help in interpreting the information that was sent to me.

6... For the reconstruction of this two-sided process I analyzed only records in Dutch archives. My main sources were the semi-static archives of the Ministry of Social Affairs: *Directorate of the Emigration* (boxes 196, 198, inv. 08.991, inv. 08.4), *Emigration of former-militairs 1949-1954* (inv. 1.839.621/08.4), *ARBVO-archives* (inv. 396.21, files 1016, 1017, 1018); and the semi-static archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: *Centraal Rayokantoor Djakarta* (inv. 56, file West 2), *Commissariaat Semarang 1950-1957* (inv.nr. 86, Emigration Australia), *Commissariaat Palembang 1950-1957* (inv. 143, inv. 144, Emigration Australia), *Commissariaat Makassar 1950-1957* (inv. 148, inv. 149, Emigration Australia), *Commissariaat Bandung 1950-1957* (inv. 461, Emigration Australia), *Code 6, 1955-1964* (inv. 7869, inv. 7878).

7... There is a vast academic literature on this topic. I refer to some of these publications throughout this chapter. For a reflection of the official government responses towards their own policy in the past, the following two publications are worth reading: *Australia's Immigration Policy*, issued by the Department of Immigration, Australian Government Publishing Service: Canberra, revised edition, January 1971, and *The Evolution of a Policy*, by the Hon. Phillip Lynch, Minister for Immigration, Australian Government Publishing Service: Canberra, March 1971.

8... See, for instance, David Day *Claiming a Continent. A new History of Australia*. Sydney 1997, pp. 209-228.

9... See, for instance, Janis Wilton and Richard Bosworth *Old World and New Australia*, Melbourne 1984, chapter 1.

10... See also Day 1997, p. 352.

11... See, for instance, James Jupp *Immigration*, Sydney University Press, Melbourne, 1991, p. 97.

-
- 12... See Day 1997, p. 356 and Jupp 1991, p. 97.
- 13... See, for instance, the preface of Suzanne D. Rutland in the book of Daniel J. Huygens *Opposite the Lion's Den. A Story of Hiding Dutch Jews*, NSW 1996 (also pp. 163-180); see also Wilton & Bosworth 1984, pp. 3-6.
- 14... See *Staatsblad van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden*, no. I 538, Besluit van 28 December 1948, houdende vaststelling van het Besluit Demobilisatievoorzieningen in Indonesië (A Royal Decree about the demobilization facilities in Indonesia).
- 15... Five years later a new *Assisted Migration Agreement* between the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia was entered into. See *Tractatenblad van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden*, 1956, no. 92.
- 16... See Jupp 1991, p. 84, who states that by the 1950s Australian Foreign Ministers were being questioned on their overseas visits and were forced into stating that there was no White Australia Policy, which all informed opinion knew to be untrue.
- 17... See especially Harry Martin *Angels and Arrogant Gods. Migration Officers and Migrants reminisce 1945-85*, Canberra 1988, pp. 91-97. Also Day 1997, p. 390.
- 18... At the same time, at least up to 1955, the Dutch government tried to discourage these Dutch Eurasians who were supposed to be 'Eastern orientated' from emigrating to the fatherland - The Netherlands - that most of them had never seen before. See Wim Willems & Leo Lucassen (eds) *Het onbekende vaderland. De repatriëring van Indische Nederlanders (1946-1964)*, SDU: The Hague, 1994.
- 19... As in *Vrij Nederland* dd. 10 December 1955.
- 20... For the text (in Dutch as well as in English) of the Migration and Settlement Agreement, see *Tractatenblad van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden*, 1965, nr. 87.
- 21... See Day 1997, p. 392.

22... Derived from *The Age*, 22 June 1959.

23... According to Jupp 1991, p. 85-86, minor concessions were made almost annually in the 1960s in an incrementalist approach which allowed the exclusion policy to be gradually modified without attracting popular opposition or greatly increasing the numbers of non-Europeans admitted.

24... See the confidential report about the official visit that the Minister of Social Affairs and Public Health, Dr. G.M.J. Veldkamp, paid to New Zealand and Australia from March 4 to March 22, 1964, especially pp. 30-31 (the Archives of the Ministry of Social Affairs, Directorate of the Emigration, box 196).

25... See the *Speech by Hon. Hubert Opperman, M.P. on Immigration (Ministerial Statement) and the debate*, from the Parliamentary Debates, 9th, 24th and 29th March 1966. A.J. Arthur, Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra.

26... In *The Canberra Times* of 8, 9, 10 and 11 January 1971 such headlines can be found as: 'Minister admits colour bar', 'Camouflaged Racism, says editorial'.

27... See the *Herald*, 31 July 1972. The survey was held by the Australian Sales Research Bureau in association with the Department of Political Science, University of Melbourne.