

Dutch connections : 400 years of Australian-Dutch maritime links 1606-2006 / editors: Lindsey Shaw and Wendy Wilkins; designer: Jeremy Austen
(<https://catalogue.nla.gov.au/catalog/3698233>) conference and book.

Expectation versus Reality: Postwar Dutch Migration to Australia
Nonja Peters

Maritime Museum
Darling Harbour, Sydney
13 May 2006
9.30am –10.15am

Introduction

This article will demonstrate how local, national and global influences and social, cultural and economic policies of the day in both the Netherlands and Australia determined the expectations and the social and cultural connection that post-war Dutch migrants had with Australia and Australians. The period it covers, from 1947 to 1970, is when approximately 160 000 Dutch nationals, from the Netherlands and Netherlands East Indies (NEI) made Australia their home. This context provides the conceptual space for an assessment of the *reality* of leaving all that is familiar behind to start a new life in a strange new world versus the *expectation* engendered by the immigration/emigration propaganda generated by both countries. Dutch migration history is relevant to the 270,000 Australians who now claim to have Dutch heritage.

Australia specifically requisitioned the Dutch to increase the population and overturn the flagging birth rate, for reasons of defence and to fill employment vacancies in the skilled trades and semi-skilled labour areas in heavy industry, the burgeoning building and construction sectors and public utilities. Intending emigrants were enticed to Australia at information evenings and via posters, billboards and fliers that depicting an attractive lifestyle and level of materialism unheard of in post-war Netherlands. Moreover, it could be reached with passage assistance! All that was required of a prospective emigrant was that they meet race – the White Australia policy governed entry requirements - age and health criteria and remain in the type of employment for which they were selected by Australian authorities for two years.

However, before the post-war Dutch embarked on this emotional journey – and few were really aware of the complexity involved in such an undertaking – Australians had already formulated an impression of them from pre-war and wartime contact. In contrast, the impression of Australia and Australians harboured by most Dutch emigrants were derived from a government that wanted to get rid of them, a government that was desperate for their labour power and a migration propaganda machine also prone to sensationalising – so how reliable is that?

How did the Australian government, ‘who wanted them’, view them? Well, as it stands, their perceptions were not formulated in isolation of the Dutch Government, which had, well before war started, been looking for a home for its surplus-farming sons. Their concerns had, in 1939, occasioned a visit to Australia from the Director General of the Netherlands Emigration Foundation Mr J.A.A. Hartland and a Netherlands Government representative to discuss a possible influx of Dutch farmers. On 5 July 1939 the *Sydney Morning Herald* reporting on this meeting noted specifically that the Australian Government saw the proposed migration of Dutchmen to Australia as bringing to:

... to the development of this country that remarkable initiative and pertinacity which they displayed in wresting the low-lying lands of Holland from the sea and transforming them into fertile fields.

Sharing our tradition of democracy, and equipped, for the most part with a knowledge of English, Dutch settlers could be assimilated easily in Australian communities. In other Dominions such as South Africa and Canada they have proved strong, adaptable migrants, succeeding by their industry and thrift... They are the qualities inherent in the ‘best type’ of modern Netherlanders. Australia could not make a better choice of immigrants than those men who spring from the same stock as the pioneers who nearly made *Terra Australis* a ‘New Holland.

The outbreak of WWII disrupted these migration plans with the Pacific War even tarnishing the idealised vision of *Dutchness* that had been espoused. These views are confirmed by an article in *The Western Australian* newspaper on Tuesday August 23, 1949, which asserted that the, “majority of Dutch believe ...Australians still feel hostile toward them as a consequence of their misfortunes in the Pacific War and for events in Indonesia since the war.”

An Emigration Officer in the Former Netherlands East Indies (NEI) noted similar feelings among potential migrants from there. In a memo dated 14 March 1950 he observed that many were saying that ‘in their recent actions Australia favoured Indonesia and that as such [our] presence in Australia may not

be welcomed.” This change in the feelings of Australians’ toward the Dutch seems to have been generated largely by the ideology on Colonialism promoted by the Communist Party; by bans imposed on Dutch shipping by Australian Waterside Unions through 1945 to 1948; and by the realisation that ‘Australia would not help the Dutch during the *Bersiap Period* - the Indonesian Nationalist uprising in the wake of World War II. Migrants also recall the sensationalisation of all these events by the Dutch press in the Netherlands.

However, that these negative views were not necessarily shared by all, and sundry is additionally demonstrated by the Tuesday August 23, 1949, *Western Australian* newspaper article, which also quotes Alfred Schuurman, the founder of the Dutch Australian Weekly and pro-migration lobbyist, saying that he was “doubtful...if many Australians regarded the Dutch as other than admirable potential immigrants!” His views are more in line with those of the Commonwealth Government who, in reality when post-war they could not get enough Britons to emigrate, due to Britain's post-war reconstruction plans and a shipping shortage, were quick to invite the racially (physiognomically) similar, blonde, blue-eyed, Dutch families, upon whom they conferred surrogate British status. In contrast, Dutch from the NEI seeking entry had first to prove they were 51% White!

This focus on assimilation or 'Anglo conformity' by this ninety per cent Australian-born and English-speaking society, and the demand that newcomers assimilate quickly and totally to its culture not only implicitly asserted the superiority of Australian culture over theirs it also guaranteed that Australia's essential *Britishness* would remain. Australians expected that the 'New Australians' would become so completely absorbed, in fact, that it would be as if they had never come at all!

Aanpassen (to adjust to) was how the Dutch responded to the Australian imperative. *Aanpassen*, or Dutch assimilation ideology and practices, are distinctive because, throughout the assimilation period, whether they considered them agreeable or not, the majority of Dutch appeared willing to conform to them - at least in the public sphere. Generally, in public settings the Dutch appeared to want to get rid of or at least cover-up any social characteristics defined as ‘ethnic’ by Australians. Anglo-conformity became the hallmark of ‘Dutch identity’ in Australia. Most Dutch would say that “... if people come out here to make this their new country, they should ... adapt themselves under all circumstances. When you are in Rome, do as the Romans do. You must fit in. After all, if you expect to further yourself economically and this country is prepared to give you a chance, then you have no right to be different.

These resettlement patterns, which soon had the Dutch heralded the most 'assimilated' and therefore 'model migrants' also had them labelled 'invisible'!

Sociologist Van Den Berghe associates the tendency of an immigrant group to assimilate with the advantages in doing so and one of the conditions that he believes encourages assimilation is an environment in which ethnic groups are hierarchical. Most migrants were unaware that the invitation by the Commonwealth Government for migrants to settle in Australia had 'conditions' attached in the form of 'in-built preferences. Then again when you consider that between 1947 and 1974, 85 per cent of the British were granted passage assistance against 60 per cent of the Dutch, Germans, Maltese, Yugoslavs and Eastern Europeans and only 34 per cent of Greeks and 20 per cent of the Italians, clearly a ranking prevailed. Perceived from this perspective, Dutch invisibility in Australia can be viewed as the way the Dutch kept their privileged second place on the preferential ladder, a strategy that also gained them better treatment in the Australian marketplace. Moreover, so long as the dominion governments continued to foster a larger immigration than could be supplied from Britain alone, the policy would benefit the Dutch who everywhere were rated 'second best'.

By the 1970s Dutch invisibility was generally the accepted way to view Dutch resettlement. On 2 February 1978 *The Adelaide Advertiser* noted:

The typical Dutchman who came to Australia and assimilated for all his individualistic reasons, is a man without and out of history. He is 'strong willed, fast thinking, often stubborn and possessed with a fanaticism to succeed'. (1) His migration and assimilation, it seems, are natural expressions of his character. Yet, this same Dutchman has only been in Australia since the 1950s: His migration was part of historic changes happening in both Australia and the Netherlands, and was negotiated and to a large extent financed by those governments.

Although the assimilated Dutch was a persuasive stereotype not all members of the Dutch community agreed with it. Many preferred like the Dutchman quoted by *The Canberra Times* on 13 May 1978 – to believe that the Dutch were the best [of all migrants] at playing the 'assimilation' game'. Their view is supported by recent research which shows that despite the first generation's zealous 'Australian imitation', that they remained simultaneously, steadfastly very Dutch in the privacy of their homes. This peculiar way of maintaining their culture has led some social scientists to speak of the Dutch culture as a 'closet culture' and describe first generation Dutch migrants as having developed a distinctive public and private persona as a stratagem for maintaining their cultural integrity. Perhaps this is the successful stratagem for a globalised world!

Can Dutch willingness to play the assimilation game be related to their satisfaction with migration? Migration sets up expectations in all its stakeholders - governments, migrants and the mainstream community into which newcomers are to be absorbed. How far did the image that Dutch migrants had gained of Australia and Australians before leaving the Netherlands actually correspond with reality? On 28 January 1950 a reporter from *De Waarheid* in an article *The false Bait: Australia land of Tomorrow* notes after attending one of the information evenings at the local Labour Office in Amsterdam that:

It was the twenty third evening, and the small room was full to overflowing. The 500 people present were seated not only on the seats but also on the window ledges, the stairs, and on tables. Hundreds succeeded in obtaining standing room only. At these meetings people are told, among other things, how large Australia is and how small Holland is. It is also said our country is too densely populated. Many of the audience, already determined to emigrate visualise the Australian landscape; extensive wide fields, steppes carrying millions of sheep, mountains, primeval forests, and extensive industrial centres; skies are blue, clouds are white, the mountains are purple, and the fields green – just as on the poster. The more the listener hears about this land the more he is lured on by visions of wide-open spaces. Each of the un-or underemployed in the room hopes to be among those to leave for the vision.

These views correspond with those from the respondents of our study who also mentioned that they expected ‘wide open spaces’; ‘an easy uncomplicated lifestyle, warm temperature, no class distinction, a country with large farms plenty of sheep and rabbits’. Although *De Waarheid* also noted ‘in the course of the evening that emigrants were told of the requirements they must fulfil, and of the avalanche of paper with which they would need to struggle to be considered for emigration to the ‘great promised land’, that the quality of debate during the course of the evening remained at a very basic level. Moreover, the fact that people were generally too shy to speak up in public, gave the propagandists the chance to sum up the discussion on an enlightened and positive note.

In reality before the Displaced Person's (DP's) assisted passage scheme had drawn to an end in 1952, the Information Branch of the Department of Immigration established in 1945 was already churning out good luck stories for consumption by European source countries. Designed to lure foreigners and assist in their integration, the placards and brochures depicted Australia as the future as a country with booming industry, full employment, boundless opportunities and good working conditions, where an immigrant could own their own motor vehicle and a home of their own filled with countless whitegoods.

So successful was this system that by 1955 the Information Branch had become the Department of Information, which now was placing some 1000 immigrant 'success stories' in home-town newspapers around the world. Powerful propaganda devices because strong on human interest these were usually accompanied by photographs that actually showed the local lad or family's good fortune in Australia.

In effect, however, the mooted materialism was really hard to come by, if only because subsidized Dutch immigrants were forced to give up everything they had towards their passage costs.

This meant many arrived at their destination virtually destitute, with only landing money (which in 1950 was £10 for singles and £20 for a family) and a packing crate of household possessions measuring no more than one cubic metre. These criteria left most Dutch without the collateral they would need to access bank loans or other affordable financial support. The plight of the newly arrived was exacerbated by Australia's building material shortage which also forced the larger families to start their life in Australia at one of the Department of Immigration accommodation centres in rural or metropolitan WA. Military camps were used because they could be refurbished with minimal recourse to labour and building materials.

Dutch women traveling on a Nedlloyd or P & O luxury liner such as the *MS Himalaya* or the *MS Johan van Oldenbarneveltdt* describe feeling especially overwhelmed by the transition from a well-appointed cabin to a bare cubicle at a Department of Immigration accommodation facility in which barracks had been converted into louse-infected 'little cubicles, which offered but a semblance of privacy since the partitions were only man-high, so you shared noises, sounds and smells with everyone else in the barrack!' A Dutch girl recalls the culture shock of arrival at Bonegilla where the largest Dutch contingent were accommodated as:

From living in a three-storey house in The Hague, a city of distinction, to unlined army barracks where walls were of Hessian to separate families, the beds were hard with grey, blue-striped cheap blankets. Privacy was non-existent as conversations could be heard from one end of the army hut to the other.

The Dutch and Australian governments kept pushing the idea that the 'right type' of migrant would make it in Australia despite the challenges of resettlement; and translated that meant 'persons willing to put in the hard yards. A mass protests about conditions occasioned a visit to Bonegilla camp by Dr Pieters cultural attaché to the Dutch embassy, who (famously) advised: "See those hills around us? At first the climb will be difficult but, once you get to the top and see the other side, you will be so happy"! The notion of having failed at migration - and there was little sympathy for migrants who returned to the Netherlands - was also a strong driving force. After this debacle the Dutch government did, however, immediately employ 'Escort Officers' on-board Dutch ships to handle further enquiries. Mr H.P. Francissen on the Grote Beer noted:

In my candid opinion the information these people receive in Holland is far from satisfactory. They are entirely without practical knowledge about the country in which they hope to make a new start in life.

In contrast the response from the then Minister for Immigration Mr Harold Holt, which appeared in *The Argus* on 4 August 1951, was to instruct his staff at the Department of Information to paint a 'grimmer picture' in propaganda booklets about Australia than had been the case in 1950, because it was giving people the wrong impression. In truth many Dutch migrants became extremely homesick and 30 per cent are believed to have eventually returned home, although some later remigrated leaving parts of their fractured family on both shores.

Leaving the camp was especially problematic for larger families, which typified Dutch migration, because these found it harder to access housing and their mothers had often to resort to making life in tents or old tram carriages '*gezellig*' (homely, cosy, convivial) until the family could afford the deposit on a second-hand house or a block of land. 'Strapped for cash' the whole family was expected to contribute their earnings or time, or both, on weekends and after work or school, cleaning old bricks or making their own from the meagre weekly allocation of cement that the building material shortage allowed. When they had sufficient to erect a one-car garage or the back veranda of their future home these Dutch were forced to come up with innovative ways to cram their many children into the smallest spaces. By this time the myth of finding 'gold nuggets lying on the streets' had been dispelled, and migrants had come to terms with the harsh reality that nothing, but hard toil would buy them the quality of life and the material possessions they dreamed of.

How were these Dutch received by Australian society? Moving into Australian society induced thus a head-on encounter between the Australian and Dutch cultures. The tensions and conflicts imposed by this unbidden co-existence, initially shaped both the migrants' and the Australians' perceptions of each other. Until mass migration commenced most Australians had never seriously considered that the presence of foreigners might necessitate changes in them. As a consequence, the dynamics at the interface were, mixed. Some [Australians] viewed the newcomer's arrival with suspicion, while others found it exciting that people from half the countries of Europe were coming to live in their midst.

The expectations of Australia and the stereotype of Australians emigrants gained from both governments and the media hardly helped the transition. For example, the Catholic newspaper *De Tijd* 1 September 1950 claimed,

Only for the man and woman who have given up all ideals of a Dutch home life and are capable of putting themselves on the level of the average Australian, is there a chance of success. The authorities in Holland should warn migrants that on arrival in Australia they have no rights but only responsibilities to become 'New Australians' in the shortest possible time.

To take on the banner of a 'New Australian one had first to appreciate what being an Australian meant. Migrants formulated their ideas about Australia and Australians from the type of information contained in information booklets such as - *Weg Naar Australië (Way to Australia)*. Claiming, incidentally, to be '*in bevat van geen verhaaltjes maar alleen feiten* (comprised of facts not fiction) and it notes that:

The greatest part of the Australian population lives in the largest cities. From this it could be said that Australians are city dwellers. That being said the specific traits that we see as distinguishing city dwellers from country folk are not so visible in Australia. It could be said in contrast to the Netherlands that through their open friendliness, unassuming behaviour and dress that practically every Australian man displays qualities more often associated with country folk. On the other hand, the social class differences that we encounter in conservative villages and towns in the Netherlands are not so discernible in Australian society. Australians are more laid back, more jovial, they gossip less, but swear a lot more, although this swearing, steeped within the language, is more jocular than offensive. The Australian is not so egotistical, although when it comes to business he prefers to deal in small circles as opposed to the cosiness we associate with the larger group. The Australian drinks much, but only before 6pm in the evening, because no liquor can be sold after that time. As a result, everyone that can afford it, and that is just about the entire male population, goes to one or other of the many bars around town, where they empty one glass after the other. Despite this, one could not say that Australians love nothing more than to spend all they have and hold on alcohol. Rather, apart from being a good businessman, the Australian can also be said to be decent, despite his fanatical love of all sports. However, his philosophy on life goes something like, live and let live and above all he is of the meaning that it is better to live to work than the other way around. Although family life in Australia is not as developed as in the Netherlands, there is noticeably little use made of dinning out facilities. Even though the food there is excellent and cheap.

The Dutch will also find it strange to find Australians begin the day with such a hefty breakfast. This is not just comprised of a rusk or plate of porridge as we do it,

but of large pieces of meat, fried eggs, a great deal of fruit, quality fruit of the greatest variety that is also dirt cheap. Above all tea they drink unbelievable quantities of tea. The use of vegetables is less. Importantly we find the Australian cuisine unexciting. Vegetables are cooked until they are almost unrecognisable and often served up without being drained first. They do have potatoes but generally speaking they are more expensive than ours. However, they eat enormously more sweet foods than we do. That being said the Dutch Housewife will have little trouble maintaining her Dutch menus although she will find it cheaper to switch to Australian cuisine.

Few Dutch were in a position to note the reality or otherwise of this stereotype, which incidentally said as much about what it was to be Dutch as it did about what being Australian meant.

What sort of relationships emerged between the Dutch and their Australian hosts in this climate? Australians either exploited migrants economically or assisted them in a variety of ways such as selling the newcomers properties or blocks of land without first exacting a deposit. Local traders helped by extending them the credit they needed to be able to start their building program. However, in the early years and really throughout their lives in Australia the closest friends of most working-class Dutch were from the same church, province or town, or Dutch people they met on the ship coming across. Dutch women and men all say they liked talking to the 'Aussies' and had workmates as friends but they also say they didn't really mix their friends.

On the positive side was the great value employers placed on Dutch employees who they described as 'ambitious, hard workers, who were keen to do overtime, to save enough money to buy or build a home, or to become self-employed. One way the Dutch communicated 'facts' about themselves was to present themselves in opposition to local workers:

Australians may be good tradesmen but there are few real craftsmen who love to produce a good piece of work. Everything has to be done quickly, and if the product is properly finished, is of little concern to them. They don't have to achieve the best - 'near enough is good enough' is the motto here.

These same migrants claimed that the 'Dutch' were 'meticulous' and 'careful', take a 'great pride in their work'. On the positive side was the great value employers placed on Dutch employees who they described as 'ambitious, hard workers, who were keen to do overtime, to save enough money to buy or build a home, or to become self-employed. Simultaneously the Dutch were pronounced 'arrogant and opinionated' especially if they mentioned innovative procedures for the workplace, although the way the

Dutch language translates into an imperative may also have led to this stereotype. Second generation Dutch say they often rejected their heritage in the workplace for fear of being associated with these character traits.

Given assurances that the newcomers would not disrupt the Australian way of life, some Australians took it upon themselves to hasten the migrants' transition by pressuring them to speak only English. Dutch women complain of Australians stopping them in the street to admonish them for speaking Dutch to their children! "You shouldn't, it is not good for the children, you should talk English to them this is the country they have to live in.

The difficulties in a strange new land were different for children and young adolescents. As one child migrant notes, 'assimilation was the policy and it certainly buried many feelings of *Dutchness*, which was detrimental.' Migrant children found it most difficult because the ultimate outcome of the ideology was divided values of the old country and the new country and the veneration of everything Australian and devaluation of everything ethnic.

Between these conflicting sources of power, the Dutch immigrant child was also forced to make vital decisions about 'belonging' and 'identity'. Fitting-in was a difficult task when you were not accepted by Australians as an Australian and you did not want to be associated with those labelled inferior - the 'New Australians'. Yet having foreign names, speaking very little or no English, dressing and having different food preferences set the migrant children apart. Phillip Adams recalls:

Our [Australian] food, like our beliefs, was basic. At our place, the diet was toast with dripping, Golden Syrup or Mira Plum jam while a main meal was likely to be skewered corned beef awash in tomato sauce with mashed potatoes stained with two slices of beetroot. Bread was High Tin or Square Tin and cheese was a choice of cheddar off the block or Kraft in blue packets. Thus, before the arrival of the reffos, and DPs with their alien accents and funny food, life in white Australia was serene and self-satisfied...

To avoid the confrontations and disadvantage associated with ethnic lunches and appear to be the same as the Australian children many migrant children tried to stop their parents giving them salami and other European smallgoods on their sandwiches and let them order a meat pie or Kraft cheese sandwich.

Dutch women fared better as first-rate homemakers. However, being the culture bearers, they had also to grapple with Australian customs like 'bring a plate'. The idea being to contribute to the event's

fare instead the women brought empty plates thinking their host was short of tableware. On the other hand, the experience of trauma, dislocation and torture greatly increased their incidence of homesickness among homebound women. As early as 1950 State Ministers for Health started complaining about the rising cost of health care due to the increasing numbers of immigrants requiring hospitalisation for reasons of mental rather than physical care.

Although not hospitalised my mother, Jo Peters, was homesick for the first four years. In the Netherlands, Jo visited her mother for morning coffee every day. Jo also felt loneliness and isolation was a greater problem for women who, on arrival, moved straight into a rental property. "The women in the migrant camps had each other" she would say. Jo simply could not deal with the transition from urban Europe to a house with spiders and snakes in the Australian bush. Unable to speak any English apart from saying 'two pies please' - the family lived on this Australian 'delicacy' until the family moved from the hills suburb where we spent our first three weeks in Australia – which my mother incidentally thought was the outback - to rooms in the city. Here, depressed she either walked the streets all day with her children until her husband finished work or went to the wharf in the hope that a ship might arrive with people from her hometown.

Not all migrant women felt homesick or isolated, Jo's friend Sjaan and her Aunt Corinna loved the freedom and open spaces of Australia almost immediately. They had felt oppressed by the cramped living conditions and poverty in the Netherlands:

You get married and you lived in with Mum and Dad. Then as soon as you can, you make a baby because you get your own apartment... By the time you get three kids, you get a three-bedroom apartment... But what happens? You have a flat two blocks further down from Mum. So, you have coffee with Mum every morning - and it's a closed circuit and I could see myself getting sucked in. And once things have gone too far, you can't get out. So, I up and left because it scared the hell out of me.

However, even these migrants frequently carried a sense of guilt about having deprived their parents of a relationship with their grandchildren and themselves.

This article demonstrated how events, policies and propaganda in the receiving and relinquishing countries determined the expectations the Dutch in the postwar diaspora formulated about what life in Australia would be all about versus the reality of life in Australia and the social and cultural connection

these migrants were able to forge with Australia and Australians. A representative summing up of this 50-year Dutch Australians experience comes down to 'lots of opportunities if you were willing to put in the hard yards' – thus milk and honey - but no gold nuggets on the streets as some information sources had promised. Many also felt the dislocation and alienation had been unnecessary given that the Dutch who stayed behind in the Netherlands had also made it without such a major upheaval in their lives

Notes

PAGE 6

- Nonja Peters, *Milk and Honey But No Gold*, UWA Press, 2001.
The *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 July 1939.
The *Western Australian* newspapers, Tuesday August 23, 1949.
A445/1 Item 178/1/4 memo from immigration selection officer to secretary Department of Immigration, Canberra.
Ibid
The *West Australian* newspapers, Tuesday August 23, 1949.
. Wim Willemsen, 'Breaking Down the White Wall: The Dutch From Indonesia' in Nonja Peters (ed). *The Dutch Down Under 1606-2006*, UWA Press: Perth, 2006, pp.132-149.
Jeannie Martin, *The Migrant Presence: Australian Responses 1947-1977*. Sydney. George Allen & Unwin, 1978.
. Nonja Peters, 'Just a Piece of Paper: Dutch Women in Western Australia' *Studies in Western Australian History* – August 2000.
. P. van den Berghe, *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York, 1981, p. 259.
Ibid.
Nonja Peters, 'Two Generations of Dutch Women in Australia', in Nonja Peters (ed) *The Dutch Down Under 1606-2006*, UWA Press: Perth, 2006, pp224-241.
. J. Wilton & R. Bosworth, *Old Worlds and New Australia: Post-war Migrant Experience*, Sydney, 1984.
Hendrik K van Leeuwen, 'A Retrospective on Dutch Migration to Australia in the 1950s – a media perspective –and the reflections on selected Dutch migrants in Victoria', MA Thesis, School of Visual Performing and Media Arts, Deakin University, Victoria, 1995.
The Adelaide Advertiser, 2 February 1978.
Walker Birkhead 2006 in Nonja Peters (ed) *The Dutch Down Under 1606-2006*, UWA Press: Perth, 2006.
'*The false Bait: Australia land of Tomorrow*' *De Waarheid*. 28 January 1950.
Proposal, Footsteps of the Dutch in Australia, for the Curtin Research Fellowship Research being undertaken with the Dutch around Australia by Dr Sue Summers and Dr Nonja Peters.
This is also noted by J. Menges, 'Geschiktheid voor Emigratie: Een onderzoek naar psychologische aspecten der emigrantbiliteit', Staatsuitgeverij, The Hague, 1959, p.1.
Nonja Peters, *Milk and Honey but no Gold: Postwar Migration to WA 1945-1964*, Perth: University of Western Australia Press, 2001.
Armit, M. *Immigration Snapshot. BIMPR Bulletin*. Canberra: AGPS, 1995.

Wim Blauw, Explanations of Postwar Dutch Migration to Australia, in Nonja Peters (ed), in *The Dutch Down Under 1606-2006*, UWA Press: Perth, 2006, pp.168-183.

Peters 2001.

van Leeuwen, 1995.

Ibid

Ibid

The Argus, 4 August 1951.

Nonja Peters, Going Dutch: 400 years of Netherlanders in Australia, in R. Wilding & F. Tilbury (eds) *A Changing People: Diverse Contributions to the State of Western Australia*, Migration Research Network, 2004.

Peters, 2001.

Cited by Van Leeuwin, 1995, p.44.

Translated from the Dutch in *Weg Naar Australië* (Way to Australia) Dutch Migration Organisation, 1951, which reads:

Interviews

Het grootste deel van de Australische bevolking woont in de grote steden. Daaruit blijkt dat de Australiër in wezen een stedeling is. Niettemin zijn de specifieke trekken, die de stedeling b.v bij ons van een dorping of platteland ondscheidt, in Australië niet te onderkennen. Door hun hartelijkheid, hun ongedwongen optreden en de verwaarloosde kleding heft praktisch iedere Australische man iets van een platteland. Aan de andere kant is het standsverschil, dat men vooral in ons land in erg conservatief dorpen en steden nog veelal aantreft, in het Australische leven lang niet zo duidelijk uitgedrukt. In Australië is men onverschilliger, jovialer, men roddelt minder, doch vloekt daarentegen weer veel meer, ofschoon dit vloeken niet ernstig gemeend is en al bijna tot de omgaaNSTaal behoort. De Australiër is ook niet zo egoïstisch, hoewel hij wanneer het op zaken doen aankomt, zich gaarne in een klein kringetje terugtrekt uit de gezelligheid van een grote groep. De Australiër drinkt veel, doch alleen voor zes uur in de namiddag, want daarna mag geen sterke drank verkocht worden. Voordien echter gaat iedereen die zich het kan permitteren, en dat is bijna de gehele mannelijke bevolking, naar een van de vele bars, waar het ene glas na het andere geledigd wordt. Ondanks dat, kan men weer niet zeggen dat men in Australië liever doen dan hun hebben en houden aan drank opmaken. Integendeel, de Australiër is behalve een goed zakeman ook wezen een degelijk mens, ondanks zijn fantatieke liefde voor alle mogelijke sport. Maar zijn lijfspreuk is, zoiets als, leven en laten leven, en bovendien is hij van mening dat het beter is te leven om te arbeiden dan omgekeerd.

Hoewel men in Australië lang niet zo'n ontwikkeld gezinsleven kent als bij ons, wordt er toch merkwaardig weinig gebruik gemaakt van restaurants en eetgelegenheden. Niettemin is het eten daarin uitstekend en goedkoop.

Voor de Nederlander zal het wel aanvankelijk vreemd zijn dat de Australiër met een zo stevig ontbijt begint. Dit bestaat niet uit een beschuitje en een bordje pap, zoals bij ons, doch uit grote stukken vlees, spiegeieren en veel fruit, fruit dat in de heerlijkste soorten en spot goedkoop te verkrijgen is. Bovendien worden er ontzaglijke hoeveelheden thee gedronken. Het verbruik van groenten is niet zo hoog. Bovendien is de Australische bereidingswijze voor ons niet zeer aantrekkelijk. De groente wordt bijna stukgekookt en met veel water opgediend. Aardappelen zijn er wel, doch over het algemeen duurder dan bij ons. Daarentegen is het gebruik van zoetigheden wederom enorm. De Nederlandse huisvrouw kan haar eigen Hollandse menu gerust aanhouden, doch goedkoper is het waanneer zij geheel naar de Australische gewoonte overschakelt.

. H. M., interview 1996.

Nonja Peters, 'Making it in Australia: Self-employment among Dutch Australians' in Nonja Peters (ed), in *The Dutch Down Under 1606-2006*, UWA Press: Perth, 2006, pp.168-183.

Nonja Peters, 'Trading Places: Greek, Italian, Dutch and Vietnamese Enterprise in Western Australia', University of Western Australia (W.A.) 2000.

Peters, 2000.

Peters, 2001.

Ibid

Wendy Walker-Birkhead 2006, pp.242-253.