

**Challenging the Negative Discourse on Refugees;
A Political Discourse Analysis of Pro-Refugee Parties
in the Netherlands.**

Nora Achterbosch
S5663997
Utrecht University
3 Augustus 2021

A Thesis submitted to
the Board of Examiners
in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Arts in Conflict Studies & Human Rights

Supervisor: Dr. Gijs Verbossen

Date of Submission: 3 Augustus 2021

Trajectory: Internship (15 ECTS) / Thesis Track (15 ECTS)

Word Count: 15.483

ABSTRACT

Given prevailing anti-refugee sentiments in Europe, it is worthwhile to look into attitudes which counter this trend. In this research, a discourse analysis will take place looking at the party programs, social media output and positions in parliamentary debates of pro-refugee parties in the Netherlands. By combining these different spheres in which political discourse is enacted in the 21st century, I come to a comprehensive analysis of the current state of affairs of the pro-refugee debate in the Netherlands. The following question is paramount in this research: “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve?” The analytical concepts of the interpretative repertoire, discursive strategy and counter-framing will serve as guidelines for answering this question.

Following from the analysis, the legal framework, human dignity, international solidarity and cooperation, the global unequal distribution of resources, and inclusive nationalism are observed as prominent interpretative repertoires within the pro-refugee discourse. In addition, compassion, counter-framing, legitimacy of information and firm language are observed as discursive strategies. It is through these interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies that the prevailing anti-refugee discourse is challenged.

As to its success, the pro-refugee discourse successfully engages with the discursive hegemonic struggle through the frequent use of social media, the proposal of plenty political motions, the strategy of counter-framing, reference to the legal framework and the linkage to relevant and trustworthy sources. Nevertheless, continuous reference to the vague concept of a common idea of humanity, the emphasis of refugee children, quantification and the lack of synergy between interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies stand in the way from fully successfully countering the prevailing anti-refugee discourse.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	3
1.2 DISCOURSE AND DISCOURSE THEORY	3
1.3 DISCOURSE TAKING SHAPE: HEGEMONIC AND COUNTER DISCOURSES	4
1.4 DISCOURSE PLANES: POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND SOCIAL MEDIA DISCOURSE	4
1.5 TYPOLOGY OF DISCOURSE: ANALYTICAL CONCEPTS	5
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONTEXT	7
2.1 INTRODUCTION	7
2.2 ANTI-REFUGEE DISCOURSE	7
2.3 PRO-REFUGEE DISCOURSE	8
2.4 REFUGEE DISCOURSE IN THE NETHERLANDS	9
2.5 THE RESEARCH GAP	10
CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH DESIGN	12
3.1 INTRODUCTION	12
3.2 SAMPLING DATA	12
3.2.1. <i>POLITICAL PARTIES</i>	12
3.2.2 <i>PARTY PROGRAMS</i>	12
3.2.3 <i>SOCIAL MEDIA</i>	12
3.2.4 <i>PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES</i>	13
3.2.5. <i>TIME FRAME</i>	13
3.2.6. <i>SELECTION OF DATA</i>	14
3.3 OPERATIONALIZED CONCEPTS	14
3.4. CODING AND ANALYSIS	15
3.5. LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS	15
CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS	16
4.1 INTRODUCTION	16
4.2 PARTY PROGRAMS	16
4.2.1 <i>THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK</i>	16
4.2.2 <i>HUMAN DIGNITY</i>	17
4.2.3 <i>INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY AND COOPERATION</i>	17
4.2.4 <i>THE UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES AND EXPLOITATION</i>	18
4.2.5 <i>INCLUSIVE NATIONALISM</i>	18
4.2.6. <i>GENERAL OBSERVATIONS</i>	19
4.3 SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS	19
4.3.1 <i>COMPASSION: DIRE CIRCUMSTANCES AND IMAGINARIES OF CHILDREN</i>	19
4.3.2. <i>COUNTER-FRAMING</i>	20
4.3.3 <i>LEGITIMACY OF INFORMATION</i>	21

4.3.4. <i>FIRM LANGUAGE</i>	22
4.3.5. <i>GENERAL OBSERVATIONS</i>	22
4.4 PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES	22
4.4.1 <i>INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES</i>	22
4.4.2 <i>DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES</i>	23
4.4.3 <i>OBSERVATION ON SUCCESSFULNESS AND DYNAMICS</i>	24
CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION	27
STRENGTHS	27
WEAKNESSES	28
OVERALL CONCLUSION	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY	31
ANNEX 1. PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS RESULTS 2021	36
ANNEX 2. CODING	37
ANNEX 3. DATA	39
ANNEX 4. POLITICAL MOTIONS	61

INTRODUCTION

Europe has increasingly become a place of hostility when it comes to the reception and perception of refugees. Right-wing populism and anti-EU sentiments have been on the rise (Kyle and Gultchin 2018), countries have installed laws that criminalize helping refugees (Amnesty International, 2020), refugee boats on the coast of Greece are pushed back onto the Mediterranean (The Guardian, 2021), questionable deals to curb the arrival of refugees in Europe are made (Long, 2018) and negotiations about the new EU migration pact have come to a standstill (Banks, 2021); a discourse of sovereignty, nationalism and xenophobia is prevailing (Murray & Longo, 2018). The Netherlands is no exception to this trend. The VVD and PVV, the largest parties until the 2021 elections both hold strict and sometimes discriminatory views towards refugees. Reports, research and court cases have indicated the negative perception and reception for refugees in the Netherlands (SVMA & VAJN, 2021; Commissie Rechtsstatelijkheid, 2021; Vluchtelingenwerk, 2019).

Research about the negative perception and reception of refugees in the EU has been numerous, but there are some limitations to what has been investigated. Indicated by the existing literature, pro-refugee political discourse on social media has been not investigated so far. Although existing research has focused on political discourse, pro-refugee discourse and social media on the topic of refugees separately, the combination of these subjects is unique. For this reason, this research focuses on the following question: “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve?” Not only will the typology of pro-refugee discourse be investigated, the dynamic between the pro- and anti-refugee discourse is also central in this research. To answer the research question, party programs, social media posts and two relevant parliamentary debates will be analyzed. By combining these different spheres in which political discourse is enacted in the 21st century, I aim to come to a comprehensive analysis of the current state of affairs of the pro-refugee debate in the political arena in the Netherlands.

The theoretical foundation of my research is based on discourse theory. “Discourses are produced by effects of power within a social order, and this power prescribes particular rules and categories which define the criteria for legitimating knowledge and truth within the discursive order” (Foucault as cited by Adams, 2017). Although there are multiple definitions of discourse, I follow Potter’s definition of discourse as “talk and texts as parts of social practice” (1996, p. 105). Discourse always tries to establish a hegemony of truth over other discourses (Fairclough, 2001). It is especially this hegemonic struggle and the uncovering of unequal power relations which are central to this research; how are refugees talked about and how can the hegemonic anti-refugee discourse be countered through talks and texts? Certain relevant analytical concepts such as the interpretative repertoire, discursive strategy and counter-framing act as guidelines within my research method and will help to uncover this question. The interpretative repertoires are fundamental elements that constitute a discourse. It looks at the core arguments that are made and which ‘building’ blocks are used in establishing social reality. Practically, this means that I will look into the reasons to have a positive attitude towards refugees. Subsequently, discursive strategies are strategies that employ this interpretative repertoire. These are conscious discursive actions that aim to bring about the interpretative repertoire in a persuasive manner. Counter-framing is one of these discursive strategies, as it is a way to rebut how social reality is perceived by the opposition.

Regarding the research method, party programs, social media output on Twitter, Facebook and Instagram and two parliamentary debates of pro-refugee parties are analyzed and coded in Nvivo. The selection of the pro-refugee parties is based on existing analysis and led to the selection of the following parties: D66, GroenLinks, ChristenUnie, Denk, Partij van de Arbeid, Partij van de Dieren, SP, Bij1 and Volt. The analysis covers data from roughly the two months before and the two months after the parliamentary elections of 2021, given that during this period the communication output of the parties is expected to increase. Following from the discourse analysis, the legal framework, human dignity, international solidarity and cooperation, the global unequal distribution of resources and

inclusive nationalism are observed as prominent interpretative repertoires within the pro-refugee discourse. In addition, compassion, counter-framing, legitimacy of information and firm language are observed as discursive strategies within the pro-refugee discourse. These interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies constitute an answer to the first part of the question; In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve? It is through the abovementioned interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies that the prevailing anti-refugee discourse is challenged by the pro-refugee discourse.

As to the second part of the question, 'what, if anything, can the pro-refugee discourse achieve', the pro-refugee discourse shows promising elements. The pro-refugee discourse successfully engages with the hegemonic struggle through the frequent use of social media and the proposal of plenty political motions, the recurring strategy of counter-framing, the reference to the legal framework and the linkage to relevant and trustworthy sources. Through this, the pro-refugee discourse provides an important counter-discourse which is a worthy opponent to the anti-refugee discourse. Nevertheless, continuous reference to the vague concept of a common humanity, the emphasis of refugee children over refugees in general, the quantification of refugees and the lack of synergy between the interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies within the party programs, social media activity and parliamentary debates stands in the way from fully successfully countering the prevailing anti-refugee discourse.

CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL AND ANALYTICAL APPROACH

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The theoretical foundation of my research is based on discourse theory. Although there are multiple definitions of discourse, I follow Potter's definition of discourse as "talk and texts as parts of social practice" (1996, p. 105). According to founder Foucault, discourse is intertwined with power and discourse analysis aims to uncover this power. Discourse always tries to establish a hegemony of truth over other discourses. It is especially this hegemonic struggle and the uncovering of unequal power relations which are central to this research; how are refugees talked about and how can the unfair treatment of refugees be countered through talks and texts? Certain relevant analytical concepts discussed here will act as guidelines for my research method and will help to uncover this question.

1.2 DISCOURSE AND DISCOURSE THEORY

Although Foucault's discourse theory deserves more than a few sentences of reference, due to the limitations of this research I will not dive limitlessly into explaining his grand theory. Instead, I will here concisely explain its main thoughts and premises and will use the analytical frames of other scholars who build forward on discourse theory to inform my research.

In short, Foucault's discourse theory is based on the idea that truth is established through social construction and is produced by those who have the power to shape it. "Discourses are produced by effects of power within a social order, and this power prescribes particular rules and categories which define the criteria for legitimating knowledge and truth within the discursive order" (Foucault as cited by Adams, 2017). The aim of discourse analysis is then to uncover unequal power relations in society. Discourse is defined by Foucault as "systems of representation, the rules and practices that produce meaningful statements in different historical periods. They are ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledge and relation between them" (Foucault as cited in Goswami, 2014, p. 14).

This definition of discourse is broad and somewhat vague, and discourse is one of the concepts which lacks a uniform definition in the academic debate. In everyday life, discourse is most commonly understood as discussion or conversation. Nevertheless, this understanding is limited, and discourse considers virtually all forms of communication (Schneider, 2013). Schneider (2013) provides a useful overview of different definitions of discourse: "talk and texts as parts of social practice" (Potter 1996, p. 105); "the use of language" (Chilton 2004, p. 16); "anything written or said or communicated using signs" (Fillingham 1993, p.100); "the flow of knowledge through time" (Jäger 2004: 129; translation FS); "social cognitions, socially specific ways of knowing social practices" (van Leeuwen 2008. P. 6). As one can observe from the above-mentioned definitions, discourse is related but not limited to language and texts. It can also encompass other modes such as smell, sound, and visuals. This research acknowledges this but will focus on the strand of discourse that deals with text only. For this reason, Potter's definition will be followed.

In discourse theory as founded in the early work of Foucault, the ontological position of structure was emphasized. By this, it is meant that social reality is seen as shaped by the structural nature of things, rather than by the action of individuals. This has also been one of the main criticisms of Foucault's early work, as it seemingly neglects the power of the individual in shaping social reality (Schneider 2013, Moussa and Scapp 1996). In dealing with this shortcoming, I will be taking in mind Giddens' idea of structuration. Giddens takes a dualistic approach to discourse and stresses that "structural properties of social systems are both the medium and the outcome of the practices that constitute those systems" (1979, p.69). Here, the notion of social systems can be exchanged for the notion of discourse. Hence, discourse is both shaped by the action of individuals while simultaneously the actions of individuals are shaped by discourse.

Throughout my research, I would like to emphasize this duality of structure. I will do this primarily by looking at the different planes of discourse, in which the rules and guidelines – the structure – of discourse are to some extent provided and therefore guide individual actors. Hence, there are preconceived structural expectations of the discourse under investigation, which influence the actors within my research. Furthermore, I will be looking at posts from verified political actors which have the potential to shape political reality for their readers. This comprehensive approach leaves room for individual actions – how actors are shaping social reality – and the structural foundations and rules of a given discourse.

1.3 DISCOURSE TAKING SHAPE: HEGEMONIC AND COUNTER DISCOURSES

As will be further elaborated upon in chapter two, in the current political landscape of the EU anti-refugee sentiments have been taking hold and have become increasingly hegemonic. As interpreted by Lukes and Kearns (2006), hegemony as meant by Gramsci, refers to ‘the ability to limit the public conception of what alternatives might be available’ (Macdonalds, 2011, p.36). Hence, when a certain discourse prevails over others, it is taken to be valid or truthful or at least ‘most truthful’ and the discourse is hegemonic. Nevertheless, as discourse is seen as constructed by those who have the power to shape it, discourses are not uncontested. The strand of discourse theory of Laclau en Mouffe focuses on the constant struggle of different discourses: “The political concept of hegemony can be usefully employed in analyzing orders of discourse - a particular social structuring of semiotic difference may become hegemonic, become part of the legitimizing common sense which sustains relations of domination, but hegemony will always be contested to a greater or lesser extent, in hegemonic struggle” (Fairclough, 2001, p.124). It is exactly this order of discourse that is under investigation here and that will be analyzed in the upcoming chapters; what does a counter-discourse opposing the hegemonic anti-refugee discourse look like? And what can it potentially achieve? Counter discourses as defined by Foucault in Moussa and Scapp (1996, p. 88): “discourses provided by those who are generally spoken for who begin to speak for themselves, resisting power that oppresses them. It aims at ‘clearing a space in which the formerly voiceless might begin to articulate their desires – to counter the domination of prevailing authoritative discourses.” In my research, I will take a more pragmatic definition of counter-discourses as “discourses which challenge the hegemonic discourse”. In specific, I will look at discourse that opposes anti-refugee discourses in the Netherlands.

As my research is focusing on the question “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve?”, the research revolves around questions about ‘how things change, interact and influence each other [and] will explore the dynamics, nuances, ebbs and flows, in phenomena under investigation (Mason, 2017, p. 12). Hence, I will not merely dissect the reoccurring elements of a pro-refugee discourse but will investigate its relation to the hegemonic, anti-refugee discourse. I will look at how these discourses interact with one another, and how they both attempt to construct a certain social reality. In doing so, the above-mentioned notion of dual structuration is honored further. As such, discourse is here viewed as something that is shaped by societal structures while being simultaneously shaped by actors with a certain agency. With this, it is acknowledged that discourses are dynamic.

1.4 DISCOURSE PLANES: POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND SOCIAL MEDIA DISCOURSE

In conducting critical discourse analysis, I will focus on two discourse planes; political discourse and social media discourse. Jager states that ‘discourse planes’ can be seen as “the societal locations from which ‘speaking’ happens.” In addition, he states that “it can also be observed that these discursive planes impact on one another, relate to one another, use each other and so on”(Jager, 2011, p. 49). This is also acknowledged by Threadgold’s statement that there is ‘a small but growing body of evidence that political and policy discourse concerning immigration actually fuel the media discourse, which in turn drives policy’(2009: 1). In my research, I will focus therefore on the intersection of these two planes, which are chosen for reasons informed by the conducted literature review in chapter two.

Political discourse is defined by Van Dijk. "... Political discourse (and its many genres) may here be singled out as a prominent way of 'doing politics'. Indeed, most political actions (such as passing laws, decision making, meeting, campaigning, etc.) are largely discursive. Thus, besides parliamentary debates, bills, laws, government or ministerial regulations, and other institutional forms of text and talk, we find such political discourse genres as propaganda, political advertising, political speeches, media interviews, political talk shows on TV, party programs, ballots, and so on" (1997, p. 18).

The social media discourse plane is chosen considering that it provides a potential opportunity for opening up the public sphere (Fozdar & Pedersen, 2013 & Feltwell et al, 2017) in which societal relevant topics can be deliberated. In some cases, social media has been widely researched concerning discourse analysis. Nevertheless, as will be concluded from the literature review in chapter two, social media research about pro-refugee attitudes of political parties has been somewhat neglected.

1.5 TYPOLOGY OF DISCOURSE: ANALYTICAL CONCEPTS

A common problem with some analytical concepts is their operationalizability. In this section, I list various relevant concepts from critical discourse analysis which can serve as guidelines for answering the question "In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve?".

As discourse analysis is broad, I will focus on critical discourse analysis. "Critical Discourse Analysis is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose and ultimately to resist social inequality" (van Dijk, 1998, p. 1). As will be elaborated upon in chapter two, the academic focus has been on the analysis of discourse that disadvantages refugees. However, I will look at discourse in which discursive power is used to counter this. Hence, central to my analytical frame are power relations, which benefit the reception and perception of refugees. In conducting critical discourse analysis, I will make use of concepts such as interpretive repertoires, discursive strategies and counter framing which will be looked at under the umbrella term of typology of discourse.

Interpretive Repertoires: "Repertoires can be seen as the building blocks speakers use for constructing versions of actions, cognitive processes and other phenomena. Any particular repertoire is constituted out of a restricted range of terms used in a specific stylistic and grammatical fashion. Commonly, these terms are derived from one or more key metaphors and the presence of a repertoire will often be signaled by certain tropes or figures of speech" (Whetherell & Potter, 1988, p.172).

Discursive Strategies: refers to "a more or less intentional plan of practices (including discourse practices) adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim. As far as the discursive strategies are concerned, that is to say, systematic ways of using language, we locate them at different levels of linguistic organization and complexity" (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p 44).

To exemplify, 'Reisigl and Wodak (2001) look at discursive strategies about positive self and negative other representation. They identify strategies such as nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivization and intensification/mitigation. Similarly, van Dijk introduces examples of discursive strategies related to a dichotomous division of the positive self and negative other such as generalization, categorization, euphemism, victimization, self-glorification and others. According to van Dijk's social-cognitive approach to discourse (2006), 'the macro-ideological strategies are discursive ways to either enhance or mitigate 'our'/ 'their' bad characteristics and, as a result, mark discourse ideologically' (Igwebuike, 2018, 154). By contrast, I will take into account strategies that oppose this positive-self and

negative other dichotomy and will look at discursive strategies which enable a more positive outlook and the reception and perception of refugees in the Netherlands.

In addition to the abovementioned, I will take counter-framing into account in my analysis. Counter framing refers to “attempts to rebut, undermine or neutralize a person’s or group’s myths, versions of reality, or interpretive framework” (Benford 1987, 75). Counter framing is an analytical concept borrowed from framing theory and frame analysis, a multidisciplinary field that focuses on (media) communication while looking at metaphors, stories, traditions, slogans, jargons, catchphrases, artifacts, contrasts or spins (Matthes, 2009).

In sum, interpretative repertoires, discursive strategies and counter-framing will be used in the research as analytical concepts to answer the question ‘What is the typology of a pro-refugee discourse? What discursive strategies, interpretive repertoires and counter framing strategies can be observed? It is important to note that the difference between interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies relates to the discourse being performed intentionally or not. By looking at them both, together with the concept of counter framing, a typology of a pro-refugee discourse can be analyzed.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONTEXT

2.1 INTRODUCTION

As elaborated upon in the previous chapter, discourse is not uncontested. Hegemonic discourses constantly aim to establish a prevailing truth over social life, whereas counter-discourses try to challenge this truth. In looking at the empirical findings upon refugee discourses, an overview of the typologies indicated by existing and relevant research of both discourses will be provided. In this research, the anti-refugee discourse is viewed as hegemonic, and the pro-refugee discourse as a counter-discourse. Whereas the former can be characterized by nationalism, positive self- and negative other representation, xenophobia, islamophobia, racism and securitization, the latter can be characterized by inclusive nationalism, images of deserving migrants, victimization or hero-frames, framing contests, human dignity, solidarity, and compassion and reference to children. It must be noted that discourses are often not binary but take place on a spectrum. Nevertheless, research upon sentiments related to the arrival and reception of refugees have often been analyzed as such, considering matters of migration and refugees have been and will be cause for polarization.

The focus of this chapter will be on the pro-refugee discourse, as this is at the core of the research. What arguments are used by those employing a pro- or anti-refugee discourse and what does the academic world state about its relation to one another? What can we observe about its potential effectiveness? What does the existing academic literature shows when I ask the question “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve?”.

Furthermore, a brief context will be provided specifically on the refugee debate in the Dutch political landscape. This section will not only provide the necessary background for the overall research but will also lay the foundation for the sampling of political parties which I will analyze.

2.2 ANTI-REFUGEE DISCOURSE

Firstly, it is important to reflect on a worrying development in Europe; Populism is on the rise and with that anti-refugee sentiments as well (Kyle and Gultchin, 2018). Although there are different kinds of populism, cultural populism is its most common form. It relies – amongst others – on positive self- and negative other representations, related to the national inhabitants of a country and ‘outsiders’ (Kyle and Gultchin, 2018). Following from Saxton (2003), O’Doherty (2001), Pickering (2001), Lynn and Lea (2003), and Hier and Greenberg (2002) as cited by Every and Augoustinos (2008), this nationalism is used to argue in favor of the exclusion refugees as they are a threat to sovereignty, national security, and national identity. Hence, Europe is plagued by an anti-refugee discourse that is especially related to nationalism. Concerning this, Yilmaz (2012) argues that a hegemonic discursive shift already took place in the mid-1980s where right-wing populists in Europe placed immigration more explicitly on the political agenda. In doing so, especially Islam and Muslim migrants were seen as incompatible with the European culture, and xenophobia and islamophobia became more common. In addition, Murray and Longo (2018) state that as a response to the high influx of refugees from 2015, the European Union faced a legitimacy crisis in which national governments started relying even more on border security, exclusionary language and their national interests. Hence, the anti-refugee discourse has been on the rise for a few decades now, and current developments which laid bare the vulnerabilities of the European Union aggravated this trend. Furthermore, Baker (2020) argues about the dynamics between the pro- and anti-refugee discourse, that the anti-refugee discourse is so hegemonic that it has permeated the pro-refugee discourse.

More specifically in relation to media representation, it is argued that the discourse on refugees is primarily negative and conflict-centered; when migrant groups “are present in the media, they are often

framed as either economic, cultural, or criminal threats and thus covered in a highly unfavorable way” (Eberl et al, 2018, p. 217). Also on social media platforms such as Twitter, negative messages in which Muslims are equated with illegals and terrorists prevail in various countries, but especially and surprisingly in Germany (Gualda & Rebollo, 2016). Furthermore, Özerim (2020) and Kreis (2017) respectively argue that Twitter is often used as a vehicle for anti-immigration sentiments and that certain Twitter trends align ‘with current trends in Europe where nationalist-conservative and xenophobic right-wing groups gain power and establish a socially accepted discourse of racism’ (Kreis, 2017, p. 489).

In sum, anti-refugee discourse is prominent in Europe and is characterized by nationalism, a positive self- and negative other representation, xenophobia, islamophobia, racism and securitization. Furthermore, social media serves as a vehicle for discourse on refugees, and especially anti-refugee discourse. The question that remains is what the pro-refugee discourse looks like according to the academic literature and how it relates to the anti-refugee discourse.

2.3 PRO-REFUGEE DISCOURSE

Empirical research has indicated various characteristics of the pro-refugee discourse: Inclusive nationalism, images of deserving migrants, victimization or hero-frames, framing contests, human dignity, solidarity, and compassion and reference to children. These characteristics are not all described concerning the theoretical concepts from the previous chapter per se but are concepts that will inform the discourse analysis of this research.

Firstly, Every and Augoustinos (2008) elaborate on how nationalism is sometimes used as an argument in favor of better treatment of asylum seekers, rather than as an argument for their exclusion. Upon their analysis, it is concluded that inclusive nationalism ‘that is grounded in common goals such as economic prosperity and in common values such as egalitarianism and generosity’ can provide an argument for the positive reception and perception of asylum seekers (2005, p. 567). Unfortunately, the success of this argument was limited in the Australian debate which was the subject of this study. However, the analysis remains useful as “It offers the possibility of going beyond the entrenched oppositions of closed or open national borders and imaginaries, towards a more complex interplay between inclusive national values and universal responsibilities towards asylum seekers” (2008, p. 576).

Secondly, Vollmer and Karakayali (2018) argued through a discourse analysis of newspapers and news magazines that a positive discourse entails depictions of deserving migrants, and that to an extent, reference to deserving migrants can be successful in changing the way people perceive refugees. Related to the concept of deserving migrants are ‘hero- and victimization frames’, as proposed in the research by Eberl et al (2018). Although limitedly elaborated upon, regarding a potential counter-discourse, a ‘victimization frame’ or ‘hero frame’ which depicts immigrants as in need of help is mentioned. Horsti is cited by Eberl et al (2018) for arguing that such a frame can potentially “promote social change for a more humane politics of immigration” (2008, p. 52). In relation to framing, Fadaee (2020) looks at pro-refugee groups in Germany which provide a counter-discourse and concludes that “the pro-refugee groups choice of frames could have been more strategic if they would have not neglected media counter-frames” and that “framing processes should be developed in an interaction with hegemonic discursive field and in competing framing contests” (p. 1). She ends by noting, “a realistic pro-refugee politics, which resonates with everyday experience and future anxieties of European by proposing solutions to real challenges while simultaneously addressing structural injustice, should become the center of pro-refugee politics (p. 13). Hence, a potential successful counter-discourse against anti-refugee discourse has to consider the wider framing contests in which it is situated.

Thirdly, as briefly elaborated upon before, Baker (2020) argues that at current, the ‘left-wing’ is entangled within the discourse of the ‘right-wing’ on the subject of refugees. In other words, the pro-refugee discourse seems to – at least partly- adopt characteristics of the anti-refugee discourse. Examples of this are the assumption by the ‘left wing’ of a ‘refugee crisis’, viewing refugees as victims without any agency and the quantification of refugees as a homogenous and potentially problematic category. Baker then draws on Ancient Greece to rethink the left-wing discourse on migration, in which humanity and

empathy without turning the refugee into a helpless victim are central. By contrast, the idea of using victimization frames as mentioned by Eberl et al (2018) is add odds with this, as it stresses the lack of agency of refugees and therefore leads to their dehumanization.

Fourthly, Siapera (2019) focuses on the public discourse on refugees in the hybrid media system in Greece. Upon the analysis of the social media pages of grassroots pro-refugees groups in Greece, Siapera diagnosed different kinds of solidarity, “which forms a much-needed counter-discourse against ‘the overly racist mainstream media and the liberal humanitarian ‘feel good’ responses to the refugee crisis...” She also states that ignoring this discourse would ignore an important rising politics from below, which, at least in Greece, has “succeeded in finding resonance and support in local communities” (p. 263). Hence, this research illustrates that social media is important in providing a counter-discourse concerning refugees. Hence, in line with Eberl et al (2018), Siapera emphasizes the importance of social media in refugee discourse. In relation to the notion of solidarity by Siapera, a new approach is suggested by Wallaschek (2020). He argues that the meso-level aspect of solidarity concerning the ‘refugee crisis’ is overlooked in light of macro-institutional and micro-behavioral approaches to solidarity (p. 14)... “that is, between individual attitudes and state structures” (p. 5.). This can be related again to the paper by Eberl et al, who argue that future research on discourses related to migration should include political actors such as politicians or political parties, which are located on the meso level.

Lastly, according to Sohlberg et al, “compassion-evoking and widely circulated news images seem capable of affecting public opinion and change history” (2018, p. 2276). Sohlberg et al argue that in the aftermath of the widespread photo of the drowned toddler Alan Kurdi, public opinion turned more positive concerning refugees; “Our interpretation is that pictures that evoke the moral emotion of compassion can initially unmoor the effect of ideological preferences and trigger public opinion change, but that even highly upsetting pictures find themselves relatively quickly drawn into political conflicts and processes through familiar political predispositions” (2018, p. 2283). Although this research is focused on images and not on text, compassion and reference to children are important elements in the pro-refugee discourse. In relation to this, Gualda and Rebollo (2016) state that within the pro-refugee discourse thousands of tweets were found referring to children and their vulnerability and victimhood, and newspapers ‘paid a good deal of attention to the tragic issue of refugees who are living in extreme peril and facing inhumane living conditions and various atrocious threats (Fotopoulos & Kaimaklioti, 2016, p. 275).

Although these different characteristics of the pro-refugee discourse might come across as somewhat arbitrary, especially in relation to each other, they will be elaborated upon more in relation to the coding and data analysis in the upcoming chapters. For a concise overview of this, Annex two can be inquired.

2.4 REFUGEE DISCOURSE IN THE NETHERLANDS

The abovementioned research provides interesting insights into the characteristics of pro- and anti-refugee discourse. As my research is focused on the question “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve?” and as I will be looking into the political landscape in the Netherlands, the Dutch context regarding refugees is worth some consideration.

Recently, civil society and watchdog organizations have signaled worrying trends in the Netherlands. First and foremost, in a report on the lawfulness of party programs a plurality of parties - CDA, Forum voor Democratie, Ja21, PVV, SGP and the VVD – all received a ‘red’ rating when it came to their plans regarding migration and asylum seekers (Commissie Rechtsstatelijkheid, 2021). Hence, these parties included plans related to refugees which were drastically add odds with the Dutch constitution and rule of law. Quite shockingly, the two biggest parties in terms of parliamentary seats until the 2021 elections– VVD and PVV – are also included in this list. Furthermore, the Court of Justice of the EU has recently ruled that the Netherlands is too strict in refugee cases of family reunification

(Vluchtelingenwerk, 2021), and another report ‘Unheard; injustice in alien law’ (SVMA & VAJN, 2021) states that refugees and asylum seekers are treated with great distrust and are often the victim of a rigid bureaucratic system. Hence, refugees are not in a favorable position in the Netherlands and as discussed in the previous chapter, it is in text and discursive practices that this is enforced; the Netherlands is no exception to the prevailing anti-refugee discourse in Europe.

Furthermore, the Dutch political landscape is interesting to research as no research upon the pro-refugee discourse exists in this context. Although both research regarding political parties (van Heerden et al, 2013) and discourse analysis (Brouwer et al, 2017) on the topic of migration in the Netherlands exist, a research in which both pro-refugee political communication and social media – as opposed to traditional media – are taken into account is new. This is also confirmed by Stieglitz & Brokman: “Little is known about the relevance of social media for politics in other countries as well as factors of success for the application of social media for political purposes (2012, n.p).” In the section below, this research gap will be further discussed.

Considering the prevalence of political anti-refugee sentiments in the Netherlands and the lack of research on what is countering this, it is interesting to investigate what a pro-refugee discourse in the Netherlands entails and whether this can potentially lead to positive change for the position of refugees. How is there made sense of the perception and reception of refugees in the Netherlands, what truths about social reality does the pro-refugee discourse aim to establish and how is it countering the anti-refugee discourse? It is exactly these questions that are central in this research and which will be investigated in the upcoming chapters.

2.5 THE RESEARCH GAP

In addition to the fact that the Netherlands is worthwhile investigating, the relevant academic literature has indicated various research gaps which inform the direction of this research.

Firstly, as indicated by Every and Augoustinos “There has been less focus on the formulation and use of national categories in pro-asylum seeker discourse, though Saxton (2003) and Gale (2005), in their analysis of Australian media accounts of asylum seekers, included a brief exploration of these (2008, p. 566).” This shows that nationalism has been mainly looked at in explaining anti-refugee sentiments. Not only in reference to nationalism the focus has been on anti-refugee discourse, as little research can be found about pro-refugee discourse on both the political level and on social media. In addition to this, Fadaee argues that there is much written on framing and the mobilization of social movements, but “that media counter-frames – which contradict a movement’s existing frames – has remained under-researched” (2021, p. 5). Although I do not focus on a social movement in the traditional sense, as explained in the previous chapter and in the literature review, counter-framing is an important strategy within the pro-refugee discourse and can provide insights into the process and dynamics between pro- and anti-refugee discourse.

Secondly and as stressed earlier, various scholars have emphasized the importance of social media within research about the political refugee discourse as it has been relatively overlooked so far (Stieglitz & Brokman, 2013; Wallascheck, 2020; Guidry et al, 2018; Wattal et al, 2010). Although mainstream media such as newspapers can provide interesting insights and are worthwhile to investigate, in the 21st-century social media is an influential social sphere in which people shape, discuss and spread discourse and therefore cannot be overlooked. For this reason, social media will serve as an important discourse plane in this research.

Thirdly, in looking into refugee discourse, the meso level – aka the level between the individual and state - is sometimes overlooked. This can be illustrated by Eberl et al (2018), who argue upon their conclusion that future research could go several directions, of which one is to focus on different actors “i.e. how political actors like parties or individual politicians depict the issue of immigration or

immigrants as a social group” and argues that “by ignoring social media, we neglect a part of the media reality that a large portion of European audiences uses exclusively or in addition to news stories” (2018, p. 218).

In sum, the political pro-refugee discourse in the Netherlands deserves more attention. The combination of investigating the pro-refugee discourse, political party discourse and social media discourse is unique. For this reason, this research asks the questions “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve?” while simultaneously looking for answers in the Dutch political social media landscape.

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

To arrive at answering my research questions, it is important to answer some prior questions. In the literature review the question on “What are characteristics of a pro-refugee discourse?” is partially answered. However, how this question can be answered in relation to Dutch political parties, both in their party programs, social media activity and in parliamentary debates will be central in this chapter. Here, the methodological steps such as the sampling of data, the operationalizing of the theoretical concepts, coding and analysis are described.

3.2 SAMPLING DATA

3.2.1. POLITICAL PARTIES

To conduct my analysis, it is paramount to answer the sub-question “How are the Dutch political parties located on the pro/against spectrum of discourse regarding refugees?” In other words, which parties will be central to my analysis?

In selecting parties, I have relied on the existing analysis of party positions on refugees during the 2021 parliamentary elections. In light of the parliamentary elections of 2021, the Dutch Council for Refugees analyzed the thirteen incumbent parties regarding 10 propositions. As a result, the following parties were categorized as pro-refugee: D66, GroenLinks, ChristenUnie, Denk, Partij van de Arbeid, Partij van de Dieren and the Socialistische Partij. A shortcoming of this analysis, however, has been the exclusion of non-incumbent parties. Especially Volt and Bij1, two new parties which have won respectively three and one seat(s) in the parliament after the 2021 elections (Annex 1), are important to include in the analysis as the positions can be seen as progressive in their stance towards refugees. Following from this, Volt and Bij1 will be included as pro-refugee parties as well. It is important to include these new parties, as their recent instatement in the parliament can provide a new counter-discourse against existing ones.

It is important to note that the categorization of the parties as pro- and anti-refugee simplified, as in reality the parties are more likely to be located on a spectrum. Nevertheless, the abovementioned secondary analysis comes from a recognized NGO which has viewed these parties positively in terms of their attitude towards refugees. Although most of these parties are traditionally categorized as left-wing parties, they are not selected based on a left/right-wing division.

3.2.2 PARTY PROGRAMS

Part of the political discourse is party programs (van Dijk, ref). Hence, they are a logical data source. The party programs provide in-depth information about the party's views and aims. Furthermore, they can provide insights into the interpretative repertoires of the pro-refugee discourse; in what way are refugees talked about? Unfortunately, within party programs, there is little room for the analysis of discursive strategies as these programs are somewhat static and limited in the way they can respond to day-to-day societal developments. For this reason, the analysis of party programs will be supplemented by a social media analysis and the analysis of two relevant parliamentary debates.

3.2.3 SOCIAL MEDIA

Considering the aim of this research is to look into a counter-discourse and the dynamic between pro- and anti-refugee discourse, the position of parties on social media can contribute. Incorporating social media has the potential to demonstrate how interpretive repertoires are enacted through discursive strategies. As derived from the literature review “given the tremendous growth of social media, in particular Twitter and Facebook, social media are increasingly used in political context recently—both by citizens and political institutions” (Stieglitz and Dang-Xuan, 2013, p 1278). Hence, social media is deserving

of more attention with regard to the pro-refugee political discourse, as social media provides a possibility for opening the public sphere for deliberation (Stieglitz, 2012) and therefore for shaping a discourse.

Given the excessive amount of existing social media platforms, the question remains which platforms should be taken into account. Facebook, Twitter and Instagram are chosen as platforms from which relevant data can be analyzed. Facebook and Twitter are indicated to be important platforms in political communication (Stieglitz and Dang-Xuan 2013) and given that Instagram is the second biggest platform and experienced tremendous growth in the Netherlands (Social Dutch 2020), this platform will also be taken into account. Messages of verified political parties are analyzed on these platforms, as these posts can be seen as the official discourse of the party on social media. Unfortunately, given the limited nature of this research, the profiles of individual political actors, and comments and reactions of the post will not be considered. It is important to note that Twitter is limited to the use of 218 characters, where Facebook and Instagram do not know these limitations and therefore might provide posts of which more in-depth analysis is possible.

3.2.4 PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Besides party programs and social media posts, it is worthwhile to look at real-life debates between the parties. The reasoning behind this is twofold. Firstly, to have a look at the dynamics between the pro- and anti-refugee discourses, party programs and social media posts are not enough. Within an active discussion, the pro- and anti-discourses can be contrasted against one another more clearly. Secondly, the research question goes further than characterizing the interpretive repertoires and discursive strategies of the pro-refugee discourse. It also revolves around the question “What, if anything, can they achieve?” One cannot derive the potential effect of the pro-refugee discourse simplistically in relation to the electoral success of the party, as too many factors play into account here. Therefore, two parliamentary debates will be considered in the analysis as well, as the effect of the pro-refugee debate can be illustrated by the practical outcome of a debate, namely whether certain political motions are accepted or rejected. Two parliamentary debates will be considered; the 49th parliamentary meeting and the 68th. These debates are selected because of their relevance regarding the topic of refugees and since they take place within the time frame of the research.

By looking at both party programs, social media activity and relevant debates I cover three main areas in which politics is enacted in the 21st century. Whereas party programs provide insights into the different discursive repertoires regarding refugees, social media and parliamentary debates are where you can observe these repertoires in real-time with their discursive strategies in action.

3.2.5. TIME FRAME

The period chosen for the collection of my data is from the 1st of January 2021 to the 1st of May 2021, respectively two months before and two months after the elections. One reason for choosing this time frame is that parties are more likely to profile themselves during this time, as their communication output – and hence analyzable data – can be expected to increase. For example, during the election time, the renewed party programs will be published. Furthermore, “From the perspective of political institutions, it is important to actively participate in the political communication based on the use of social media, especially during election campaigns. Social media thereby represents the ideal vehicle and information base to gauge public opinion on policies and political positions as well as to build community support for candidates running for public office.” (Zeng et al, 2010 as cited by Stieglitz and Dang-Xuan, 2013, 1278). Another reason for choosing this period was the inclusion of new voices – potentially pro-refugee voices – after the elections, as new parties might have (a) seat(s) in the parliament. This was the case during the 2021 parliamentary elections, as the new parties, Volt and Bij1, received a place in the parliament while also providing a pro-refugee discourse. Lastly, the period was chosen to confine the amount of data. Future research can potentially expand this time frame to gain more insights into the pro- and anti-refugee discourse by political parties over a longer period.

3.2.6. SELECTION OF DATA

Excerpts of the party programs, social media posts and fragments of the two parliamentary debates were manually selected based on whether the following subjects were mentioned: ‘refugee(s)’, ‘xenophobia’, ‘asylum policy or asylum seeker’ and ‘alien law’. In addition, especially on social media, these terms are not always used but through images or videos, it is clear that the topic revolved around refugees. It is important to note that the topic of migration is highly interlinked with that of refugees. However, there is a clear distinction between asylum seekers, refugees and migrants. The selection of the excerpts of the party programs, the social media posts and fragments of parliamentary debates is based on reference to the perception and reception of refugees and asylum seekers, not to migration in general.

3.3 OPERATIONALIZED CONCEPTS

The theoretical concept of the interpretive repertoire and discursive strategy are the two concepts that provide the main units of the analysis.

Interpretive Repertoires: “Repertoires can be seen as the building blocks speakers use for constructing versions of actions, cognitive processes and other phenomena. Any particular repertoire is constituted out of a restricted range of terms used in a specific stylistic and grammatical fashion. Commonly, these terms are derived from one or more key metaphors and the presence of a repertoire will often be signaled by certain tropes or figures of speech” (Whetherell & Potter, 1988, p.172).

Discursive Strategies: “a more or less intentional plan of practices (including discourse practices) adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim. As far as the discursive strategies are concerned, that is to say, systematic ways of using language, we locate them at different levels of linguistic organization and complexity” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p 44).

The abovementioned concepts are theoretical and are somewhat abstract in providing an answer to what to look for in the analysis. Hence, in the operationalizability of these concepts, I took some liberties as to their interpretation. In simplistic terms, I look at the interpretative repertoire as the way the subject - in this case, the perception and reception of refugees – is generally and unconsciously talked about. As argued by McKenzie (2005, p 3), a core requirement of discourse analysis in which interpretative repertoires are central involves “Focusing on variations in the ways discourse is constructed, both within and across accounts, in order to begin to understand the epistemological and action orientations of specific versions”. In addition, “the use of interpretative repertoires has the potential to “[shift] the focus of research from understanding the needs, situations, and contexts of individual users to the production of knowledge in discourses, that is, within distinct conversational traditions and communities of practice” (Tuominen, Talja, & Savolainen 2002, p.273). Hence an interpretative repertoire refers to how something is viewed and how its epistemology is argued. The different interpretative repertoires are further discussed in the upcoming chapter.

In relation to the interpretative repertoire, the discursive strategy can be explained as an intentional discursive action to employ the interpretative repertoire. In the next chapter, various discursive strategies can be observed within the pro-refugee discourse. A central concept that will be looked at within the notion of the discursive strategy is the concept of counter framing:

Counter framing refers to “attempts to rebut, undermine or neutralize a person’s or group’s myths, versions of reality, or interpretive framework (Benford 1987, 75)”

Particularly this concept is important because it will provide insights into the dynamics between the pro and anti-refugee discourse and therefore helps to answer the sub-question “How do the pro-and against discourses relate to one another. Does the pro-refugee discourse refer to the anti-refugee discourse, and if yes, how?”

3.4. CODING AND ANALYSIS

In the analysis, the interpretative repertoire and discursive strategy will be employed as codes. The subcodes are derived from both the literature review as well as from an initial quick scan through the data. In Annex two the codes can be found and will be elaborated upon in the next chapter, as they are part of the analytic observation of the data. The party programs, social media posts and selected parliamentary debates will be coded in NVivo. The data will be accompanied by the original Dutch texts for the particular message of the original texts to not get lost in translation.

The party programs will serve primarily as data for looking into the various interpretive repertoires, whereas the social media posts will be analyzed in light of the enactment of these repertoires, hence the discursive strategies. The parliamentary debates will be looked at in relation to the interpretative repertoires, discursive strategies and the potential success of the pro-refugee discourse.

3.5. LIMITATIONS AND STRENGTHS

Although the design of the research is thorough, all research is somewhat limited. Future research upon this topic could include an extended time frame and the inclusion of data from anti-refugee parties to gain more insights into the and dynamics between the pro-and anti-refugee discourse. As to the generalizability of the findings, the research is focused primarily on the Dutch political landscape and hence might be somewhat confined in its generalizability. Nevertheless, the interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies are at least partly derived from existing empirical findings from other countries as well. This contributes to the generalizability of this research.

CHAPTER 4. ANALYSIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Following from the discourse analysis, various subcodes of the interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies are drafted, of which the codebook can be found in Annex two. These codes are employed as guidelines for analysis. A distinction is made between the analysis of party programs, social media posts, and parliamentary debates. The party programs are looked at primarily in terms of interpretative repertoires; how do pro-refugee parties talk about refugees and how do they argue their point of view? By contrast, the social media posts are analyzed concerning the discursive strategies; how exactly do the parties consciously aim to achieve their goals and defend their views regarding refugees in their everyday discourse? Lastly, the two parliamentary debates are considered in relation to the discursive strategies, the dynamics between pro-and anti-refugee parties and the potential successfulness of the pro-refugee discourse. In the analysis, the first part of the research question is central: “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse?” In the last section of this chapter, the potential success of the pro-refugee discourse will be discussed, in terms of the acceptance of political motions. In the upcoming chapter, the potential success in terms of strengths and weaknesses of the pro-refugee discourse will be further elaborated upon.

4.2 PARTY PROGRAMS

The pro-refugee discourse can be divided into at least five interpretative repertoires; the legal framework, human dignity, international solidarity and cooperation, the unequal distribution of resources and exploitation, and inclusive nationalism. The interpretative repertoires will be illustrated by some examples of which more can be found in Annex 3.

4.2.1 THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Within this interpretative repertoire, the legal framework involving refugees is referred to as making sense of the positive perception and reception of refugees in the Netherlands. Human Rights declarations, the UN Geneva Refugee Convention of 1951, EU directives and other legal requirements that are applicable in the Netherlands provide an argument for the good and fair reception of refugees. All pro-refugee parties which are analyzed refer to legal instruments within their party programs.

Some parties simply refer to the importance of upholding the legal framework that protects refugees; the different legal documents are paramount and form the basis of the way refugees ought to be treated.

PvdD: “International treaties such as the Refugee Treaty and the European Convention of Human Rights are the foundation. The Netherlands will not approve of agreements, such as the EU-Turkey deal, which violate this.”¹

Other parties go further in explaining how legal instruments provide a reason for an improvement of the current situation of refugees in the Netherlands.

GroenLinks: “The Refugee Convention of the EU, the European Convention of Human Rights and the right to asylum from the EU form the foundation for our approach to refugees. For this reason, the Netherlands will contribute much more than it does now to the reception of vulnerable refugees. We will do this by taking in an equal share from the designated group from the UN.”²

¹ “Internationale verdragen zoals het Vluchtelingenverdrag en het Europees Verdrag voor de Rechten van de Mens vormen het uitgangspunt. Nederland gaat niet akkoord met afspraken, zoals de Turkije deal, die hier mee strijdig zijn.” (PvdD, 2021, p. 102-103)

² “Het Vluchtelingenverdrag van de Verenigde Naties, het Europees Verdrag voor de Rechten van de Mens en het asielrecht van de EU vormen de basis voor onze omgang met vluchtelingen. Nederland gaat daarom veel meer dan nu bijdragen aan

Interestingly, concerning the legal framework, some parties criticize the infamous Turkey Deal for conflicting with international treaties and human rights, whereas others see this deal as an execution of the legal framework. Hence, some inconsistency is found in the pro-refugee discourse upon the legal framework.

Bij1: “Bij1 sees this as a humanitarian crisis, which is caused by a failing European reception policy such as the Turkey deal, with human rights violations as a consequence.”³

DENK: “DENK believes that ... We should strive towards deals with countries on the outskirts of Europe, such as the EU-Turkey deal. In doing so, there must be acted upon international treaties.”⁴

4.2.2 HUMAN DIGNITY

As referred to in the literature review, Baker (2020) argues that humanity should be more central to the pro-refugee discourse. Within this interpretative repertoire, this humanity is mentioned, and the human being as dignified is central. A positive reception and perception of refugees are argued in reference to respect for human life and human dignity. There is reference to the value of human life, 'humane conditions', 'humane treatments, 'shared humanity' and 'humanitarian policies'. It demands respect for the individual and the context in which this individual is placed. Strikingly, except for the SP, all pro-refugee parties refer to this repertoire.

ChristenUnie: “Looking after the needs of refugees is at the heart of Christian politics. We are all made and loved by the same God and the country in which we live, we received coincidentally. For this reason, we hold the principle belief that we have to provide a safe space to victims of disasters, wars, persecution and repression.”⁵

4.2.3 INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY AND COOPERATION

This interpretative repertoire understands the positive perception and reception of refugees in the Netherlands as something inevitably based on international solidarity and cooperation, especially on the EU level. It talks of refugees in terms of the transboundary implications, international solidarity and responsibility and fair relocations. Together with the interpretative repertoire of human dignity, this interpretative repertoire is very dominant within the pro-refugee parties. The way this repertoire is used is threefold. In some cases, there is simply a call for better cooperation within the EU.

Volt: “Volt wants a humane refugee policy and a sensible labor-migration policy for the European Union as a whole. Cooperation and solidarity are preconditions to prevent future migration crises. Through this, we promote European values through the humane reception of refugees and asylum seekers and to offer them a future.”⁶

In other instances, discontent with the current EU refugee policy is expressed and the failure of cooperation within the EU is referred to.

opvang van kwetsbare vluchtelingen. Dat doen we door een evenredig deel van de door de Verenigde Naties aangewezen groep op te nemen.” (GroenLinks, 2021, p. 86)

³ “BIJ1 ziet deze crisis als een humanitaire crisis, die veroorzaakt wordt door falend Europees opvangbeleid als de Turkijedeal, met mensenrechtenschendingen als gevolg.” (Bij1, 2021, p. 80)

⁴ “Dat er gestreefd moet worden naar het sluiten van deals met landen aan de buitengrenzen van Europa, zoals de EU-Turkijedeal. Daarbij is het van belang dat er gehandeld wordt volgens internationale verdragen.” (DENK, 2021, p. 60)

⁵ “Omzien naar de noden van vluchtelingen ligt na aan het hart van de christelijke politiek. We zijn allemaal gemaakt en geliefd door dezelfde God en het land waar we wonen hebben we ook maar gekregen. We hebben daarom de principiële overtuiging dat we een veilige plek moeten bieden aan slachtoffers van rampen, oorlog, vervolging en onderdrukking.” (ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 19)

⁶ “Volt wil een menselijk vluchtelingenbeleid en een verstandig arbeidsmigratiebeleid voor de Europese Unie als geheel. Samenwerking en solidariteit zijn een randvoorwaarde om toekomstige migratiecrises in Europa te voorkomen. Hierbij dragen we onze Europese waarden uit door vluchtelingen en asielzoekers menswaardig op te vangen en een toekomst te bieden.” (Volt, 2021, p. 19)

D66: “For a transboundary approach to migration is a working European migration and asylum policy essential. The inhuman circumstances on the Greece island are the most tangible evidence of inadequate European asylum policy. This has to change. All member states, the Netherlands as well, have to take responsibility. A European migration- and asylum policy has to be effective, fair and humane.”⁷

Most often, however, the Netherlands is called upon its responsibility and its duty to play a pioneering role in the EU.

ChristenUnie: “The Netherlands makes an effort to, within Europe, or if necessary with a group of like-minded member states, come to an agreement about migration.”⁸

4.245 THE UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES AND EXPLOITATION

This interpretative repertoire is related to both climate change and Western (economic) domination. Refugees are deserving of positive perception and reception by Western host countries – such as the Netherlands- considering the historical western (economic) domination and/or exploitation. Climate change and the involvement in conflict are examples of this. Since the Netherlands is a Western country that profits from developments and therefore causes refugee influxes, they are responsible for the fair treatment of these refugees. Quite some parties, and especially those with a focus on equality and climate change, make use of this repertoire.

Bij1: “The reason to flee has often directly or indirectly to do with the history of exploitation and colonization through Western countries. Conflicts which are caused by these countries are still happening and broaden the gap between the richer and poorer countries. Above all, these Western countries contribute actively to these conflicts, amongst others through the arms trade. As a consequence, the living conditions deteriorate so far that there is sometimes no other choice than to leave. Because the Netherlands is part of the problem, it is our responsibility to be part of a solution. Through the climate crisis, more territories will become inhabitable, if not directly through floods, then indirectly through heightened food and water insecurity and conflicts which are caused by this. The Netherlands prepares for the reception of people who have to leave their houses because of climate change.”⁹

4.2.5 INCLUSIVE NATIONALISM

As elaborated upon by Every and Augoustinous (2008), if nationalism is used inclusively, it can provide an argument for the positive reception and perception of refugees; Nationalism “that is grounded in common goals such as economic prosperity and in common values such as egalitarianism and generosity” can lead to the acceptance of refugees (2005, p. 567). This interpretative repertoire can also be found within the Dutch context; the Netherlands is viewed as a hospitable and/or diverse country that fuels positive perception and reception of refugees. Often the pro-refugee parties appeal to core values of the Netherlands and traditions regarding international cooperation and historical inclusivity.

⁷ “Voor een grensoverschrijdende aanpak van migratie is een werkend Europees migratie- en asielbeleid noodzakelijk. De onmenselijke toestanden op de Griekse eilanden zijn het meest tastbare bewijs van gebrekkig Europees asielbeleid. Dat moet anders. Alle lidstaten, ook Nederland, moeten verantwoordelijkheid nemen. Een Europees migratie- en asielbeleid moet effectief, eerlijk en menselijk zijn.”(D66, 2021, p. 194)

⁸ “Nederland spant zich in om binnen Europa, of desnoods met een groep gelijkgestemde lidstaten, tot afspraken over migratie te komen.”(ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 20)

⁹ “De reden om te vluchten heeft vaak direct of indirect te maken met een geschiedenis van uitbuiting en kolonisatie door Westerse landen. Conflicten die veroorzaakt zijn door deze landen duren ook nu nog voort en vergroten de kloof tussen de rijkere en armere landen. Bovendien dragen deze Westerse landen op dit moment actief bij aan deze conflicten door middel van o.a. de wapenhandel. Als gevolg hiervan zijn de leefomstandigheden zodanig verslechterd, dat er soms geen andere keuze is dan te vertrekken. Omdat Nederland onderdeel is van het probleem, is het onze verantwoordelijkheid om onderdeel te zijn van een oplossing. Door de klimaatcrisis zullen in de komende jaren meer gebieden onleefbaar worden, dan wel direct door overstromingen, dan wel indirect door verhoogde voedsel- en wateronzekerheid en daardoor veroorzaakte conflicten. Nederland bereidt zich voor op het ontvangen van mensen die door de klimaatcrisis hun thuis moeten verlaten.”(Bij1, 2021, p. 79)

DENK: “The Netherlands is traditionally a land of immigration. It started with the big migration at the start of the middle ages. After that, it was the oppressed protestants, Jews and ‘dissidents’ from the South of the Netherlands, the South of Europe and Eastern Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries that came to the Netherlands. After that, migration flows came from Spain, Italy, former Yugoslavia and later from Turkey and Morocco. Migration is something of all times and brought much good to our country, such as the reconstruction after the Second World War. Therefore, DENK sees immigration as a strength and core value of our country.”¹⁰

4.2.6. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Besides insights into the various interpretative repertoires, two other observations can be made from the analysis of the pro-refugee party’s election programs. Firstly, the dominant interpretative repertoires of parties can be linked to the wider approach of the party; although the parties make use of various kinds of interpretative repertoires, one can observe a link between their dominant interpretative repertoires regarding refugees and the party’s wider perception of social reality. For example, the PvdD, which focuses primarily on animal rights and climate change states:

“Millions of people have fled their homes. The conflicts are often exaggerated through water- and food shortages as a consequence of climate change. We can make our world safer and more peaceful if we are willing to look at our share in causing these problems.”¹¹

More of these examples of this can be found in Annex 3. Given that parties have to distinguish themselves in relation to other parties which are placed relatively close on the political spectrum, it seems only logical that the interpretative repertoires are linked to the party’s wider discourse.

Secondly, although the interpretative repertoire of international solidarity and cooperation and human dignity are dominant within the pro-refugee party’s discourse, multiple repertoires can be found in a single statement. As one can observe from the analysis in Annex 3, the same quotes are sometimes referred to in different interpretative repertoires.

4.3 SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS

In four months, approximately 125 tweets, 28 Facebook posts and 22 Instagram posts of pro-refugee parties were related to the topic of refugees. The following discursive strategies can be observed within this social media discourse: compassion, counter-framing, legitimacy of information and firm language. The strategies will be illustrated by some examples, of which more can be found in Annex 3.

4.3.1 COMPASSION: DIRE CIRCUMSTANCES AND IMAGINARIES OF CHILDREN

As elaborated upon in the literature review, the research by Sohlberg et al “focused on the impact of viewing a picture of the vulnerable and innocent, which belongs to a specific class of pictures that are associated with the moral emotion of compassion (2018, p. 2283).” The research demonstrated that powerful news images, such as the picture of Alan Kurdi, a drowned refugee child, can temporarily increase support for the welcoming of refugees. Inspired by this, the observation of a recurring discursive strategy was made: that of evoking and showing compassion, especially through reference to

¹⁰ “Nederland is van oudsher een immigratieland. Het begon met de grote volksverhuizing aan het begin van de Middeleeuwen. Daarna waren het de verdrukte protestanten, joden en andersDENKenden uit de Zuidelijke Nederlanden, Zuid-Europa en Oost-Europa die in de 16e en 17e eeuw naar Nederland kwamen. Later volgden de migratiestromen vanuit Spanje, Italië, voormalig Joegoslavië en nog later die uit Turkije en Marokko. Migratie is van alle tijden en het heeft ons land veel goeds gebracht, zoals de wederopbouw na de Tweede Wereldoorlog. DENK ziet immigratie dan ook als een kracht en als een kernwaarde van ons land.”(Denk, 2021, p. 57)

¹¹ “Miljoenen mensen vluchten van huis en haard. De conflicten worden veelal verergerd door water- en voedseltekorten als gevolg van klimaatverandering. We kunnen onze wereld veiliger en vreedzamer maken als we bereid zijn te kijken naar ons eigen aandeel in het ontstaan van de problemen.” (PvdD, 2021 p. 7)

refugee children and dire circumstances. In various instances, political parties described the terrible circumstances that children are in the overcrowded refugee camps.

Volt: “Winter cold, rats and now also ground poisoned with lead. This goes beyond all humanity. How much misery do the #500 children have to deal with before they will be noticed by the @VVD @CDAvandaag @Christenunie and @D66? Read also our blog from our number 4, @KoekkoekMarieke, about this terrible situation: <https://voltnederland.org/blog/politieke-pleitbezorgers-gezocht>.”¹²

In addition to a description of the terrible circumstances that refugee children are in, there was much emphasis on the personal stories of integrated refugee children in the Netherlands who were about to be deported.

GroenLinks: “There is insufficient room for customization in the asylum policy, experts say. Through this people are getting stuck in the system and poignant situations arise, such as with Sofia and Najoua Sabbar. @CorinneEllemeet summons the cabinet today: pay attention to customization.”¹³

Furthermore, as a consequence of the fire that destroyed a big part of the refugee camp Moria in Greece, public debate arose regarding the evacuation of unaccompanied refugee children to the Netherlands. The children were often referred to in a quantified matter.

GroenLinks: “That’s it @ChrisvanDamCDA! And now, let’s keep going. @cdavandaag we count on your support next Tuesday to give the 4000 unaccompanied children who are stuck at the Greek island a home within the EU, of which 500 in the Netherlands #fixthemoriadeal #Moria”¹⁴

4.3.2. COUNTER-FRAMING

Previously done research has emphasized the importance of framing concerning the topic of refugees. According to Fadaee “the pro-refugee groups choice of frames could have been more strategic if they would have not neglected media counter-frames” and that “framing processes should be developed in an interaction with hegemonic discursive field and in competing framing contests” (2020, p. 1). According to Benford, counter framing refers to “attempts to rebut, undermine or neutralize a person’s or group’s myths, versions of reality, or interpretive framework (1987, p. 75)”. In the context of this research, counter-framing refers to undermining and challenging existing concepts and beliefs through for example highlighting contradictions and inconsistencies in the beliefs and values of those expressing racist views or challenging language that maintains and regulates negative intergroup relations. In addition, the negative way in which refugees are perceived is explicitly refuted. Furthermore, putting another party on the spot in terms of their responsibility or in relation to unkept promises are included here into counter-framing as well.

¹² Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 24). “Winterkou, ratten en nu ook nog een met lood vergiftigde grond. Dit gaat alle menswaardigheid te buiten. Hoeveel ellende moeten o.a. de #500kinderen nog doorstaan om eindelijk door @VVD, @cdavandaag, @christenunie en @D66 opgemerkt te worden? Lees ook de blog van onze nummer 4, @KoekkoekMarieke, over deze verschrikkelijke situatie: <https://voltnederland.org/blog/politieke-pleitbezorgers-gezocht>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/VoltNederland/status/1353360884169637891>

¹³ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, April 4). “Er is onvoldoende ruimte voor maatwerk in het asielbeleid, zeggen experts. Hierdoor komen mensen vast te zitten in het systeem en ontstaan er schrijnende situaties, zoals bij Sofia en Najoua Sabbar. @CorinneEllemeet roept het kabinet vandaag op: heb oog voor maatwerk.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1382304032195239936>

¹⁴ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, January 28). “Zo is het @ChrisvanDamCDA! En nu doorpakken. @cdavandaagwe rekenen komende dinsdag op jullie steun om de overgebleven 4000 alleenstaande kinderen die vastzitten op de Griekse eilanden een thuis te geven in de EU, waarvan 500 in Nederland. #fiksdemoriadeal #Moria.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1354787204468453380>

Interestingly, the social media data illustrates that the neglect of counter-framing which is observed by Fadaee is not applicable within the Dutch context. Quite often, there is made use of counter-framing in which the social reality of the anti-refugee parties is challenged by the discourse of the pro-refugee parties in the Netherlands. In addition, the pro-refugee parties regularly contrast their beliefs with that of the political opponent.

First and foremost, certain beliefs of anti-refugee parties are tackled and undermined, such as is the case with the VVD, which blames the shortage of housing on refugees.

PvdA: “...Also your everlasting claim that status holders are stealing houses again was mentioned. Easy to blame them for the fact that under your leadership too little was build. While slumlords could act without restrictions. With the support of the whole coalition.”¹⁵

Also, anti-refugee parties are explicitly called out by name by pro-refugee parties for their contribution to the negative reception and perception of refugees.

SP: “What the VVD is doing is scapegoat politics and borders with this on the PVV: you cause a housing crisis, you cut back on mental healthcare, and then state that we can’t handle more problems. The VVD is destroying it, not the refugee. - @RenskeLeijten at @WNLOpZondag”¹⁶

In addition, the wider political climate of ‘the parliament’, the ‘government’ or the ‘coalition’ is called out for unjust behavior towards refugees.

Volt: “The government is consciously leaving people in this hell. Action is now necessary. Moria exists because of political unwillingness. We have seen it at the child benefits scandal: real injustice is only solved if someone stands up and continuously fights against this political unwillingness.”¹⁷

4.3.3 LEGITIMACY OF INFORMATION

Within this discursive strategy, reference to sources that contribute to the pro-refugee discourse is used to strengthen the legitimacy of the message. Not only can this strengthen the legitimacy of the social media output of the pro-refugee parties, but it also illustrates that the parties are aware of wider societal topics and developments and take this into account in their discourse. Over half of the parties use this strategy within their social media discourse. The sources used are established and legitimate ones, such as news outlets as the Dutch Broadcast Foundation (NOS) and newspapers such as NRC and Trouw and the Volkskrant. Also, in light of the relation between the Child Benefits Scandal and the treatment of asylum seekers, reports by experts were often referred to.

GroenLinks: “Children who have fled and arrived in the Netherlands disappear from the asylum seeker centra. My request to the state secretary: We have to offer these children more

¹⁵ PvdA [@PvdA]. (2021, March 12). “Ook je eeuwige bewering dat statushouders woningen inpikken kwam weer voorbij. Makkelijk om hen de schuld te geven van het feit dat er onder jouw leiding te weinig gebouwd is. En dat terwijl huisjesmelkers ruim baan kregen. Met steun van je h le coalitie.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/PloumenLilianne/status/1370336585212911616>

¹⁶ SP [@SPnl]. (2021, February 29). “Wat de VVD doet is zondebokpolitiek en schuurt daarmee tegen de PVV aan: je zorgt voor een wooncrisis, je bezuinigt de geestelijke gezondheidszorg kapot en zegt dan er kunnen geen problemen bij. De VVD maakt het kapot, niet de vluchteling.’ - @RenskeLeijten bij @WNLOpZondag.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/SPnl/status/1365957590971252736>

¹⁷ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, Januari 24). “De regering laat mensen bewust in deze hel zitten. Actie is nu nodig. Moria bestaat dankzij politieke onwil. We hebben het gezien bij de toeslagenaffaire: echt onrecht wordt pas opgelost als iemand opstaat en continu tegen politieke onwil vecht.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/VoltNederland/status/1353310218256588801>

perspective in our country to prevent them from falling into the arms of traffickers
<https://www.trouw.nl/buitenland/duizenden-asielkinderen-vermist-in-europa~b55c2b76f/>.”¹⁸

4.3.4. FIRM LANGUAGE

Another observable discursive strategy is the usage of certain words or phrases which adds urgency and or necessity to the message. There is talk of a ‘civilization crisis’, a ‘humanitarian crisis’, ‘devastating fires’, the ‘drowning of refugees’, ‘scandalous deals’. This strategy does not necessarily stand on its own but is often combined with other discursive strategies. Especially in combination with the strategy of counter-framing, anti-refugee parties are forcefully called out for their behavior or responsibility, such as in the example below.

PvdA: “Dear @MarkRutte. Lilianne here. Something has to get off my chest. I’d rather tell you in a debate, but we don’t meet. Therefore it has to go like this. You came in again with your tough talks about migration. Did you mean by that that you want to continue the policy of this cabinet to let children suffocate in the hell that is Moria?”¹⁹

4.3.5. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

In sum, evoking compassion, counter-framing, establishing the legitimacy of information and strong language are discursive strategies that characterize the pro-refugee party discourse in the Netherlands. Twitter is the most used platform to spread this discourse; quantitatively there are more related posts to found about refugees on Twitter in comparison to other platforms, and the frequency of posting is also higher. In addition, some parties are more active than others on social media. For example, the SP only provided three tweets and no posts on Facebook or Instagram regarding the topic of refugees whereas newer parties such as Bij1 and Volt are very active on all social media platforms. Also, Groenlinks was highly active on Twitter but posted nothing related on Facebook and only one post on Instagram within the researched time frame. Lastly, with regard to the content of the discourse, some parties are more formal than others. The style per party differs, as some - such as D66 – uses more moderate and formal language and formats whereas DENK – especially on Facebook – employs strong and informal language more often. This illustrates variety within the pro-refugee discourse on social media and shows that even though there are structural limitations from certain social media platforms – such as the number of characters in a tweet –, there is room for the political parties to create their unique discourse.

4.4 PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

The two parliamentary debates are analyzed in relation to the interpretative repertoires, discursive strategies, the pro-and anti-refugee dynamic and the potential successfulness of the pro-refugee discourse. Although the successfulness of discourse is influenced by many factors, of which not all can be taken into account in this research, whether political motions are accepted can still provide some insights.

4.4.1 INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES

Some political motions initiated by pro-refugee parties revolve around changing or expanding the legal framework in favor of refugees and therefore can be categorized under this interpretative repertoire. Examples of this were requests for reinstating the discretionary power to decide upon poignant refugee cases, the expansion of resettlement of the national UNHCR quota from 500 to 5000 people a year, the

¹⁸ Groenlinks [groenlinks]. (2021, April 20). “Kinderen die zijn gevlucht en in Nederland terecht komen verdwijnen uit de aze’s. Mijn oproep aan de staatssecretaris: We moeten deze kinderen meer perspectief bieden in ons land om te voorkomen dat ze zich in de armen laten drijven van smokkelaars <https://www.trouw.nl/buitenland/duizenden-asielkinderen-vermist-in-europa~b55c2b76f/>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/CorinneEllemeet/status/1384498270303576071>

¹⁹ PvdA [@PvdA]. (2021, March 12). “Beste @MarkRutte Lilianne hier. Er moet me iets van het hart. Het liefst had ik je dat in een debat verteld, maar wij treffen elkaar niet. Daarom nu zo. Lilianne Ploumen. Je kwam weer met stoere praat over minder migratie. Bedoel je daarmee dat je het beleid van dit kabinet om kinderen te laten stikken in de hel van Moria wil doorzetten?” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/PloumenLilianne/status/1370336585212911616>

expansion of the current children's pardon, and the request to look into the possibility of the quick summary judgment of asylum requests (See motion 2714, 2716, 2717 and 2720 in Annex four).

Furthermore, the interpretative repertoire of international solidarity and cooperation – and the pioneering role within the migration policy of the EU that the Netherlands should take upon themselves – was central in the parliamentary debates.

ChristenUnie (motion 2722): "... requests the cabinet to actively support the migration pact, to nudge other member states to do the same while simultaneously become part of a pioneer group with regard to the implementation of the pact of return, the selection at the European borders and a proportionate distribution amongst the member states of the Union..."²⁰

In addition, in light of recent reports about the unjust treatment of refugees in the asylum procedure, which was related to the Child Benefits Affair, there was talk of human dignity and customization within the parliamentary debates.

SP (motion 2710): "...Observing that the aliens' policy by experts is compared with the child benefits scandal because asylum seekers are labeled as fraudulent in advance; of opinion that in the alien's policy there has to be space for a human dimension; request the government to research in which way the reasonability and proportionality could be better safeguarded in the execution of the alien's policy..."²¹

In general, the legal framework, international solidarity and cooperation and human dignity were dominant interpretative repertoires of pro-refugee parties within the two debates.

4.4.2 DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES

In various instances, compassion was shown through the description of dire circumstances and talks of refugee children.

ChristenUnie: "... in which the state secretary says to be worried about the humanitarian circumstance on the Greek islands. She also says that there should be habitable containers, but that there are all sorts of obstacles. I appreciate that the state secretary says this. Chairman, if I look at the footage on television, then I see that the circumstances are still very miserable. Therefore, I introduce the following motion..."²²

In addition, counter-framing was used by pro-refugee parties to point out factual disinformation or challenge existing views of anti-refugee parties.

ChristenUnie: "I think the VVD is creating a false contradiction. The VVD as well has said that we have to take care of this in Europe. The Netherlands is not one of the pioneers in this. We are not in the pioneering group. Our motion asks to do this because this is not only of interest to the refugees but also of Europe and with that of the Netherlands. I think the VDD is agreeing

²⁰ "...roept het kabinet op zich actief achter dit migratiepact te scharen, andere lidstaten daartoe ook te bewegen en tegelijk deel te gaan nemen aan een kopploeg met betrekking tot de uitvoering van het pact op de punten terugkeer, selectie aan de Europese grenzen en een evenredige herverdeling over de lidstaten van de Unie..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

²¹ "...constaterende dat het vreemdelingenbeleid door experts wordt vergeleken met de toelagenaffaire omdat asielzoekers bij voorbaat als fraudeur worden bestempeld; van mening dat in het vreemdelingenbeleid oog moet zijn voor de menselijke maat; verzoekt de regering te onderzoeken op welke wijze de redelijkheid en evenredigheid beter kunnen worden gewaarborgd in de uitvoering van het vreemdelingenbeleid..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

²² "Daarin zegt de staatssecretaris bezorgd te zijn over de humanitaire situatie op de Griekse eilanden. Ze zegt ook dat er eigenlijk wooncontainers zouden moeten komen, maar dat er allerlei belemmeringen zijn. Ik waardeer dat de staatssecretaris dat zegt. Voorzitter. Als ik naar de camerabeelden op televisie kijk, dan zie ik dat de omstandigheden nog steeds heel belabberd zijn. Ik kom dus tot de volgende motie." (Tweede kamer. (2021, January 27). 49^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/49)

on this, at least in the European context” “What I mean with a false contradiction is that the housing policy is not to blame on refugees who are yet to arrive, but amongst others on the VVD and the policy of the previous years. That is what I mean by a false contradiction. There is already a pioneering group with a view countries, of which one is Germany. This motion asks us to be part of this and to fulfill the promises that we – and hence the VVD; that is something I emphasize – in the European context have made. That is what this motion is asking.”²³

Furthermore, concerning the treatment of refugees in the Netherlands, there was continuously referred to various experts and legitimate sources to underline the message of pro-refugee parties.

SP (Motion 2710) “...Observing that the alien's policy by experts is compared with the child benefits scandal because asylum seekers are labeled as fraudulent in advance; of opinion that in alien policy there has to be space for a human dimension;”²⁴

Lastly, in various instances, strong language was used by pro-refugee parties, often in combination with reference to legitimate sources or the notion of human dignity.

GroenLinks (Motion 2713 on behalf of GroenLinks, PvdA, SP, PvdD, ChristenUnie): “Considering that migration experts in the book “Unheard, Injustice in alien law” rightfully conclude that people in the asylum chain as well through a lack of the application of the human dimension and distrust by the government fall between two stools and are almost crushed by the bureaucratic system;..”²⁵

4.4.3 OBSERVATION ON SUCCESSFULNESS AND DYNAMICS

Regarding dynamics, some interesting observations can be made. As exemplified above, counter-framing is regularly used in a debate to contrast the pro-and anti-refugee discourse against one another.

GroenLinks: “Do you know what I think is a disgrace? I think it’s a disgrace that mister Wiersma calls this ‘mean’. Do you know what I think is mean? I think that it is mean if we say to people from whom we know are stuck in the system, where there is no room for the human dimension; just leave, just go. That is what I think is mean. I rely on the findings of experts, lawyers and researchers who claim: we have to make sure that we are not making wrong decisions and crush people in the system. We have seen enough examples of this in the last months. I hope that now the VVD also wants to conclude that if we really want to restore the trust between the government and the citizens, we have to pay attention to the human dimension. If we have learned one thing from the past few months, from the situation that has emerged, is that there is a need for the human dimension. I ask this cabinet to take into account this call from society and to consider the human dimension.”²⁶

²³ “Volgens mij creëert de VVD een valse tegenstelling. Ook de VVD heeft gezegd dat we dit moeten regelen in Europa. Nederland is daarin niet een van de koplopers. We zitten niet in de kopploeg. Onze motie vraagt om dat ook te doen, omdat het niet alleen in het belang is van vluchtelingen, maar ook in dat van Europa en daarmee ook Nederland. Volgens mij is de VVD het daarmee eens, tenminste in Europees verband..... Wat ik bedoel met een valse tegenstelling is dat het woonbeleid niet te wijten is aan vluchtelingen die nog moeten komen, maar onder andere aan de VVD en het beleid van de afgelopen jaren. Dat bedoel ik met een valse tegenstelling. Er is al een kopploeg van een aantal landen, waaronder Duitsland. Deze motie vraagt dat wij ons daaronder scharen en de afspraken die wij — dus ook de VVD; dat benadruk ik nogmaals — in Europees verband hebben gemaakt, gewoon nakomen. Dat is wat deze motie vraagt.” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

²⁴ ...constaterende dat het vreemdelingenbeleid door experts wordt vergeleken met de toeslagenaffaire omdat asielzoekers bij voorbaat als fraudeur worden bestempeld; van mening dat in het vreemdelingenbeleid oog moet zijn voor de menselijke maat; (motion 2710, 68th assembly).

²⁵ “Overwegend dat migratiedeskundigen in het boek “Ongehoord. Onrecht in het vreemdelingenrecht” terecht constateren dat mensen ook in de asielketen door het gebrek aan toepassing van een menselijke maat en wantrouwen door de overheid tussen wal en schip raken en bijkans worden vermorzeld door een bureaucratisch systeem;” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

²⁶ “Weet u wat ik een gekke figuur vind? Ik vind het een gekke figuur dat de heer Wiersma dit "vals" noemt. Weet u wat ik vals vind? Ik vind het vals dat we tegen mensen van wie we weten dat ze vastzitten in het systeem, waar geen ruimte is voor dat maatwerk, zeggen: ga maar terug, ga maar weg. Dat vind ik vals. Ik baseer mij op bevindingen van experts, advocaten en

Nevertheless, besides the often clear friction exemplified by the abovementioned, some anti-refugee parties surprisingly co-signed or proposed pro-refugee motions, such as was the case with motions 675, 676, 2709, 2721 (see Annex Four). In addition, some anti-refugee have taken part in discursive strategies of the pro-refugee discourse by using a discursive strategy of compassion.

SGP: "...considering that at the moment still 4000 unaccompanied children in Greece are residing under lamentable and sometimes dangerous circumstances;..."²⁷

Furthermore, the example below illustrates that the legal framework is even used by anti-refugee parties to block radical motions.

PVV: "every week hundreds of foreign intruders are invading our country, with all consequences. The Netherlands will not be the Netherlands anymore. This asylum invasion brings unprecedented suffering along for our people, who are harassed, robbed, raped and even murdered by the many asylum thugs.... For this reason, the PVV submits the following motion; ... considering that the Netherlands is plagued by troubling asylum seekers; considering that the government is leaving the Netherlands in the cold by not doing anything structural about this; requests the government to arrest all illegals directly, to lock them up or deport them and to close the borders for all immigrants from Islamic countries"²⁸

Response VVD: "Then, the fourth motion, that of nr. 2711 from the PVV: closing the borders. This one I have to reject too. The motion from mister Markuszower is a motion to which I have already responded before. And the cabinet is attached to giving people protection who have this right, in line with international law. The motion contradicts this, and therefore I have to reject it."²⁹

This shows that the dynamic between pro-and anti-refugee discourse is not necessarily always antagonistic. This also illustrates that the topic of refugees can be placed on a spectrum, rather than that it can always be divided into a pro- or anti or left- or right position. As argued in chapter three, the pro-and anti-refugee division has been made here for analytical reasons. However, future research can potentially take these nuances further into account.

onderzoekers die aangeven: we moeten ervoor waken dat we nu foute beslissingen nemen en dat mensen vermalen raken in het systeem. Daar hebben we de afgelopen maanden genoeg voorbeelden van gezien. Ik hoop toch dat nu ook de VVD tot het inzicht komt dat we, als we echt het vertrouwen tussen bestuur en burger willen herstellen, oog moeten hebben voor maatwerk. Als wij één ding hebben moeten leren van de afgelopen maanden, van de situatie die hier is ontstaan, is het dat er behoefte is aan maatwerk. Ik roep dit kabinet op rekening te houden met die roep uit de samenleving om oog te hebben voor maatwerk." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

²⁷ "...constaterende dat momenteel nog circa 4.000 alleenstaande kinderen in Griekenland verblijven onder vaak erbarmelijke en soms gevaarlijke omstandigheden;..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

²⁸ "Elke week stromen honderden buitenlandse indringers ons land binnen, met alle gevolgen van dien. Nederland is straks Nederland niet meer. Deze asielinvasie brengt ongekend leed mee voor onze eigen mensen, die door het vele asieltuig worden geïntimideerd, beroofd, verkracht en zelfs vermoord... Aan dit alles moet per direct een einde komen en een einde worden gemaakt. Daarom dient de PVV de volgende motie in; constaterende dat Nederland wordt geteisterd door overlastgevende asielzoekers; constaterende dat de regering de Nederlander in de kou laat staan door hier structureel niets aan te doen; verzoekt de regering per direct alle illegalen op te pakken, vast of uit te zetten en de grenzen te sluiten voor alle immigranten uit islamitische landen..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

²⁹ Dan de vierde motie, die op stuk nr. 2711, van de PVV: de grenzen dicht. Die moet ik ook ontraden. De motie van de heer Markuszower is een motie waarop ik op deze plek al eerder heb gereageerd. En het kabinet hecht eraan om in lijn met het internationale recht bescherming te bieden aan hen die daar recht op hebben. De motie is daarmee in strijd, en daarom ontraad ik haar." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

Regarding the success of the pro-refugee discourse, in the two parliamentary debates regarding refugees, twenty-one motions were submitted. In Annex four the motions have been categorized in pro (sixteen), anti (three), and neutral positions (two) regarding the reception and perception of refugees in the Netherlands. Three of the pro and two of the neutral motions were eventually accepted. The other pro-refugee motions which were not accepted were all rejected by a small majority. From these numbers, one can observe that the pro-refugee parties are active in their attempt to change Dutch society in favor of refugees and that even though not all their motions were accepted, there is support for them. In addition, the three anti-refugee motions, of which one stressed the EU return directive (motion 674), one requested to arrest or deport all those who are illegal and to stop all immigrants from Islamic countries (motion 2711) and one requested to criminalize illegality (motion 2719) were all rejected. Hence, the anti-refugee discourse was impeded before it could change the situation for refugees in the Netherlands for the worse. In sum, one could argue that the pro-refugee discourse in these debates is relatively successful.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

As the previous chapter focused on the typology of the pro-refugee discourse, and with that the first part of the question: “In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse,” this chapter will emphasize the second part of the question: “and what, if anything, can they achieve?” The critical examination of the pro-refugee discourse is central here. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the discourses and what are potential ways to strengthen it within its aim to counter the hegemonic anti-refugee discourse? In answering this, the strengths – of which the prominence of the discourse, the legal framework, counter framing and reference to specific sources – will be elaborated upon. Finally, the weaknesses within the pro-refugee discourse will be indicated and possibilities for improvement will be suggested.

STRENGTHS

This first strength is a numerical one rather than that it relates to interpretative repertoires or discursive strategies per se; the pro-refugee parties have a strong voice within the political arena. Not only has social media, and especially Twitter, been utilized to spread the discourse, the party programs included plentiful passages on the topics of refugees. In addition, within only two parliamentary debates sixteen pro-refugee motions were submitted as opposed to three anti and two neutral ones. Although the anti-refugee discourse can still be claimed to be dominant, “hegemony will always be contested to a greater or lesser extent, in hegemonic struggle” (Laclau and Mouffe, 2001, p.124). It is exactly within this research that this struggle is presented and within it is shown that the pro-refugee parties take an active stance to improve the reception and perception of refugees within the Netherlands through their discourse.

Another strength of the pro-refugee discourse is the reference to the interpretative repertoire of the legal framework. As explained in the previous chapter, this repertoire makes sense of the topic of refugees in reference to the legal framework related to refugees. Human Rights declarations, the UN Geneva Refugee Convention of 1951, EU directives and other legal requirements that are applicable in the Netherlands provide an argument for the good and fair reception of refugees. All pro-refugee parties consistently refer to this, in their party programs specifically. This interpretative repertoire adds to the success of the discourse as it provides a logical and consistent argument; the Netherlands is required in an international context to fulfill certain duties towards refugees. It does not appeal to vague concepts or to emotions, but more simply to a common reality that must be accepted by anti-refugee parties as it is the law. Although the law is not a static concept and can be challenged by the anti-refugee discourse, a rights-based discourse can be effective. This is especially true when this discourse is accompanied by a discourse of humanitarian relief (Dauvergne, 2000), which can be related to the interpretative repertoire of inclusive nationalism and international cooperation. Furthermore, as illustrated in section 4.4.3, even the VVD uses the legal framework as an argument to reject a rather radical notion which requests to “Arrest or deport all those who are illegal and to close the borders for those who come from Islamic countries.” Hence, the legal framework seems to be commonly accepted as a standard within the refugee debate, and therefore it is a strength of the pro-refugee discourse to rely on this interpretative repertoire.

A third strength is counter-framing, which is employed by pro-refugee parties to undermine the discourse of the anti-refugee parties. Specifically, on the topic of the housing crisis, where anti-refugee parties are blaming migrants, pro-refugee parties are vocal to blame the liberal policy of the last few years instead. Consistently, the pro-refugee parties are calling the anti-refugee parties out on their false contradictions. In doing so, they also consistently hold anti-refugee parties accountable for their contribution to the wrong treatment of refugees such as the terrible circumstances the Greek refugee camps are in or the deportation of children who have been in the Netherlands their whole life. As argued by Fadaee (2020) “framing processes should be developed in an interaction with hegemonic discursive field and in competing framing contests” (p. 1)... “a realistic pro-refugee politics, which resonates with

everyday experience and future anxieties of European by proposing solutions to real challenges while simultaneously addressing structural injustice, should become the center of pro-refugee politics (p. 13). This is exactly what happens within the discursive strategy of counter framing by the pro-refugee parties: they are not simply isolated within their own discourse but take an active part in the framing contest and the hegemonic struggle.

Lastly, the pro-refugee discourse actively engages with wider societal developments, signals that come from civil society and reliable sources. They do this by not only linking the treatment of refugees to the Child Benefits Scandal – which was a prominent topic of debate in the last couple of months – but also by regularly referring to newspaper articles and expert sources within their argumentation. This discursive strategy can be strong, as arguments are more relevant to the everyday Dutch person and can be less simply refuted when it relies on reliable sources. This can be exemplified by the discussion regarding motion 2712:

GroenLinks: “I rely on the findings of experts, lawyers and researchers who claim: we have to make sure that we are not making wrong decisions and crush people in the system. We have seen enough examples of this in the last months. I hope that now the VVD also want to conclude that if we really want to restore the trust between the government and the citizen, we have to pay attention to the human dimension. If we have learned one thing from the past few months, from the situation that has emerged, is that there is a need for the human dimension. I ask this cabinet to take into account this call from society and to consider the human dimension.”³⁰

VVD: “there is attention paid to the human dimension. This is exactly why this motion expresses distrust towards that implementation. But let's come back about your point ‘mean’: it is mean if you let people dangle for an extra amount of time through this motion.”³¹

This illustrates that while a pro-refugee party bases its argumentation and the submission of a motion on sources, the anti-refugee party simply refutes this without further argumentation. Unfortunately, however, short of 6 votes the related motion was rejected (69/149).

WEAKNESSES

In terms of weaknesses of the pro-refugee discourse, the interpretative repertoire of human dignity leaves something to be desired. As stated in the previous chapter in this interpretative repertoire the human being as dignified is central. The positive reception and perception of refugees are argued in reference to respect for human life and human dignity. Phrases such as ‘humane’, ‘inhumane’ and ‘the human dimension’ were common in this repertoire but remained vague. These phrases might appeal to an intuitive idea of the ‘right’ treatment of refugees, or to a notion of minimum standards in which people should live, but fails to refer to anything concrete. For this reason, referring to a humane refugee or immigration policy could mean anything, which makes it hard to agree upon. This vagueness can stand in the way of reaching the goal of better treatment of refugees because it fails to bring about any practical strategy to change the situation. For this reason, an improvement could be joining the idea of

³⁰ “Ik baseer mij op bevindingen van experts, advocaten en onderzoekers die aangeven: we moeten ervoor waken dat we nu foute beslissingen nemen en dat mensen vermalen raken in het systeem. Daar hebben we de afgelopen maanden genoeg voorbeelden van gezien. Ik hoop toch dat nu ook de VVD tot het inzicht komt dat we, als we echt het vertrouwen tussen bestuur en burger willen herstellen, oog moeten hebben voor maatwerk. Als wij één ding hebben moeten leren van de afgelopen maanden, van de situatie die hier is ontstaan, is het dat er behoefte is aan maatwerk. Ik roep dit kabinet op rekening te houden met die roep uit de samenleving om oog te hebben voor maatwerk.” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

³¹ “Er is oog voor maatwerk. Dat is juist waarom deze motie wantrouwen uitstraalt richting die uitvoering. Maar even op dat punt "vals": het is vals als je mensen door deze motie extra lang laat bungelen. (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

‘humane’ with insights into minimum standards or practical ways to move from the ‘inhumane’ to the ‘humane’.

Furthermore, the pro-refugee discourse is very much focused on refugee children. On the one hand, focusing on children might be a strategy to find common ground with anti-refugee parties, as children are often a victim of the situation and are less likely to ‘harm a country’. Even some anti-refugee parties, such as de SGP in motion 2721, stress the importance of safety for refugee children. Referring to refugee children can therefore aid the pro-refugee discourse as this is a common ground between the pro- and anti-refugee discourse. On the other hand, by primarily focusing on children, and especially those who are unaccompanied and most vulnerable, the discourse risks neglecting ‘regular refugees’. The fact that the discussion is dominated by talks of child refugees overshadows that all people, not only children have a right to request asylum. Furthermore, as can be seen in the acceptance and rejection of certain political motions, the children who are already integrated are allowed to stay in the Netherlands, however, bringing in the 500 unaccompanied children from Moria proves to be much more of a discussion. Hence, the pro-refugee discourse seems to be limited to refugee children who are already in the Netherlands and the most vulnerable children from Moria. By merely focusing on this, the protection of all refugees seems to be narrowed.

In addition, in many instances refugees are quantified. The hashtag #500children is repeatedly used, as is reference to the total 4000 unaccompanied children who are in Moria, the relocation mechanism of the EU, and the national refugee quota from the UN. What can be a potential risk here, is the quantification of refugees, and with that their dehumanization. Baker’s (2020) observation about the left-wing being infiltrated by the right-wing anti-refugee discourse through – amongst other – quantification seems to apply here. What about child no. 501? What about the person who just turned 18 and is therefore no longer a child? Concerning this, the Fundamental Rights Agency from the European Union argues that strategic communication about fundamental rights, such as the rights of refugees, should go beyond numbers; “Most people understand issues through anecdotes and personal stories, rather than statistics. Show the human face behind the evidence to tap into emotions and give rights holders a voice” (FRA, 2018). This is something that the pro-refugee discourse could incorporate more than it currently does.

Lastly, the content of the pro-refugee discourse in the Netherlands within party programs, social media activity and parliamentary debate is predominantly in synergy. Whereas the party programs look into the reasoning behind the positive attitude towards refugees, social media posts employ strategies with which these arguments can be strengthened. Subsequently, within parliamentary debates, these strategies are executed within relation to anti-refugee parties. It is interesting to note however, that some parties are not as active on social media, while they are in the debates. For example, within four months the SP posted only three relevant tweets and no Facebook or Instagram posts whereas they did propose eight political motions during the debates. By contrast, newer parties such as Volt and Bij1 were very active on all social media platforms but were no cosigners of motions in the 68th parliamentary debate, the first debate on the topic of refugees after their instatement in the parliament. By bringing together social media discourse, while relying on the party program's reasoning and executing this in the debates, the realms in which politics is enacted in the 21st century are synchronized. As referred to in chapter one, Threadgold states that “there is a small but growing body of evidence that political and policy discourse concerning immigration actually fuel the media discourse, which in turn drives policy” (2009, p 1). Hence, there is a symbiotic relationship between different discourse planes. Consistency between these planes might add to the potential success of the pro-refugee discourse. Moreover, the party programs include various interpretative repertoires, which are not necessarily found on social media and within the parliamentary debate. It seems as if on social media and the debates certain strategies are employed without much explicit reference to the interpretative repertoires. If the interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies were more synchronized, the pro-refugee discourse could be more compelling.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

Following from the discourse analysis, the legal framework, human dignity, international solidarity and cooperation, the global unequal distribution of resources, and inclusive nationalism are observed as prominent interpretative repertoires within the pro-refugee discourse. In addition, compassion, counter-framing, legitimacy of information and firm language are observed as discursive strategies within the pro-refugee discourse. These interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies constitute an answer to the first part of the question; In what way do political pro-refugee counter-discourses attempt to oppose anti-refugee discourse, and what, if anything, can they achieve? It is through the abovementioned interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies that the prevailing anti-refugee discourse is challenged by the pro-refugee discourse.

As to the second part of the question, ‘what, if anything, can the pro-refugee discourse achieve’, the pro-refugee discourse shows promising elements. The pro-refugee discourse successfully engages with the hegemonic struggle through the frequent use of social media and the proposal of plenty political motions, the recurring strategy of counter-framing, the reference to the legal framework and the linkage to relevant and trustworthy sources. Through this, the pro-refugee discourse provides an important counter-discourse which is a worthy opponent to the anti-refugee discourse. Nevertheless, continuous reference to the vague concept of a common humanity, the emphasis of refugee children over refugees in general, the quantification of refugees and the lack of synergy between the interpretative repertoires and discursive strategies within the party programs, social media activity and parliamentary debates stands in the way from fully successfully countering the prevailing anti-refugee discourse. Overall, the pro-refugee discourse contains promising elements but can benefit from introspection in the way the perception and reception of refugees are constructed. Only then, refugees can be treated fairly in society and rebuild their lives after fleeing from war, violence, conflict or persecution. After all, “A lasting solution, the possibility to begin a new life, is the only dignified solution for the refugee himself” (UN High Commissioner for Refugees Hartling, 1984).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, R. (2017, November 17). Michel Foucault: Discourse. Retrieved from <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2017/11/17/michel-foucault-discourse/#:~:text=Foucault%20adopted%20the%20term%20'discourse,objects%20of%20which%20they%20speak'>.
- Amnesty International (3 March 2020). Europe People helping refugees and migrants risk jail as authorities misuse anti-smuggling laws. Retrieved from: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2020/03/europe-people-helping-refugees-and-migrants-risk-jail-as-authorities-misuse-anti-smuggling-laws/>
- Baker, M. (2020). Rehumanizing the migrant: the translated past as a resource for refashioning the contemporary discourse of the (radical) left. *Palgrave Communications*, 6(1), 1-16.
- Banks, M (21 July 2021). Migration & Asylum: Breaking the deadlock on EU migration policy. Retrieved from: <https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/breaking-the-deadlock-on-eu-migration-policy>
- Bijl (2021) Programma 2021 Bijl. Allemaal anders maar toch gelijkwaardig. Retrieved from: <https://cloud.bijl.org/s/xzrjkqFDMrgo42/download>
- Brouwer, J., Van der Woude, M., & Van der Leun, J. (2017). Framing migration and the process of immigration: A systematic analysis of the media representation of unauthorized immigrants in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Criminology*, 14(1), 100-119.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing Political Discourse – Theory and Practice*. London: Arnold.
- ChristenUnie (2021) Kiezen voor wat echt telt. Verkiezingsprogramma 2021-2025 Christenunie <https://www.christenunie.nl/1/library/download/urn:uuid:43e1946c-a793-41ac-a80a-fddb045f8408/verkiezingsprogramma+2021-2025+-+christenunie+-+online.pdf>
- Commissie Rechtsstatelijkheid. (2021). De Partijprogramma's voor de verkiezingen 2021 Rechtsstatelijkheid? Retrieved from <https://www.advocatenorde.nl/document/nova-rapport-commissie-rechtsstatelijkheid-verkiezingsprogrammas-2021>
- DENK (2021) DENKend aan Nederland Verkiezingsprogramma DENK 2017-2021. Retrieved from [Verkiezingsprogramma \(bewegingdenk.nl\)](http://Verkiezingsprogramma (bewegingdenk.nl))
- De Zwaan. (12 April 2021). 'Nederlandse aanpak vreemdelingen doet denken aan de toeslagenaffaire: liegen wordt gezien als norm.' *De Volkskrant*. Retrieved from: <https://www.volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/nederlandse-aanpak-vreemdelingen-doet-denken-aan-de-toeslagenaffaire-liegen-wordt-gezien-als-norm~b56134b0/?referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F>
- D66 (2021) Een nieuw begin. Laat iedereen vrij, maar niemand vallen. Verkiezingsprogramma 2021-2025. Retrieved from https://d66.nl/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/d66_verkiezingsprogramma_een_nieuw_begin_2021_2025.pdf
- Dauvergne, C. (2000). The dilemma of rights discourses for refugees. *University of New South Wales Law Journal*, 23(3), 56-74.
- Eberl, J. M., Meltzer, C. E., Heidenreich, T., Herrero, B., Theorin, N., Lind, F., ... & Strömbäck, J. (2018). The European media discourse on immigration and its effects: A literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 42(3), 207-223.

- Every, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2008). Constructions of Australia in pro-and anti-asylum seeker political discourse. *Nations and Nationalism*, 14(3), 562-580.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 5(11), 121-138.
- Fadaee, S. (2021). The Long 2015 in Germany: Activists' Pro-Refugee Frames and Media Counter Frames. *Sociological Research Online*, 26(1), 44-59.
- Feltwell, T., Vines, J., Salt, K., Blythe, M., Kirman, B., Barnett, J., ... & Lawson, S. (2017). Counter-discourse activism on social media: The case of challenging "poverty porn" television. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 26(3), 345-385.
- Fillingham, L. A. (2005). *Foucault for Beginners*. Danbury CT: For Beginners.
- Fotopoulos, S., & Kaimaklioti, M. (2016). Media discourse on the refugee crisis: on what have the Greek, German and British press focused?. *European View*, 15(2), 265-279.
- Fozdar, F., & Pedersen, A. (2013). Diablogging about asylum seekers: Building a counter-hegemonic discourse. *Discourse & Communication*, 7(4), 371-388.
- Fundamental Rights Agency of the EU [FRA]. (2018). 10 keys to effectively communicating human rights. Retrieved from <https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/10-keys-effectively-communicating-human-rights>
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis* (Vol. 241). Univ of California Press.
- Goswami, S. (2014). Michel Foucault: Structures of truth and power. *European Journal of Philosophical Research*, (1), 8-20.
- GroenLinks (2021) Verkiezingsprogramma GroenLinks 2021. Retrieved from https://groenlinks.nl/sites/groenlinks/files/2021-03/GroenLinks_Verkiezingsprogramma%202021.pdf
- Gualda, E., & Rebollo, C. (2016). The refugee crisis on Twitter: A diversity of discourses at a European crossroads. *Journal of Spatial and Organizational Dynamics*, 4(3), 199-212.
- Guidry, J. P., Austin, L. L., Carlyle, K. E., Freberg, K., Cacciatore, M., Meganck, S., ... & Messner, M. (2018). Welcome or not: Comparing# refugee posts on Instagram and Pinterest. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(4), 512-531.
- Hartling, P. (12 November 2014). Statement by Mr. Poul Hartling, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/admin/hcspeeches/3ae68fb38/statement-mr-poul-hartling-united-nations-high-commissioner-refugees-third.html>
- Hier, S. P., & Greenberg, J. L. (2002). Constructing a discursive crisis: Risk, problematization and illegal Chinese in Canada. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 25(3), 490-513.
- Horsti, K. (2008). Europeanisation of public debate: Swedish and Finnish news on African migration to Spain. *Javnost - ThePublic*, 15(4), 41-53.
- Igwebuike, E. E. (2018). Discursive strategies and ideologies in selected newspaper reports on the Nigerian-Cameroonian Bakassi peninsula border conflict. *Communication and the Public*, 3(2), 151-168.
- IOM (2019). Glossary on immigration IML Series No. 34. International Organization for Migration

- Jäger, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 1, 32-63.
- Jäger, S. (2004). *Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung. (Discourse Analysis. An Introduction)*. 4th ed., Münster: UNRAST-Verlag
- Jong, O. (5 April 2018). The EU-Turkey Deal Explained. Retrieved from: https://helprefugees.org/news/eu-turkey-deal-explained/?gclid=EAIaIQobChMI1Mf42eCF8gIVCeN3Ch0nbA4RE-AAYASAAEgLUifD_BwE
- KhosraviNik, M. (2017). Social media critical discourse studies (SM-CDS). *Handbook of critical discourse analysis*, 583, 596.
- Kyle, J., & Gultchin, L. (2018). Populism in Power around the World. Available at SSRN 3283962.
- Kreis, R. (2017). # refugeesnotwelcome: Anti-refugee discourse on Twitter. *Discourse & Communication*, 11(5), 498-514.
- Lukes, S., & Kearns, I. (2006). In conversation with... Steven Lukes. *Public Policy Research*, 13(4), 272-275.
- Lynn, N., & Lea, S. (2003). A phantom menace and the new Apartheid': the social construction of asylum-seekers in the United Kingdom. *Discourse & Society*, 14(4), 425-452.
- MacDonald, D. (2011). The power of ideas in international relations. *Regional Powers and Regional Orders*, 33-48.
- Mason, J. (2017). *Qualitative researching*. Sage.
- Matthes, J. (2009). What's in a frame? A content analysis of media framing studies in the world's leading communication journals, 1990-2005. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 86(2), 349-367.
- McKenzie, P. J. (2005). Interpretive repertoires.
- Moussa, M., & Scapp, R. (1996). The practical theorizing of Michel Foucault: Politics and counter-discourse. *Cultural Critique*, (33), 87-112.
- Murray, P., & Longo, M. (2018). Europe's wicked legitimacy crisis: the case of refugees. *Journal of European Integration*, 40(4), 411-425.
- O'Doherty, K., & Lecouteur, A. (2007). "Asylum seekers", "boat people" and "illegal immigrants": Social categorisation in the media. *Australian journal of psychology*, 59(1), 1-12.
- Özerim, M. G., & Tolay, J. (2021). Discussing the populist features of anti-refugee discourses on social media: an anti-Syrian hashtag in Turkish Twitter. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(1), 204-218.
- Partij van de Arbeid (2021) Ons plan voor een eerlijk en fatsoenlijker Nederland. Concept verkiezingsprogramma PVDA 2021-2025. Retrieved from <https://www.pvda.nl/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/PvdA-2021-2025-Ons-plan-voor-een-eerlijker-en-fatsoenlijker-Nederland-Print-versie.pdf>
- Partij van de Dieren (2021) Verkiezingsprogramma Partij voor de Dieren Tweede Kamerverkiezingen 2021. Plan B: Idealisme is het nieuwe Realisme. Retrieved from <https://www.partijvoordedieren.nl/uploads/algemeen/Verkiezingsprogramma-Partij-voor-de-Dieren-Tweede-Kamerverkiezingen-2021.pdf>

- PDC (2017) *Tweede Kamerverkiezingen 2017*. Retrieved from https://www.parlement.com/id/vk1wljxti6u9/tweede_kamerverkiezingen_2017
- PDC (2021) *Samenstelling Tweede Kamer na de verkiezingen van 17 maart 2021*. Retrieved from https://www.parlement.com/id/vlflkdqjwmw/prognose_samenstelling_tweede_kamer_na
- Pickering, S. (2001). Common sense and original deviancy: News discourses and asylum seekers in Australia. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 14(2), 169-186.
- Potter, J. (2005). *Representing Reality – Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: SAGE.
- Saxton, A. (2003). I certainly don't want people like that here: The discursive construction of 'asylum seekers'. *Media International Australia*, 109(1), 109-120.
- Schneider, F. (2013, May 6). Getting the hang of discourse theory. *Politics East Asia*. Retrieved from: <http://www.politicseastasia.com/studying/getting-the-hang-of-discourse-theory/>
- Siapera, E. Refugee Solidarity in Europe: Shifting the Discourse* Pre-print version of the article in *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 2019, doi.
- Social Dutch (2020). Social media use in the Netherlands 2020. Retrieved from <https://www.social-dutch.com/en/research/social-media-use-in-the-netherlands-2020>
- Sohlberg, J., Esaiasson, P., & Martinsson, J. (2019). The changing political impact of compassion-evoking pictures: The case of the drowned toddler Alan Kurdi. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(13), 2275-2288.
- SP (2021) Stel een daad. Verkiezingsprogramma van de SP voor de Tweede Kamerverkiezingen van 17 maart 2021. https://www.sp.nl/sites/default/files/verkiezingsprogramma_2021-2025.pdf
- Stichting Vluchteling (2021, March 3). *Hoe scoren partijen op de bescherming van vluchtelingen?*. Retrieved from <https://www.vluchteling.nl/nieuws/2021/3/hoe-scoren-politieke-partijen-op-de-bescherming-van-vluchtelingen>
- Stieglitz, S., Brockmann, T., & Dang-Xuan, L. (2012). Usage Of Social Media For Political Communication. In *PACIS* (p. 22).
- Stieglitz, S., & Dang-Xuan, L. (2013). Social media and political communication: a social media analytics framework. *Social network analysis and mining*, 3(4), 1277-1291.
- SVMA & VAJN. (2021). Ongehoord onrecht in het vreemdelingenrecht. Retrieved from: <https://www.vajn.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/boek-ongehoord-onrecht-in-het-vreemdelingenrecht.pdf>
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- The Guardian (26 April 2021). Greece accused of 'shocking' illegal pushback against refugees at sea. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/apr/26/greece-accused-of-shocking-pushback-against-refugees-at-sea>
- Tuominen, K., Talja, S., & Savolainen, R. (2002). Discourse, cognition, and reality: Toward a social constructionist metatheory for library and information science. *Emerging frameworks and methods*, 271-283.

Tweede kamer (27th of January, 2021) Stemmingen over: moties ingediend bij het meele JBZ-Raad d.d. 28 en 29 januari 2021 (vreemdelingen- en asielbeleid). Retrieved from <https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/stemmingsuitslagen/detail?id=2021P02318> VSO Infor-

Tweede Kamer (20th of April 2021) Moties ingediend bij het VAO Vreemdelingen- en Asielbeleid. Retrieved from <https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/stemmingsuitslagen/detail?id=2021P06241>

UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), *UNHCR Master Glossary of Terms*, June 2006, Rev.1, available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/42ce7d444.html> [accessed 4 June 2021]

Van Dijk, T. A. (1999). *Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis*.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction. *Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona*, 1025-1034.

Van Heerden, S., de Lange, S. L., van der Brug, W., & Fennema, M. (2014). The immigration and integration debate in the Netherlands: Discursive and programmatic reactions to the rise of anti-immigration parties. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(1), 119-136.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2005). *Introducing Social Semiotics*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge

Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland (25 February 2021). *Maak geen verschil met je stem*. Retrieved from <https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/nieuws/maak-geen-verschil-met-je-stem>

Vluchtelingenwerk Nederland (12 March 2019). Europees Hof: Nederland te streng bij gezinshereniging vluchteling. Retrieved from: <https://www.vluchtelingenwerk.nl/nieuws/europees-hof-nederland-te-streng-bij-gezinshereniging-vluchteling>

Vollmer, B., & Karakayali, S. (2018). The volatility of the discourse on refugees in Germany. *Journal of immigrant & refugee studies*, 16(1-2), 118-139.

Volt (2021) Volt Verkiezingsprogramma 2021 – 2025 @Volt Nederland. Toekomst made in Europe Retrieved from https://voltnederland.org/s/Volt_nl_programma_CR-16-3-22.pdf

Wallaschek, S. (2020). The discursive construction of solidarity: Analysing public claims in Europe's migration crisis. *Political Studies*, 68(1), 74-92.

Wattal, S., Schuff, D., Mandviwalla, M., & Williams, C. B. (2010). Web 2.0 and politics: the 2008 US presidential election and an e-politics research agenda. *MIS quarterly*, 669-688.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires. *Analysing everyday explanation: A casebook of methods*, 168-183.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (1999). Discourse and racism: European perspectives. *Annual review of anthropology*, 28(1), 175-199.

Yılmaz, F. (2012). Right-wing hegemony and immigration: How the populist far-right achieved hegemony through the immigration debate in Europe. *Current sociology*, 60(3), 368-381.

Zeng, D., Chen, H., Lusch, R., & Li, S. H. (2010). Social media analytics and intelligence. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 25(6), 13-16.

ANNEX 1. PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS RESULTS FROM 2021

PARTY	SEATS 2017-2021 ³²	SEATS 2021-2025 ³³
VVD	33	34
D66	19	24
PVV	20	17
CDA	19	15
SP	14	9
PvdA	9	9
GroenLinks	14	8
FVD	2	8
Partij voor de Dieren	5	6
ChristenUnie	5	5
SGP	3	3
DENK	3	3
JA21	0	3
Volt	0	3
50PLUS	4	1
BIJ1	0	1
BBB	0	1

³² PDC (2017) *Tweede Kamerverkiezingen 2017*. Retrieved from https://www.parlement.com/id/vk1wljxti6u9/tweede_kamerverkiezingen_2017

³³ PDC (2021) *Samenstelling Tweede Kamer na de verkiezingen van 17 maart 2021*. Retrieved from https://www.parlement.com/id/vlfkldqjwmw/prognose_samenstelling_tweede_kamer_na

ANNEX 2. CODING

1. Interpretative repertoire	Description	Examples of related Dutch vocabulary	Possible link with related academic work and analytical concepts
1.1 The Legal Framework	Within this interpretative repertoire, the legal framework surrounding refugees is referred to as making sense of the positive perception and reception of refugees in the Netherlands. Human Rights, the Geneva Refugee Convention of 1951, EU directives and other legal requirements provide an argument for the good and fair reception of refugees.	Rechten (asiel, huisvesting, zorg, onderwijs, mensenrechten, grondrechten) Onrecht Rechtvaardig	
1.2 Human Dignity	Within this interpretative repertoire, the human being as dignified is central. A positive reception and perception of refugees are argued out of respect for human life and human dignity. Here, often there is reference to 'humane conditions' and a 'shared humanity'. It demands room for the individual and it often includes reference to the 'human dimension'.	Menswaardig(heid) Menselijk Humaan / Humane Maatwerk Menselijke maat	Baker (2020): Humanity
1.3 International Solidarity and Cooperation	This interpretative repertoire understands the positive perception and reception of refugees in the Netherlands as something inevitably based on international solidarity and cooperation, especially on the EU level.	Grensoverschrijdend, solidariteit, samenwerking, verantwoordelijkheid, (eerlijke) verdeling	Siapera (2019): solidarity on social media Wallascheck (2020): meso level discursive solidarity
1.4 The global unequal distribution of resources and exploitation	This interpretative repertoire is related to both climate change and Western (economic) domination. Refugees are deserving of positive perception and reception by host countries as these countries owe it to them because of historical western (economic) domination and/or exploitation. Climate change and the involvement in conflict are examples of this.	Klimaatcrisis /verandering, uitbuiting, conflict(en), oorlog	
1.5 Inclusive nationalism	Within this repertoire, the host country - in this case the Netherlands - is seen as a hospitable and/or diverse country that fuels positive perception and reception of	Veilig thuis, gastvrij, ruimhartig, onze (kern)waarden, bijdrage, migratie	Every & Augoustinos (2008); inclusive nationalism

	refugees. It also stresses the possible contribution that refugees are to the country.		
--	--	--	--

2. Discursive Strategy	Description	Related academic work and analytical concepts
2.1. Compassion and Children	Evoking and showing compassion often through imaginaries of vulnerable refugees or children. Within this discursive strategy, refugees are depicted as heroes or victims. Often these frames are accompanied by imaginaries of dire circumstances.	Karakayali (2018); Deserving migrants Sohlberg (2019); Compassion and children Eberl et al (2018); Hero- and victim frames
2.2 Counter-framing	Counter-framing refers to undermining, challenging existing concepts and beliefs through for example highlighting contradictions and inconsistencies in the beliefs and values of those expressing racist views or challenging language that maintains and regulates negative intergroup relations. In addition, the negative way in which refugees are perceived is explicitly refuted. Furthermore, putting another party on the spot in terms of their responsibility or in relation to unkept promises is included in counter-framing as well.	Fadaee (2021); Framing Contests
2.3 Legitimacy of information	Here, reference to sources is used to strengthen the legitimacy of the message.	
2.4 Firm language use	Employing certain words that add urgency and/or necessity to the message.	

ANNEX 3. DATA

PARTY PROGRAMS - INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRES

THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

PvdD: “International treaties such as the Refugee Treaty and the European Convention of Human Rights are the foundation. The Netherlands will not approve of agreements, such as the EU-Turkey deal, which violate this.”³⁴

GroenLinks: “The Refugee Convention of the EU, the European Convention of Human Rights and the right to asylum from the EU form the foundation for our approach to refugees. For this reason, the Netherlands will contribute much more than it does now to the reception of vulnerable refugees. We will do this by taking in an equal share from the designated group from the UN.”³⁵

Bij1: “Bij1 sees this as a humanitarian crisis, which is caused by a failing European reception policy such as the Turkey deal, with human rights violations as a consequence.”³⁶

D66: “The terrible images of children in refugee camps in Greece or the full boats which got in trouble in the Mediterranean show how important it is to get a grip on irregular immigration. This asks for a European, transboundary approach. Human dignity and compliance with the Refugee Convention are a priority.”³⁷

D66: “We respect the right to ask for asylum.”³⁸

DENK: “DENK believes that We should strive towards deals with countries on the outskirts of Europe, such as the EU-Turkey deal. In doing so, there must be acted upon international treaties.”³⁹

PvdA: “The UN Refugee Convention is paramount. People keep their right to ask for asylum on European grounds, everyone has a right to an individual assessment and no one will be sent back to an unsafe country.”⁴⁰

³⁴ “Internationale verdragen zoals het Vluchtelingenverdrag en het Europees Verdrag voor de Rechten van de Mens vormen het uitgangspunt. Nederland gaat niet akkoord met afspraken, zoals de Turkije deal, die hier mee strijdig zijn.” (PvdD, 2021, p. 102-103)

³⁵ “Het Vluchtelingenverdrag van de Verenigde Naties, het Europees Verdrag voor de Rechten van de Mens en het asielrecht van de EU vormen de basis voor onze omgang met vluchtelingen. Nederland gaat daarom veel meer dan nu bijdragen aan opvang van kwetsbare vluchtelingen. Dat doen we door een evenredig deel van de door de Verenigde Naties aangewezen groep op te nemen.” (GroenLinks, 2021, p. 86)

³⁶ “BIJ1 ziet deze crisis als een humanitaire crisis, die veroorzaakt wordt door falend Europees opvangbeleid als de Turkijedeal, met mensenrechtenschendingen als gevolg.” (Bij1, 2021, p. 80)

³⁷ “De verschrikkelijke beelden van kinderen in vluchtelingenkampen in Griekenland of de volle bootjes die op de Middellandse Zee in de problemen raakten, laten zien hoe belangrijk het is om grip te krijgen op irreguliere migratie. Dat vraagt een Europese, grensoverschrijdende aanpak. Menswaardigheid en naleving van het Vluchtelingenverdrag staan hierbij voorop” (D66, 2021, p. 194)

³⁸ “We respecteren het recht op asiel aan te vragen.” (D66, 2021, p. 196)

³⁹ “Dat er gestreefd moet worden naar het sluiten van deals met landen aan de buitengrenzen van Europa, zoals de EU-Turkijedeal. Daarbij is het van belang dat er gehandeld wordt volgens internationale verdragen.” (DENK, 2021, p. 60)

⁴⁰ “VN-vluchtelingenverdrag staat recht overeind. Mensen behouden het recht om op Europees grondgebied asiel aan te vragen, ieder heeft recht op een individuele beoordeling en niemand wordt teruggestuurd naar een onveilig land.” (PVDa, 2021, p. 91)

PvdD: “Children’s rights, as established in the International Treaty of the Rights of the Child, will be anchored in alien law.”⁴¹

Volt: “The Dublin Regulation, in which was attempted to reach agreement about the relocation of refugees and the costs, has failed.”⁴²

HUMAN DIGNITY

ChristenUnie: “Looking after the needs of refugees is at the heart of Christian politics. We are all made and loved by the same God and the country in which we live, we received coincidentally. For this reason, we hold the principle belief that we have to provide a safe space to victims of disasters, wars, persecution and repression.”⁴³

ChristenUnie: “There is a need for quick change. The ChristenUnie wants a righteous asylum policy, that is hospitable and takes into account the dignity of asylum seekers.”⁴⁴

ChristenUnie: “We want a fairer migration policy, with more grip on the situation. In which we can receive vulnerable refugees generously and can end the inhumane circumstances such as on Lesbos.”⁴⁵

D66: “We can take care of safe routes to give migrant workers a chance and strengthen our economy, while we offer a humane reception to refugees.”⁴⁶

D66: “This asks for a European, transboundary approach. Human dignity and compliance with the Refugee Convention are a priority in doing so.”⁴⁷

D66: “All member states, also the Netherlands, have to take responsibility. A European migration- and asylum policy has to be effective, fair and humane.”⁴⁸

DENK: “DENK stands for a humanitarian and generous asylum policy.”⁴⁹

DENK: “When newcomers have arrived in the Netherlands, they deserve humane treatment.”⁵⁰

GroenLinks: “GroenLinks commits to peace and righteousness globally, so people can be safe in their own country. Unfortunately, at present that is often not the case. Therefore we fight for

⁴¹“Kinderrechten, zoals vastgelegd in het Internationaal Verdrag inzake de Rechten van het Kind (IVRK), worden in de Vreemdelingenwet vastgelegd.” (Partij van de Dieren, 2021, p. 103)

⁴² “Het verdrag van Dublin, waarmee geprobeerd is afspraken te maken over de verdeling van vluchtelingen en van kosten, heeft gefaald.” (Volt, 2021, p. 20)

⁴³ “Omzien naar de noden van vluchtelingen ligt na aan het hart van de christelijke politiek. We zijn allemaal gemaakt en geliefd door dezelfde God en het land waar we wonen hebben we ook maar gekregen. We hebben daarom de principiële overtuiging dat we een veilige plek moeten bieden aan slachtoffers van rampen, oorlog, vervolging en onderdrukking.” (ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 19)

⁴⁴ “Er is snel verandering nodig. De ChristenUnie wil een rechtvaardiger migratiebeleid, dat gastvrijer en menswaardiger is voor vluchtelingen.” (ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 19)

⁴⁵ “We willen een rechtvaardiger migratiebeleid, met meer grip. Waarin we ruimhartig kwetsbare vluchtelingen opvangen en een einde maken aan inhumane omstandigheden zoals op Lesbos.” (ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 10)

⁴⁶ “Kunnen we zorgen voor veilige routes om arbeidsmigranten een kans te geven en onze economie te versterken, terwijl we humane opvang bieden aan vluchtelingen.” (D66, 2021, p. 10)

⁴⁷ “Dat vraagt een Europese, grensoverschrijdende aanpak. Menswaardigheid en naleving van het Vluchtelingenverdrag staan hierbij voorop.” (D66, 2021, p. 194)

⁴⁸ “Alle lidstaten, ook Nederland, moeten verantwoordelijkheid nemen. Een Europees migratie- en asielbeleid moet effectief, eerlijk en menselijk zijn.” (D66, 2021, p. 196)

⁴⁹ “DENK staat voor een humanitair en ruimhartig asielbeleid.” (DENK, 2021, p. 58)

⁵⁰ “Wanneer nieuwkomers eenmaal gearriveerd zijn in Nederland, verdienen zij een humane behandeling.” (DENK, 2021, p. 58)

a humane and righteous asylum and migration policy.”⁵¹

PvdA: “We are always open to the reception of refugees and look what is necessary for our own labor market. Take migration out of the taboo zone and carry out a humane, sober and effective policy.”⁵²

Volt: “Volt wants a humane refugee policy and a sensible labor migration policy for the European Union as a whole. Cooperation and solidarity are preconditions to prevent future migration crises. Through this, we promote European values through the humane reception of refugees and asylum seekers and to offer them a future.”⁵³

PvdD: “People in refugee camps have a right to a humane existence. This means at least the right to safety, enough food and drinks, legal aid, healthcare, and humane housing.”⁵⁴

Bij1: “Bij1 sees this as a humanitarian crisis, which is caused by a failing European reception policy such as the Turkey deal, with human rights violations as a consequence.”⁵⁵

INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY AND COOPERATION

SP: “Refugees that can’t safely stay in the region, we take in in the EU. All member states have to contribute to this. We stop looking away from member states where vulnerable people are victimized, as becomes painfully clear in the Greek refugee camps.”⁵⁶

Bij1: “We want an asylum and refugee policy that is carried by the whole of Europe, that fights human trafficking, torture and exploitation. This policy has non-violence, human dignity and solidarity as its foundation.”⁵⁷

DENK: “... That refugees and asylum seekers should be distributed equally between the countries of the European Union. The member states that refuse to receive refugees have to be sanctioned.”⁵⁸

Volt: “Besides the problems of climate and the moving power relations on the world stage, we see the emergence of overcrowded refugee camps which do not offer any form of perspective in the European territory. These are all problems that don’t stop at borders and which we can only solve through international cooperation.”⁵⁹

⁵¹ “GroenLinks zet zich in voor vrede en rechtvaardigheid wereldwijd, zodat mensen in hun eigen land veilig kunnen zijn. Helaas is dat nu veel te vaak niet het geval. We strijden daarom voor een humaan en rechtvaardig asielen- en migratiebeleid.”(GroenLinks, 2021, p. 85)

⁵² “We staan altijd open voor de opvang van vluchtelingen en bekijken nuchter wat er nodig is voor onze eigen arbeidsmarkt. Haal migratie uit de taboesfeer en voer een humaan, nuchter en effectief.” (PvdA, 2021, p. 87)

⁵³ “Volt wil een menselijk vluchtelingenbeleid en een verstandig arbeidsmigratiebeleid voor de Europese Unie als geheel. Samenwerking en solidariteit zijn een randvoorwaarde om toekomstige migratiecrises in Europa te voorkomen. Hierbij dragen we onze Europese waarden uit door vluchtelingen en asielenzoekers menswaardig op te vangen en een toekomst te bieden.” (Volt, 2021, p. 19)

⁵⁴ “Mensen in vluchtelingenkampen hebben recht op een menswaardig bestaan. Dat betekent in ieder geval recht op veiligheid, voldoende eten en drinken, juridische bijstand, medische zorg en menswaardige huisvesting.” (PvdD, 2021, p. 101)

⁵⁵ “BIJ1 ziet deze crisis als een humanitaire crisis, die veroorzaakt wordt door falend Europees opvangbeleid als de Turkijedeal, met mensenrechtenschendingen als gevolg.” (Bij1, 2021, p. 80)

⁵⁶ “Vluchtelingen die niet veilig in de regio terecht kunnen, nemen we op in de EU. Alle lidstaten moeten hier een bijdrage aan leveren. We stoppen het weggijken van lidstaten, waar kwetsbare mensen de dupe van worden, zoals pijnlijk duidelijk wordt in de Griekse opvangkampen.”(SP, 2021, p. 26).

⁵⁷ “Wij willen een door heel Europa gedragen asielen- en migratiebeleid, dat mensenhandel, marteling en uitbuiting bestrijdt. Dit beleid heeft geweldloosheid, waardigheid en solidariteit als fundament.” (Bij1, 2021, p. 79)

⁵⁸ “Dat vluchtelingen en asielenzoekers eerlijk verdeeld moeten worden tussen landen binnen de Europese Unie. Lidstaten die weigeren vluchtelingen op te nemen worden gesanctioneerd.”(Denk, 2021, p. 58)

⁵⁹ “Naast de klimaatproblematiek en de schuivende machtsverhoudingen op het wereldtoneel, zien we op Europees grondgebied overvolle vluchtelingenkampen ontstaan die geen enkele vorm van perspectief bieden. Dit zijn stuk voor stuk problemen

Volt: “Volt wants a humane refugee policy and a sensible labor-migration policy for the European Union as a whole. Cooperation and solidarity are preconditions to prevent future migration crises. Through this, we promote European values through the humane reception of refugees and asylum seekers and to offer them a future.”⁶⁰

Bij1: “Bij1 sees this crisis as a humanitarian crisis, which is caused by failing European reception policy such as the Turkey deal, with human rights violations as a consequence.”⁶¹

D66: “For a transboundary approach to migration is a working European migration and asylum policy essential. The inhuman circumstances on the Greece island are the most tangible evidence of inadequate European asylum policy. This has to change. All member states, the Netherlands as well, have to take responsibility. A European migration- and asylum policy has to be effective, fair and humane.”⁶²

Volt: “For years the EU finds itself in a political crisis concerning the control of the refugee influx. Greece and Italy cannot provide a suitable solution, through which inhuman situations arise. Still, the other member states of the EU, including the Netherlands, shift the problems in a shameful way to Greece and Italy. The Dublin regulation, which attempted to make agreements about the distribution of refugees and the costs, has failed. We have to quickly make new and reinforceable agreements about the reception of refugees in the EU, and about the distribution of the accompanying costs.”⁶³

Bij1: “The Netherlands has to commit within Europe and internationally to make agreements about this, where solidarity and righteousness are leading.”⁶⁴

ChristenUnie: Migration policy is also about the soul of our nation, about who we are as a country. About how we can include people hospitable into our society and our constitution. About our responsibility to stand up for the heartbreaking fate of the many refugees in the world, who are not looking for work, but for security and protection. About the courage that is needed to cooperate better within Europe, to work to stop the injustice against refugees, in our continent, of all places.”⁶⁵

ChristenUnie: “The Netherlands shares with other countries in the world the responsibility for

die niet stoppen bij grenzen en die we alleen kunnen oplossen met internationale samenwerking.”(Volt, 2021, p. 10).

⁶⁰ “Volt wil een menselijk vluchtelingenbeleid en een verstandig arbeidsmigratiebeleid voor de Europese Unie als geheel. Samenwerking en solidariteit zijn een randvoorwaarde om toekomstige migratiecrises in Europa te voorkomen. Hierbij dragen we onze Europese waarden uit door vluchtelingen en asielzoekers menswaardig op te vangen en een toekomst te bieden.”(Volt, 2021, p. 19)

⁶¹ “BIJ1 ziet deze crisis als een humanitaire crisis, die veroorzaakt wordt door falend Europees opvangbeleid als de Turkijedeal, met mensenrechtenschendingen als gevolg.”(Bij1, 2021, p. 79)

⁶² “Voor een grensoverschrijdende aanpak van migratie is een werkend Europees migratie- en asielbeleid noodzakelijk. De onmenselijke toestanden op de Griekse eilanden zijn het meest tastbare bewijs van gebrekkig Europees asielbeleid. Dat moet anders. Alle lidstaten, ook Nederland, moeten verantwoordelijkheid nemen. Een Europees migratie- en asielbeleid moet effectief, eerlijk en menselijk zijn.”(D66, 2021, p. 194)

⁶³ “De EU verkeert al jaren in een politieke crisis met betrekking tot de beheersing van vluchtelingenstromen. Griekenland en Italië kunnen alleen geen passende oplossingen bieden, waardoor er mensenwaardige toestanden ontstaan. Toch blijven de andere lidstaten van de EU, inclusief Nederland, de problemen op een beschamende manier afschuiven op Griekenland en Italië. Het verdrag van Dublin, waarmee geprobeerd is afspraken te maken over de verdeling van vluchtelingen en van kosten, heeft gefaald. We moeten dus snel nieuwe en afdwingbare afspraken maken over de opname van vluchtelingen in de EU, en over de verdeling van de daarbij horende kosten.”(Volt, 2021, p. 19-20)

⁶⁴ “Ook zet Nederland zich binnen Europa en internationaal in om hier internationale plannen en afspraken over te maken, waarbij solidariteit en rechtvaardigheid leidend zijn.” (Bij1, 2021, p. 19)

⁶⁵ “Migratiebeleid gaat ook over de ziel van onze natie, over wie we zijn als land. Over hoe we mensen gastvrij in onze samenleving én onze rechtsstaat kunnen opnemen. Over onze verantwoordelijkheid om op te komen voor het hartverscheurende lot van de vele vluchtelingen in de wereld, die niet op zoek zijn naar werk, maar juist naar veiligheid en bescherming. Over de moed die nodig is om in Europa beter samen te werken om het onrecht jegens vluchtelingen – nota bene op ons eigen continent – te stoppen.”(ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 19)

their fate.”⁶⁶

ChristenUnie: “The Netherlands makes an effort to, within Europe, or if necessary with a group of like-minded member states, come to an agreement about migration.”⁶⁷

D66: “That’s why we continue our tradition of international cooperation and want that the Netherlands is going to play a pioneering role within Europe. Together we can defend our territory and our interests. We can take care of safe routes to give migrant workers a chance and strengthen our economy, while we offer a humane reception to refugees.”⁶⁸

GroenLinks: “The Netherlands puts maximum efforts in the European Union for a fair distribution of refugees amongst the member-states and takes the leading role together with other willing countries: we will not hide behind others.”⁶⁹

PVDA: There will be a European asylum system, based on solidarity and protection. The European policy should not be dictated by the few countries that obstruct it. As long as there is a European stalemate in the area of migration, we want to cooperate with a broad coalition of countries to offer refugees protection by redistributing them, with financial support from the common EU budget.”⁷⁰

Volt: “Frontex has to be improved; only transferring money to Italy or Greece when there is distress does not suffice. All member states have to contribute equally to this and Volt wants the Netherlands to give a good example.”⁷¹

THE UNEQUAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESOURCES

Bij1: “The reason to flee has often directly or indirectly to do with the history of exploitation and colonization through Western countries. Conflicts which are caused by these countries are still happening and broaden the gap between the richer and poorer countries. Above all, these Western countries contribute actively to these conflicts, amongst others through the arms trade. As a consequence, the living conditions deteriorate so far that there is sometimes no other choice than to leave. Because the Netherlands is part of the problem, it is our responsibility to be part of a solution. Through the climate crisis, more territories will become inhabitable, if not directly through floods, then indirectly through heightened food and water insecurity and conflicts which are caused by this. The Netherlands prepares for the reception of people who have to leave their houses because of climate change.”⁷²

⁶⁶ “Nederland deelt met andere landen in de wereld een verantwoordelijkheid voor hun lot.”(ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 19)

⁶⁷ “Nederland spant zich in om binnen Europa, of desnoods met een groep gelijkgestemde lidstaten, tot afspraken over migratie te komen.”(ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 20)

⁶⁸ “Daarom zetten we onze traditie van internationale samenwerking voort en willen we dat Nederland in Europa een voortrekkersrol speelt. Samen kunnen we ons grondgebied en onze belangen verdedigen. Kunnen we zorgen voor veilige routes om arbeidsmigranten een kans te geven en onze economie te versterken, terwijl we humane opvang bieden aan vluchtelingen.”(D66, 2021, p. 10)

⁶⁹ “Nederland spant zich in de Europese Unie maximaal in voor een eerlijke verdeling van vluchtelingen over de lidstaten en neemt het voortouw met andere welwillende landen: we verschuilen ons niet achter anderen.”(GroenLinks, 2021, p. 86)

⁷⁰ “Er komt een Europees asielsysteem, gebaseerd op solidariteit en bescherming. Het Europees beleid mag niet gedictieerd worden door de enkele landen die dwarsliggen. Zolang er een Europese impasse is op het terrein van migratie, willen wij met een brede coalitie van landen optrekken om vluchtelingen bescherming te bieden door hen te hervredelen, met financiële steun vanuit het gezamenlijke EU-budget.”(PvdA, 2021, p. 89).

⁷¹ “Frontex moet verbeterd worden; alleen geld overmaken naar Italië en Griekenland wanneer de nood hoog is, volstaat niet. Alle lidstaten moeten hier gelijkwaardig aan bijdragen en Volt wil dat Nederland het goede voorbeeld geeft.” (Volt, 2021, p. 18)

⁷² “De reden om te vluchten heeft vaak direct of indirect te maken met een geschiedenis van uitbuiting en kolonisatie door Westerse landen. Conflicten die veroorzaakt zijn door deze landen duren ook nu nog voort en vergroten de kloof tussen de rijkere en armere landen. Bovendien dragen deze Westerse landen op dit moment actief bij aan deze conflicten door middel van o.a. de wapenhandel. Als gevolg hiervan zijn de leefomstandigheden zodanig verslechterd, dat er soms geen andere keuze is dan te vertrekken. Omdat Nederland onderdeel is van het probleem, is het onze verantwoordelijkheid om onderdeel te zijn

DENK: “Ever since the declaration of ‘the War on Terror’ by the United States in 2001, there is an ongoing cycle of violence which we do not seem to be able to overcome. Military invasions in Afghanistan, the illegal invasion in Iraq by the US, supported by the Netherlands, and the ugly proxy-war in Syria where the Netherlands has supported a terroristic organization, have eventually resulted in millions of people dying and millions fleeing.”⁷³

DENK: “That the root causes of migration have to be dealt with. This means that African countries should not be robbed by Western great capitalists and Chinese state capitalists.”⁷⁴

PvdD: “Millions of people have fled their homes. The conflicts are often exaggerated through water- and food shortages as a consequence of climate change. We can make our world safer and more peaceful if we are willing to look at our own share in causing these problems.”⁷⁵

PvdD: “Through climate change areas become inhabitable, through loss of biodiversity the food security becomes threatened, through pollution the local habitat will be destroyed and through weaponized conflict a lot of people are unsafe. Not uncommon, there is a relation between these problems. It is often the root cause why people flee from their country.”⁷⁶

PvdD: “Western governments, amongst which the Netherlands, have to focus on eradicating the breeding ground of conflicts. De Partij van de Dieren want the Netherlands to stop with supporting combat missions. Western bombardments and military involvement in conflicts like in Afghanistan and Libya did not make the world safer. Instead, millions of people fled and the threat of terrorism is still present.”⁷⁷

SP: “In the last years, the Netherlands has participated in a permanent war, amongst others in Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria. Nowhere these wars have led to peace. Instead, they caused way more suffering and victims. Destruction of countries led to millions of refugees and strengthened the position of terroristic organizations.”⁷⁸

Volt: “Volt wants that the root causes of migration, such as poverty, hunger and lack of chances, is dealt with through international cooperation. Negative trade balances, local corruption and western import restrictions cause poorer countries not to develop. Besides, climate change is pressuring the countries around the equator. Volt want to work in European and Dutch relations in dealing with these problems, so poorer countries can also flourish and

van een oplossing. Door de klimaatcrisis zullen in de komende jaren meer gebieden onleefbaar worden, dan wel direct door overstromingen, dan wel indirect door verhoogde voedsel- en wateronzekerheid en daardoor veroorzaakte conflicten. Nederland bereidt zich voor op het ontvangen van mensen die door de klimaatcrisis hun thuis moeten verlaten.”(Bij1, 2021, p. 79)

⁷³ “Sinds het uitroepen van ‘The war on terror’ door de Verenigde Staten in 2001, is er sprake van een spiraal van geweld die niet doorbroken lijkt te worden. Militaire invasies in Afghanistan, de illegale invasie in Irak door de VS, gesteund door Nederland en de lelijke proxy-oorlog in Syrië waarbij Nederland een terroristische organisatie heeft gesteund, hebben er toe geleid dat uiteindelijk miljoenen mensen zijn omgekomen en miljoenen mensen zijn gevlucht.”(DENK, 2021, p. 53)

⁷⁴ “Dat de grondoorzaken van migratie aangepakt moeten worden. Dat betekent dat Afrikaanse landen niet leeggeroofd mogen worden door westerse grootkapitalisten en Chinese staatskapitalisten.”(DENK, 2021, p. 58)

⁷⁵ “Miljoenen mensen vluchten van huis en haard. De conflicten worden veelal verergerd door water- en voedseltekorten als gevolg van klimaatverandering. We kunnen onze wereld veiliger en vreedzamer maken als we bereid zijn te kijken naar ons eigen aandeel in het ontstaan van de problemen.” (PvdD, 2021, p. 7)

⁷⁶ “Door klimaatverandering worden gebieden onbewoonbaar, door biodiversiteitsverlies komt op sommige plekken de voedselzekerheid in gevaar, door milieuverontreiniging wordt de lokale leefomgeving vernietigd en door gewapende conflicten zijn veel mensen hun leven niet zeker. Niet zelden zit er een verband tussen deze problemen. Het zijn vaak de grondoorzaken waarom mensen hun thuisland ontvluchten.”(PvdD, 2021, p. 95)

⁷⁷ “Westerse regeringen, waaronder Nederland, moeten zich gaan richten op het wegnemen van de voedingsbodemp van conflicten. De Partij voor de Dieren wil dat Nederland stopt met het steunen van gevechtmissies. Westerse bombardementen en militaire betrokkenheid bij conflicten zoals in Afghanistan en Libië hebben de wereld niet veiliger gemaakt. In plaats daarvan sloegen miljoenen van mensen op de vlucht en is de dreiging van terrorisme nog altijd aanwezig.” (PvdD, 2021, p. 102.)

⁷⁸ “Nederland heeft de afgelopen jaren meegewerkt aan een permanente oorlog, in onder meer Afghanistan, Irak en Syrië. Nergens hebben deze oorlogen geleid tot vrede. Wel hebben ze veel leed veroorzaakt en veel slachtoffers gemaakt. Vernietiging van landen leidde tot miljoenen vluchtelingen en versterkte de positie van terroristische organisaties.”(SP, 2021, p. 27)

migration can decrease.”⁷⁹

INCLUSIVE NATIONALISM

Bij1: “By viewing people as equals instead of as a burden, the Netherlands can benefit from migration.”⁸⁰

ChristenUnie: “Migration policy is also about the soul of our nation, about who we are as a country. About how we can include people hospitable into our society and our constitution. About our responsibility to stand up for the heartbreaking fate of the many refugees in the world, who are not looking for work, but for security and protection. About the courage that is needed to cooperate better within Europe, to work to stop the injustice against refugees, in our continent, of all places.”⁸¹

ChristenUnie: “If we see human dignity as a core value of our own country, then we cannot allow ourselves to look away from it.”⁸²

D66: “That’s why we continue our tradition of international cooperation and want that the Netherlands in Europe is going to play a pioneering role. Together we can defend our territory and our interests. We can take care of safe routes to give migrant workers a chance and strengthen our economy, while we offer a humane reception to refugees.”⁸³

DENK: “The Netherlands is traditionally a land of immigration. It started with the big migration at the start of the middle ages. After that, it was the oppressed protestants, Jews and ‘dissidents’ from the South of the Netherlands, the South of Europe and Eastern Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries that came to the Netherlands. After that, migration flows came from Spain, Italy, former Yugoslavia and later from Turkey and Morocco. Migration is something of all times and brought much good to our country, such as the reconstruction after the Second World War. Therefore, DENK sees immigration as a strength and core value of our country.”⁸⁴

DENK: “Since the turn of the millennium, the theme of migration has been stigmatized. From the need for political gain, migration is negatively presented. DENK approaches migration and, with that diversity, as an opportunity and a challenge. The challenge to lead migration in the right direction will not be based on fear but based on strength. We are convinced that our

⁷⁹ “Volt wil dat de onderliggende oorzaken van migratie, zoals armoede, honger en gebrek aan kansen, door middel van internationale samenwerking worden aangepakt. Negatieve handelsbalansen, plaatselijke corruptie en westerse importbeperkingen zorgen ervoor dat armere landen zich niet kunnen ontwikkelen. Daarnaast legt klimaatverandering een steeds grotere druk op landen rond de evenaar. Volt wil in Europees en Nederlands verband werken aan het aanpakken van deze problemen, zodat ook armere landen tot bloei kunnen komen en de migratie kan afnemen.” (Volt, 2021, p. 20-21)

⁸⁰ “Door mensen als gelijkwaardig te zien in plaats van als last, kan Nederland juist baat hebben bij migratie.” (Bij1, 2021, p. 79)

⁸¹ “Migratiebeleid gaat ook over de ziel van onze natie, over wie we zijn als land. Over hoe we mensen gastvrij in onze samenleving én onze rechtsstaat kunnen opnemen. Over onze verantwoordelijkheid om op te komen voor het hartverscheurende lot van de vele vluchtelingen in de wereld, die niet op zoek zijn naar werk, maar juist naar veiligheid en bescherming. Over de moed die nodig is om in Europa beter samen te werken om het onrecht jegens vluchtelingen – nota bene op ons eigen continent – te stoppen.” (ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 19)

⁸² “Als we menselijke waardigheid als een van de kernwaarden van ons eigen land zien, dan kunnen we het ons niet veroorloven daarvan weg te kijken.” (ChristenUnie, 2021, p. 19)

⁸³ “Daarom zetten we onze traditie van internationale samenwerking voort en willen we dat Nederland in Europa een voortrekkersrol speelt. Samen kunnen we ons grondgebied en onze belangen verdedigen. Kunnen we zorgen voor veilige routes om arbeidsmigranten een kans te geven en onze economie te versterken, terwijl we humane opvang bieden aan vluchtelingen.” (D66, 2021, p. 10)

⁸⁴ “Nederland is van oudsher een immigratieland. Het begon met de grote volksverhuizing aan het begin van de Middeleeuwen. Daarna waren het de verdrukte protestanten, joden en andersDENKenden uit de Zuidelijke Nederlanden, Zuid-Europa en Oost-Europa die in de 16e en 17e eeuw naar Nederland kwamen. Later volgden de migratiestromen vanuit Spanje, Italië, voormalig Joegoslavië en nog later die uit Turkije en Marokko. Migratie is van alle tijden en het heeft ons land veel goeds gebracht, zoals de wederopbouw na de Tweede Wereldoorlog. DENK ziet immigratie dan ook als een kracht en als een kernwaarde van ons land.” (Denk, 2021, p. 57)

country can use the migration flow to make the Netherlands stronger.”⁸⁵

PvdA: “Migration is something from all times. It has made our country a society of people with diverse cultural backgrounds. The contemporary debate about migration is often a debate between two extremes: everyone is welcome or no one is. We are always open to the reception of refugees and look at what is necessary for our own labor market. Take migration out of the taboo zone and carry out a humane, sober and effective policy.”⁸⁶

SP: Newcomers have to learn Dutch as fast as possible and can integrate. In doing so, it is important that people must be helped to get a job quickly or in another way receive the possibility to contribute to our society.⁸⁷

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The Christen Unie utilizes Christian values to argue for the human dignity of refugees: “Looking after the needs of refugees are at the heart of Christian politics. We are all made and loved by the same God and the country in which we live, we received coincidentally. For this reason, we hold the principle belief that we have to provide a safe space to victims of disasters, wars, persecution and repression.”⁸⁸

Bij1 largely focuses on equality and non-discrimination and states: “By viewing people as equals instead of as a burden, the Netherlands can benefit from migration.”

The PvdA, with a focus on labor, argues: “We are always open to the reception of refugees and look what is necessary for our own labor market.”⁸⁹

The PvdD, which focuses primarily on animal rights and climate change: “Millions of people have fled their homes. The conflicts are often exaggerated through water- and food shortages as a consequence of climate change. We can make our world safer and more peaceful if we are willing to look at our own share in causing these problems.”⁹⁰

D66, a liberal party that focuses on international cooperation and a liberal economy states: “That’s why we continue our tradition of international cooperation and want that the Netherlands in Europe is going to play a pioneering role. Together we can defend our territory and our interests. We can take care of safe routes to give migrant workers a chance and strengthen our economy, while we offer a humane reception to refugees.”⁹¹

⁸⁵ “Vanaf de millenniumwisseling wordt het thema migratie echter geproblematiseerd. Uit de behoefte aan politiek gewin wordt migratie doelbewust negatief voorgesteld. DENK benadert migratie en de daarmee gepaard gaande diversiteit als een kans en een uitdaging. De uitdaging om migratie in goede banen te leiden voeren we niet op basis van angst, maar op basis van kracht. Wij zijn ervan overtuigd dat ons land de migratiestroom kan benutten om Nederland sterker te maken.”(Denk, 2021, p. 57)

⁸⁶ “Migratie is iets van alle tijden. Zij heeft van ons land een samenleving gemaakt van mensen met uiteenlopende culturele achtergronden. Het hedendaagse politieke debat over migratie is vaak een debat tussen twee uitersten: iedereen welkom of niemand welkom. We staan altijd open voor de opvang van vluchtelingen en bekijken nuchter wat er nodig is voor onze eigen arbeidsmarkt. Haal migratie uit de taboesfeer en voer een humaan, nuchter en effectief beleid.”(PvdA, 2021, p. 87)

⁸⁷ “Nieuwkomers moeten zo snel mogelijk Nederlands leren en kunnen integreren. Daarbij is belangrijk dat mensen snel aan het werk worden geholpen of op een andere wijze de mogelijkheid krijgen om een bijdrage te leveren aan onze samenleving.”(SP, 2021, p. 26)

⁸⁸ “Omzien naar de noden van vluchtelingen ligt na aan het hart van de christelijke politiek. We zijn allemaal gemaakt en geliefd door dezelfde God en het land waar we wonen hebben we ook maar gekregen. We hebben daarom de principiële overtuiging dat we een veilige plek moeten bieden aan slachtoffers van rampen, oorlog, vervolging en onderdrukking.”(ChristenUnie, 2020, p. 19)

⁸⁹ “We staan altijd open voor de opvang van vluchtelingen en bekijken nuchter wat er nodig is voor onze eigen arbeidsmarkt.”(PvdA, 2021, p. 87)

⁹⁰ “Miljoenen mensen vluchten van huis en haard. De conflicten worden veelal verergerd door water- en voedseltekorten als gevolg van klimaatverandering. We kunnen onze wereld veiliger en vreedzamer maken als we bereid zijn te kijken naar ons eigen aandeel in het ontstaan van de problemen.” (PvdD, 2021 p. 7)

⁹¹ “Daarom zetten we onze traditie van internationale samenwerking voort en willen we dat Nederland in Europa een voortrekkersrol speelt. Samen kunnen we ons grondgebied en onze belangen verdedigen. Kunnen we zorgen voor veilige routes

Volt, a pan-European party stressed: “Besides the problems of climate and the moving power relations on the world stage, we see the emergence of overcrowded refugee camps which do not offer any form of perspective in the European territory. These are all problems that don’t stop at borders and which we can only solve through international cooperation.”⁹²

SOCIAL MEDIA POSTS – DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES

COMPASSION; DIRE CIRCUMSTANCES AND REFERENCE TO CHILDREN

Volt: “For months there are more and more stories about the inhuman circumstances in refugee camps. Not only in Moria but also in camps such as the Bosnian Lipa, the situation is aggravating. Devastating fires are succeeding each other, children sleep on the street between the vermin, and our government refuses to intervene.”⁹³

GroenLinks: “After the fire in Moria, it was very clear that we needed to help these children. A political deal arose – bargaining with refugees. But these children are still sitting in the mud.”⁹⁴

Volt: “4 Months later and still this promise has not been fulfilled. The winter, rats that nibble on children’s toes, mud. There is nothing through which a bit of humanity or urgency pervades. A big SHAME!”⁹⁵

Volt: “Winter cold, rats and now also ground poisoned with lead. This goes beyond all humanity. How much misery do the #500 children have to deal with before they will be noticed by the @VVD @CDAvandaag @Christenunie and @D66? Read also our blog from our number 4, @KoekkoekMarieke, about this terrible situation: <https://voltnederland.org/blog/politieke-pleitbezorgers-gezocht>.”⁹⁶

GroenLinks: “There are still 4.000 unaccompanied children stuck in inhuman circumstances in refugee camps such as #Moria in Greece. The Netherlands has to take initiative to take in #500 children as fast as possible. This afternoon the parliament votes about the motion of @BramvanPijkGL.”⁹⁷

Bijl: “The second chamber has decided to abandon the children from refugee camps such as

om arbeidsmigranten een kans te geven en onze economie te versterken, terwijl we humane opvang bieden aan vluchtelingen.”(D66, 2021, p.10)

⁹² “Naast de klimaatproblematiek en de schuivende machtsverhoudingen op het wereldtoneel, zien we op Europees grondgebied overvolle vluchtelingenkampen ontstaan die geen enkele vorm van perspectief bieden. Dit zijn stuk voor stuk problemen die niet stoppen bij grenzen en die we alleen kunnen oplossen met internationale samenwerking.” (Volt, 2021, p. 10)

⁹³ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 14). “Er komen al maanden steeds vaker verhalen naar boven over mensonterende omstandigheden in vluchtelingenkampen. Niet alleen in Moria, maar ook in kampen als het Bosnische Lipa wordt de situatie steeds slechter. Vernietigende branden volgen elkaar snel op, kinderen slapen op straat tussen het ongedierte, en onze overheid weigert in te grijpen.” Retrieved from: https://www.instagram.com/p/CKCGbLqF_G3/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link

⁹⁴ Groenlinks [@Groenlinks]. (2021, January 18). “Na de brand in Moria was heel duidelijk dat we deze kinderen moesten helpen. Er kwam een “politieke deal” - handjeklap met vluchtelingen. Maar deze kinderen zitten nog steeds in de modder.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/jesseklaver/status/1351090296013139968>

⁹⁵ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 18). “4 Maanden verder en deze belofte is nog steeds niet uitgevoerd. De winter, ratten die aan tenen v kinderen knagen, modder. Niks maakt dat enige menselijkheid of urgentie doordringt. Een grote SCHANDE!” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/ngundogan77/status/1351108607966896131>

⁹⁶ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 24). “Winterkou, ratten en nu ook nog een met lood vergiftigde grond. Dit gaat alle menswaardigheid te buiten. Hoeveel ellende moeten o.a. de #500kinderen nog doorstaan om eindelijk door @VVD, @cdavandaag, @christenunie en @D66 opgemerkt te worden? Lees ook de blog van onze nummer 4, @KoekkoekMarieke, over deze verschrikkelijke situatie: <https://voltnederland.org/blog/politieke-pleitbezorgers-gezocht>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/VoltNederland/status/1353360884169637891>

⁹⁷ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, January 27). “Er zitten nog 4.000 alleenstaande kinderen onder erbarmelijke omstandigheden vast in vluchtelingenkampen zoals #Moria in Griekenland. Nederland moet nu het initiatief nemen en zo snel mogelijk #500kinderen opnemen. Vanmiddag stemt de Kamer over deze motie van @bramvanojikGL.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1354440802508922881>

#Moria again. Children are bitten by rats, tents are not waterproof and are regularly flooded. For how long will we look the other way? Take in minimally @500children right now!”⁹⁸

Bij1: “Why are Dutch children deported? This can’t be happening!! @needieandere Most Dutch people get their nationality automatically; most Dutch people get their Dutch citizenship at birth. Simply, because they are born as a Dutchman. Obtaining and maintaining your nationality is something most people are not thinking about. You are simply born a Dutchman and probably stay that for the rest of your life. You don’t have to worry about your residence and your nationality and in comparison to way too many others, this is a privilege. Also in comparison to Nune and Davit. Davit and Nune are respectively seven and nine years ago born in Groningen. Their parents fled from Armenia to the Netherlands not long before.”⁹⁹

Bij1: “BIJ1 supports this petition. Jacob and Tina have to be able to stay in the Netherlands. We also remember Lili and Howick. The current asylum policy is simply inhumane and will continue to cause these kinds of situations. Also, here applies: it is time for a systematic change.”¹⁰⁰

DENK: “Mayor, take action! Sofia and Najoua are from Amsterdam and have to stay here. Period. Our party leader @NumanYilmaz06 will therefore urge the mayor to request attention for Sofia and Najoua at the central government!”¹⁰¹

GroenLinks: “Rightfully so, people are very worried about Tina and Jacob. Together with the SP, PvdA and CU we have asked the following questions <image>.”¹⁰²

ChristenUnie: “Together with several colleague-members of parliament we have asked questions to the state secretary about both the situation of Tina and Jacob, as the situation of Sofia and Najoua. Young people who are living in insecurity and who risk deportation. I hope for a quick solution.”¹⁰³

GroenLinks: “There is insufficient room for customization in the asylum policy, experts say. Through this people are getting stuck in the system and poignant situations arise, such as with

⁹⁸ Bij1 [@PolitiekBIJ1]. (2021, February 2). “De Tweede Kamer heeft vandaag weer besloten om kinderen uit vluchtelingen-kampen als #Moria in de steek te laten. Kinderen worden gebeten door ratten, tenten zijn niet waterdicht en stromen regelmatig vol. Hoe lang kijken we nog weg? Haal nú minimaal #500kinderen hier naartoe!” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/Politiek-BIJ1/status/1356670741245222912>

⁹⁹ Bij1 [@PolitiekBIJ1]. (2021, February 8). “Hoezo worden Nederlandse kinderen Nederland uitgezet? Dat kán niet!! @needieandere De meeste Nederlanders verkrijgen het Nederlanderschap van rechtswege; de meeste Nederlanders krijgen hun Nederlanderschap bij de geboorte. Simpelweg, omdat ze geboren worden als Nederlander. Het verkrijgen en behouden van je nationaliteit, is iets waar de meeste mensen niet over nadenken. Je bent nou eenmaal als Nederlander geboren en blijft dat waarschijnlijk ook voor de rest van je leven. Je niet druk hoeven te maken over je verblijf en over je nationaliteit is ten opzichte van veel te veel mensen een voorrecht. Zo ook ten opzichte van Nune en Davit. Davit en Nune zijn respectievelijk zeven en negen jaar geleden geboren in Groningen. Hun ouders waren niet lang daarvoor gevlucht vanuit Armenië naar Nederland.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/SylvanaBIJ1/status/1358776585344737280>

¹⁰⁰ Bij1 [@PolitiekBIJ1]. (2021, April 5). “BIJ1 ondersteunt deze petitie. Jacob en Tina moeten in Nederland kunnen blijven. We herinneren ons ook Lili en Howick nog. Het huidige asielbeleid is simpelweg inhumaan en zal dit soort situaties blijven veroorzaken. Ook hier geldt dus: het is tijd voor systeemverandering.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/PolitiekBIJ1/status/1379162040808448002>

¹⁰¹ DENK [@DenkNL]. (2021, April 5). “Burgemeester, kom in actie! Sofia en Najoua zijn Amsterdammers en moeten hier blijven. Punt. Onze fractievoorzitter @NumanYilmaz06 gaat daarom aanstaande donderdag de burgemeester verzoeken om aandacht te vragen voor Sofia en Najoua bij het Rijk!” Retrieved from https://twitter.com/DENK_Amsterdam/status/1379028060683563009

¹⁰² GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, April 6). “Terecht maken mensen zich grote zorgen om Tina en Jacob. Met SP, PvdA en CU samen deze vragen gesteld <afbeelding>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/CorinneEllemeet/status/1379410924709232640>

¹⁰³ ChristenUnie [@christenunie]. (2021, April 8). “Samen met een aantal collega-Kamerleden vragen gesteld aan de staatssecretaris over zowel de situatie van Tina en Jacob, als die van Sofia en Najoua. Jonge mensen die al lang in onzekerheid zitten en voor wie uitzetting dreigt. Ik hoop op een snelle oplossing.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/DonCeder/status/1380206163904585729>

Sofia and Najoua Sabbar. @CorinneEllemeet summons the cabinet today: pay attention to customization.”¹⁰⁴

GroenLinks: “That’s it @ChrisvanDamCDA! And now, let’s keep going. @cdavandaag we count next Tuesday on your support to give the 4000 unaccompanied children who are stuck at the Greek island a home within the EU, of which 500 in the Netherlands #fixthemoriadeal #Moria”¹⁰⁵

Volt: “...On the 10th of December Laurens walked 500 rounds around the parliament during the Human Rights Walk to let the government know that the 500 minors from the Greek camps are welcomed with open arms.”¹⁰⁶

GroenLinks: “January 2021: only 2 of the promised 50 unaccompanied children are taken from Greece by the Netherlands. The situation on Lesbos and other islands is still inhumane. Tents are blown away and there is probably poisonous lead in the ground. #SOSMoria @Evacuate-now.”¹⁰⁷

GroenLinks: “In a bit, the second chamber will vote about our proposal to receive 500 children. ChristenUnie and D66 are no longer bound to the VVD, but for a majority @SGPnieuws or @CDAvandaag are necessary too. Will they show their humanity? End of threat @sosMoria #evacuatenu.”¹⁰⁸

GroenLinks: “Summer 2020: 170 municipalities indicate that they want and can take in 500 children. 100.000 people signed a petition which supports this. GroenLinks requests the state secretary to make a plan for this with the municipalities. This she refuses as well. @SOSMoriaa #evacuatenu.”¹⁰⁹

ChristenUnie: “At the end of last week hundred vulnerable refugees came from Greece to the Netherlands. That was the result of the agreements of last autumn, after the destructive fire on Lesbos, that were made within the collation. These children (57, among which thirty were younger than 4), fathers and mothers, can look forward again.”¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁴ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, April 4). “Er is onvoldoende ruimte voor maatwerk in het asielbeleid, zeggen experts. Hierdoor komen mensen vast te zitten in het systeem en ontstaan er schrijnende situaties, zoals bij Sofia en Najoua Sabbar. @CorinneEllemeet roept het kabinet vandaag op: heb oog voor maatwerk.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1382304032195239936>

¹⁰⁵ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, January 28). “Zo is het @ChrisvanDamCDA! En nu doorpakken. @cdavandaag we rekenen komende dinsdag op jullie steun om de overgebleven 4000 alleenstaande kinderen die vastzitten op de Griekse eilanden een thuis te geven in de EU, waarvan 500 in Nederland. #fixdemoriadeal #Moria.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1354787204468453380>

¹⁰⁶ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 22). “... Op 10 december liep Laurens tijdens de Human Rights Walk 500 rondjes rond het Binnenhof om de regering te laten weten dat de 500 minderjarigen uit de Griekse kampen hier met open armen worden ontvangen.” Retrieved from https://www.instagram.com/p/CKCGbLqF_G3/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link / <https://www.facebook.com/VoltNederland/videos/161736672134376/> / <https://twitter.com/VoltNederland/status/1352576756797083648/>

¹⁰⁷ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, Februari 2). “Januari 2021: nog maar 2 van de beloofde 50 alleenstaande kinderen zijn door Nederland uit Griekenland gehaald. De situatie op Lesbos en andere eilanden is nog steeds onmenselijk. Tenten waaien weg en er zit waarschijnlijk giftig lood in de grond. #SOSMoria #evacueernu.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1356593686319136768>

¹⁰⁸ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, Februari 2). “Zometeen stemt de Tweede Kamer over ons voorstel om 500 kinderen op te vangen. ChristenUnie en D66 zijn niet langer gebonden aan de VVD, maar voor een meerderheid zijn ook @SGPnieuws of @cdavandaag nodig. Laten zij hun menselijke gezicht zien? / einde draad #SOSMoria #evacueernu.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1356593910668214280>

¹⁰⁹ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, Februari 2). “Zomer 2020: 170 gemeenten geven aan dat ze 500 kinderen willen en kunnen opnemen. 100.000 mensen tekenen een petitie die dit ondersteunt. GroenLinks roept de staatssecretaris op om met de gemeenten hier een plan voor te maken. Ook dit weigert ze. #SOSMoria #evacueernu.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1356593017654808578>

¹¹⁰ ChristenUnie [ChristenUnie]. (2021, March 16). “Eind vorige week kwamen honderd kwetsbare vluchtelingen uit Griekenland naar Nederland. Dat was het resultaat van de afspraken die afgelopen najaar, na de vernietigende brand op Lesbos, binnen

COUNTER-FRAMING

GroenLinks: “Wilders is claiming once again that the housing shortage is caused by migration. Fact check: that is not true. The housing crisis needs systemic change: rent control, the building of affordable houses and a minister of public housing. #DebatZuiden #MeerGroenLinks <https://www.oneworld.nl/lezen/discriminatie/sociaal-onrecht/dat-jij-geen-woning-kan-vinden-is-niet-de-schuld-van-migranten-maar-van-woonbeleid/>.”¹¹¹

PvdA: “...Also your everlasting claim that status holders are stealing houses again was mentioned. Easy to blame them for the fact that under your leadership too little was build. While slumlords could act without restrictions. With the support of the whole coalition.”¹¹²

Volt: “What do you mean, no support? Our European team under the leadership of @d_boeselager has done research into which European municipalities want to commit to a humane reception of refugees. So it is possible, also in the Netherlands. Write to your municipality and asked if they also want to vouch for this. Many cities & communes across Europe would welcome asylum seekers from our borders We put them all on one map  <http://Europewelcomes.org>. If you want to do something about a more humane Europe, start by writing to your mayor!”¹¹³

GroenLinks: “But: in return, the VVD wants to reduce the number of spots in the Netherland in another refugee program by 100. Extremely cynical politics #SOSMoria #evacuatenuow.”¹¹⁴


D66: “It is such a typical VDD position. Support for the reception of refugees does not start with people. It starts with the political courage to say: people who are fleeing from war and violence are getting a safe home here. That is leadership. -@Robjetten #WNLopZonda.”¹¹⁵

SP: “What the VVD is doing is scapegoat politics and borders with this on the PVV: you cause a housing crisis, you cut back on mental healthcare and then state that we can’t handle more problems. The VVD is destroying it, not the refugee. - @RenskeLeijten at

de coalitie waren gemaakt. Deze kinderen (57, waaronder dertig jonger dan 4 jaar), vaders en moeders kunnen weer vooruitkijken.” Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/ChristenUnie/posts/3669551433131598>

¹¹¹ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, March 13). “Wilders roept weer eens dat de woningnood door migratie komt. Fact check: dat is niet waar. De wooncrisis heeft een systeemverandering nodig: een huurplafond, bouw van betaalbare woningen en een minister van Volkshuisvesting. #DebatZuiden #MeerGroenLinks <https://www.oneworld.nl/lezen/discriminatie/sociaal-onrecht/dat-jij-geen-woning-kan-vinden-is-niet-de-schuld-van-migranten-maar-van-woonbeleid/>.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1370797833037692942>

¹¹² PvdA [@PvdA]. (2021, March 12). “Ook je eeuwige bewering dat statushouders woningen inpikken kwam weer voorbij. Makkelijk om hen de schuld te geven van het feit dat er onder jouw leiding te weinig gebouwd is. En dat terwijl huisjesmelkers ruim baan kregen. Met steun van je h le coalitie.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/PloumenLilianne/status/1370336585212911616>

¹¹³ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, April 26). “Hoezo geen draagvlak? Ons Europees team onder leiding van @d_boeselager heeft onderzocht welke Europese gemeentes zich willen inzetten voor humane opvang van asielzoekers. Het kan dus wel, ook in NL. Meehelpen? Schrijf naar jouw gemeente en vraag of zij ook garant wil staan. Many cities & communes across Europe would welcome asylum seekers from our borders. We put them all on one map  <http://Europewelcomes.org>. If you want to do something about a more humane Europe, start by writing to your mayor!” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/KoekkoekMarieke/status/1386646173096808454>

¹¹⁴ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, February 2). “Maar: daarvoor moet van de VVD wel het aantal door Nederland aangeboden plekken in een ander vluchtelingenprogramma met 100 worden verminderd. Extreem cynische politiek. #SOSMoria #evacueernu.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1356593530492305408>

¹¹⁵ D66 [@D66]. (2021, February 28). “Het is zo’n typische VVD-stelling. Draagvlak voor de opvang van vluchtelingen begint niet bij mensen. Dat begint bij de politieke moed om te zeggen: mensen die vluchten voor oorlog en geweld krijgen hier een veilig thuis. Dat is leiderschap.-@RobJetten #WNLopZondag.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/D66/status/1365955478405136385>

@WNLOpZondag”¹¹⁶

D66: “Two conservative politicians debate about migration again. About how bad the whole situation is. Together they constitute a right-wing majority.”¹¹⁷

DENK: “The @VVD is discriminating and demonizing refugees. We from @DENKNL are in favor of a generous and humane reception in the Netherlands. #DENKAnders #VoteDENK #VoteStephan.”¹¹⁸

DENK: “The VVD acts as if it is a spectator of the IND-drama. Some asylum seekers are waiting for 20 years or longer on a residence permit. Tunaha Kuzu points out just before submitting his motions that this all emerged under the VVD regime. And that it has to change.”¹¹⁹

Bij1: “It’s interesting how damaging the rule of law, deporting Muslims and the `violation of human rights is put between centrum-left and centrum-right. SP and PvdD would be on the outer left. This, while even the most moderate trade union demands are going too far and they want to keep refugees out of Europe. Where would @PolitiekBij1 (that very typically is not taken into account) fit in this diagram? This is the normalization of right-wing extremism. A thread.”¹²⁰

Volt: “The government is consciously leaving people in this hell. Action is now necessary. Moria exists because of political unwillingness. We have seen it at the child benefits scandal: real injustice is only solved if someone stands up and continuously fights against this political unwillingness.”¹²¹

Bij1: “The second chamber has decided to abandon the children from refugee camps such as #Moria again. Children are bitten by rats, tents are not waterproof and are regularly flooded. For how long will we look the other way? Take in minimally @500children right now!”¹²²

GroenLinks: “All members of the parliament of CDA and VVD vote again against our motion which requests to host children from refugee camps in Greece in the Netherlands. But we won’t

¹¹⁶ SP [@SPnl]. (2021, February 29). “Wat de VVD doet is zondebokpolitiek en schuurt daarmee tegen de PVV aan: je zorgt voor een wooncrisis, je bezuinigt de geestelijke gezondheidszorg kapot en zegt dan er kunnen geen problemen bij. De VVD maakt het kapot, niet de vluchteling.’ - @RenskeLeijten bij @WNLOpZondag.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/SPnl/status/1365957590971252736>

¹¹⁷ D66 [@D66] (2021, March 15). “Twee conservatieve politici debatteren weer over migratie. Over hoe erg het allemaal wel niet is. Samen vormen zij een rechtse meerderheid.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/D66/status/1371520281966211073>

¹¹⁸ DENK [@DenkNL]. (2021, March 4). “De @VVD discrimineert en demoniseert vluchtelingen. Wij van @DENKNL staan voor ruimhartige en menselijke opvang in Nederland. #DENKanders #StemDENK #StemStephan.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/StephanvBaarle/status/1367457714545303558>

¹¹⁹ DENK [@DenkNL]. (2021, April 14). “De VVD doet alsof het toeschouwer is van het IND-drama. Sommige asielzoekers wachten al 20 jaar of langer op een verblijfsvergunning. Tunahan Kuzu wijst hen vlak voor het indienen van zijn moties fijntjes erop dat dit allemaal onder VVD-bewind is ontstaan. En dat het nu anders moet.” Retrieved from; <https://twitter.com/DENKNL/status/138240088169938944>

¹²⁰ Bij1 [@PolitiekBIJ1] (2021, February 17). “Bijzonder hoe het aantasten van de rechtsstaat, het deporteren van moslims en het schenden van mensenrechten hier tussen ‘centrum-links’ en ‘centrum-rechts’ wordt geplaatst. 2/ SP en PvdD zouden op uiterst links zitten. Dat, terwijl de eerste zelfs gematigde vakbondseisen te ver vindt gaan en zij vluchtelingen buiten Europa wil houden. Waar zou @PolitiekBIJ1 (die heel typisch niet is meegenomen) dan in dit schema passen? Dit is de normalisatie van rechtsextremisme. Een draadje.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/RebekkaTimmer/status/1361968120466968576>

¹²¹ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, Januari 24). “De regering laat mensen bewust in deze hel zitten. Actie is nu nodig. Moria bestaat dankzij politieke onwil. We hebben het gezien bij de toeslagenaffaire: echt onrecht wordt pas opgelost als iemand opstaat en continu tegen politieke onwil vecht.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/VoltNederland/status/1353310218256588801>

¹²² Bij1 [@PolitiekBIJ1]. (2021, February 2). “De Tweede Kamer heeft vandaag weer besloten om kinderen uit vluchtelingenkampen als #Moria in de steek te laten. Kinderen worden gebeten door ratten, tenten zijn niet waterdicht en stromen regelmatig vol. Hoe lang kijken we nog weg? Haal nú minimaal #500kinderen hier naartoe!” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/PolitiekBIJ1/status/1356670741245222912>

give up. Because this is about helping people in need and we have to find support for that.”¹²³

GroenLinks: “We can do something about this. But the demissionary cabinet is blocking the necessary solidarity. Tuesday the second chamber will hold a roll call vote about my motion to take in 500 unaccompanied minor refugees. Exciting! <https://volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/het-nieuwe-kamp-moria-is-nog-slechter-dan-het-oude-we-zitten-hier-te-wachten-tot-we-doodgaan~be48a913/>”¹²⁴

LEGITIMACY OF INFORMATION

DENK: “Never as long as DENK exists. We will always fight against the hate-sowing, xenophobic and fascistic ideology of Wilders <https://nos.nl/artikel/2363627-pvv-wil-ministerie-voor-de-islamisering-en-remigratie?fbclid=IwAR21EPe1wt9BFFLapLLiRVTf8OhU1CMAYvYxneKasMfzCUstKbUZfd5xQs.>”¹²⁵

Volt: “There are a lot of themes such as climate, safety and migration which require trans-boundary solutions. But in the second chamber, there is little discussed about this. And if it is about the topic of Europe, it is mostly negative, says Dassen. A lot of young people see that it is time for a European voice. https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2021/02/05/nieuwe-partijen-voor-een-europees-geluid-leefbaar-platteland-of-een-gezond-leven-a4030707?fbclid=IwAR1F8y5_1cB4RG006NWwOVX7BJjIpK3YcQ_EvRyGFq8azacc6rNvMZXJekY.#ToekomstMadeInEurope#ikstemvolt#TK2021#GeneratieVolt.”¹²⁶

GroenLinks: “Children who have fled and arrived in the Netherlands disappear from the asylum seeker centra. My request to the state secretary: We have to offer these children more perspective in our country to prevent them from falling into the arms of traffickers <https://www.trouw.nl/buitenland/duizenden-asielkinderen-vermist-in-europa~b55c2b76f/>.”¹²⁷

GroenLinks: “The immigration service gives poignant cases barely a residence permit. That’s why it is so important that the next cabinet brings back the state secretary’s discretionary power. This week we vote for a motion to prepare for this

¹²³ GroenLinks [@groenlinks] (2021, February 2). “Alle Kamerleden van CDA en VVD stemmen opnieuw tegen onze motie die vraagt om kinderen uit vluchtelingenkampen in Griekenland onderdak te bieden in Nederland. Maar we geven niet op. Want dit gaat over het helpen van mensen in nood en daar moeten we steun voor vinden.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/jesseklaver/status/1356623550900293633>

¹²⁴ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, February 2). “We kunnen hier iets aan doen. Maar het demissionaire kabinet blokkeert noodzakelijke solidariteit. Dinsdag stemt de Tweede Kamer (hoofdelijk) over mijn motie om 500 alleenstaande minderjarige vluchtelingen op te nemen. Spannend! <https://volkskrant.nl/nieuws-achtergrond/het-nieuwe-kamp-moria-is-nog-slechter-dan-het-oude-we-zitten-hier-te-wachten-tot-we-doodgaan~be48a913/>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1356544759045763072>

¹²⁵ DENK [DENK]. (2021, Januari 9). “Nooit zolang DENK bestaat. 🇳🇱 Wij zullen altijd strijden tegen de haatzaaiende, xenofobe en facistische ideologie van Wilders. <https://nos.nl/artikel/2363627-pvv-wil-ministerie-voor-de-islamisering-en-remigratie?fbclid=IwAR21EPe1wt9BFFLapLLiRVTf8OhU1CMAYvYxneKasMfzCUstKbUZfd5xQs.>” Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/DenkNL/posts/2870595999891841>

¹²⁶ Volt [Volt Nederland]. (2021, February 6). “Er zijn heel veel thema’s, zoals klimaat, veiligheid en migratie, die vragen om grensoverschrijdende oplossingen. Maar in de Tweede Kamer wordt daar amper over gesproken. En als het wel over Europa gaat, is dat meestal negatief, zegt Dassen. Veel jonge mensen zien dat het hoog tijd is voor een Europees geluid.” https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2021/02/05/nieuwe-partijen-voor-een-europees-geluid-leefbaar-platteland-of-een-gezond-leven-a4030707?fbclid=IwAR1F8y5_1cB4RG006NWwOVX7BJjIpK3YcQ_EvRyGFq8azacc6rNvMZXJekY.#ToekomstMadeInEurope#ikstemvolt#TK2021#GeneratieVolt.” Retrieved from: <https://www.facebook.com/VoltNederland/posts/754676195156942>

¹²⁷ Groenlinks [groenlinks]. (2021, April 20). “Kinderen die zijn gevlucht en in Nederland terecht komen verdwijnen uit de azc’s. Mijn oproep aan de staatssecretaris: We moeten deze kinderen meer perspectief bieden in ons land om te voorkomen dat ze zich in de armen laten drijven van smokkelaars <https://www.trouw.nl/buitenland/duizenden-asielkinderen-vermist-in-europa~b55c2b76f/>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/CorinneEllemeet/status/1384498270303576071>

<https://t.co/WaXPylz3Dd?amp=1>.¹²⁸

GroenLinks: Wilders is claiming once again that the housing shortage is caused by migration. Fact check: that is not true. The housing crisis needs systemic change: rent control, the building of affordable houses and a minister of public housing. #DebatZuiden #MeerGroenLinks <https://www.oneworld.nl/lezen/discriminatie/sociaal-onrecht/dat-jij-geen-woning-kan-vinden-is-niet-de-schuld-van-migranten-maar-van-woonbeleid/>.¹²⁹

D66: “Just now I received the rapport ‘Unheard; injustice in alien law’ in the second chamber. I will carefully examine it. The government has to stand next to the people, instead of opposing them.”¹³⁰

D66: “I was raised in a dictatorship. For me it is very important that people can live in freedom, living their life as they want. That is what appeals to me in @D66. The liberalism, but also the social side <https://nos.nl/artikel/2370565-deze-oud-vluchtelingen-popelen-om-tweede-kamerlid-te-wordsen.html> #teamD66.”¹³¹

D66: “Together with @GroothuizenD66 we asked for a reaction from state secretary @ankiebroekers, how did this happen and especially what does this mean for their safety?! ‘Rejected gay couple on the cover of a refugee magazine; It’s an enormous blunder’ <https://nos.nl/artikel/2362887-uitgeprocedeerd-homostel-op-cover-vluchtelingenblad-het-is-een-enorme-blunder>.”¹³²

Bij1: “Childs benefits scandal 2.0, but then about people who have a temporary residence permit. The system is not there to help people. There is more and more evidence about what we know already. Tomorrow I will ask oral questions to the state secretary.” <https://t.co/vW2t0LbnZT?amp=1>¹³³

Bij1: Why are two Dutch children deported. This can’t be happening!! RT Threat @needieandere: Davit and Nune were born respectively seven and nine years ago in Groningen. Their parents fled not long before that from Armenia to the Netherlands. The fully Dutch children, who have nothing to do with Armenia, are about to be deported... Only together we can try to save these children from their repulsive fate sikkom.nl.¹³⁴

¹²⁸ Groenlinks [groenlinks]. [2021, April 19]. “IND geeft ‘schrijnende gevallen’ nauwelijks nog verblijfsvergunningen. Daarom zo belangrijk dat een volgend kabinet de discretionaire bevoegdheid van de staatssecretaris terugbrengt. Deze week stemmen we over mijn motie alles daarvoor klaar te maken. <https://t.co/WaXPylz3Dd?amp=1>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/CorinneEllemeet/status/1384048769310760962>

¹²⁹ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, March 13). “Wilders roept weer eens dat de woningnood door migratie komt. Fact check: dat is niet waar. De wooncrisis heeft een systeemverandering nodig: een huurplafond, bouw van betaalbare woningen en een minister van Volkshuisvesting. #DebatZuiden #MeerGroenLinks <https://www.oneworld.nl/lezen/discriminatie/sociaal-onrecht/dat-jij-geen-woning-kan-vinden-is-niet-de-schuld-van-migranten-maar-van-woonbeleid/>.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/groenlinks/status/1370797833037692942>

¹³⁰ D66 [@D66nl]. (2021, April 12). “Zojuist het rapport ‘Ongehoord onrecht in het vreemdelingenrecht’ in ontvangst genomen in de Tweede Kamer. Ik ga het zorgvuldig bestuderen. De overheid moet naast mensen staan, in plaats van tegenover mensen.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/kamerlidmeets/status/1381524961072926722>

¹³¹ D66 [@D66nl]. (2021, February 27). “Ik ben opgegroeid in een dictatuur. Voor mij is het heel belangrijk dat mensen in vrijheid kunnen leven, je leven inrichten zoals je zelf wilt. Dat spreekt me aan in @D66. Het liberalisme, maar ook de sociale kant <https://nos.nl/artikel/2370565-deze-oud-vluchtelingen-popelen-om-tweede-kamerlid-te-wordsen.html> #teamD66.” Retrieved from: https://twitter.com/Hind_D66/status/1365742417899585540

¹³² D66 [@D66NL]. (2021, January 3). “Samen met @GroothuizenD66 reactie gevraagd aan staatssecretaris @ankiebroekers, hoe dit heeft kunnen gebeuren en vooral wat dit betekent voor hun veiligheid?! ‘Uitgeprocedeerd homostel op cover vluchtelingenblad: ‘Het is een enorme blunder’” <https://nos.nl/artikel/2362887-uitgeprocedeerd-homostel-op-cover-vluchtelingenblad-het-is-een-enorme-blunder> Retrieved from: https://twitter.com/Vera_Bergkamp/status/1345758767305138184

¹³³ Bij1 [@PolitiekBIJ1]. (2021, April 12). “Toeslagenaffaire 2.0, maar dan met wie een tijdelijke verblijfsstatus heeft. Het systeem is er niet op uit om mensen te helpen. Er komt steeds meer bewijs van wat we allang weten. Morgen stel ik graag mondelinge vragen aan de staatssecretaris. <https://t.co/vW2t0LbnZT?amp=1>.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/Sylvanaa-BIJ1/status/1381515499742302208>

¹³⁴ Bij1 [PolitiekBij1]. (2021, February 8). “Hoezo worden Nederlandse kinderen Nederland uitgezet? Dat kán niet!! RT

Volt: “In the last three years there are in total 18.292 unaccompanied refugee minors registered as missing after they arrived in Europe. These children are at great risk to become a victim of human trafficking and/or sexual violence <https://trouw.nl/cs-b55c2b76f>.”¹³⁵

Volt: “I think this is so fucking painful. <https://nrc.nl/nieuws/2021/01/17/belofte-na-brand-moria-niet-ingelost-a4027974>.”¹³⁶

FIRM LANGUAGE

Bij1: “The scandalous Moria deal was already made at the expense of human lives, but even from the bare minimum nothing happens. People who are fleeing are sitting in the rain and the cold. Without any perspective. This can and should not happen. Receive them now! Get them here! #speakupconfesscolor.”¹³⁷

Volt: “The European Union finds itself in a civilization crisis and the refugee camp Moria is a symbol of this crisis – Marieke.”¹³⁸

GroenLinks: “The distrust of the government in people is big. We already saw this at the child benefits scandal: where victims – especially with a migration background – are affected by a rigid mindset of the government and institutional racism, with terrible suffering as a consequence. Today, lawyers present a rapport that shows that migrants and asylum seekers receive similar treatment. We have to move from distrust to trust, with attention to every human being. Our member of parliament @corinneellemeet has requested a debate regarding this.”¹³⁹

DENK: “State secretary Knol is confused and does not know what to do with poignant cases of asylum seekers who are drowning in their asylum process. @tunahankuzunl confronts. This has to become better and more humane!”¹⁴⁰

Volt: “I think this is so fucking painful. <https://nrc.nl/nieuws/2021/01/17/belofte-na-brand->

thread @needieandere: Davit en Nune zijn respectievelijk zeven en negen jaar geleden geboren in Groningen. Hun ouders waren niet lang daarvoor gevlucht vanuit Armenië naar Nederland. De volledig Nederlandse kinderen, die niks hebben met Armenië, dreigen te worden uitgezet.....Alleen samen kunnen wij een poging wagen om deze kinderen te redden van het weezinwekkende lot dat deze kinderen te wachten staat. sikkom.nl.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/SylvanaBIJ1/status/1358776585344737280>

¹³⁵ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, Arpil 19). “De afgelopen drie jaar zijn er in totaal 18.292 alleenreizende minderjarige vreemdelingen als vermist geregistreerd na aankomst in Europa. Deze kinderen lopen een groot risico om slachtoffer te worden van mensenhandel en/of seksueel geweld. <https://trouw.nl/cs-b55c2b76f>.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/KoekkoekMarieke/status/1384140105737072646>

¹³⁶ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 18). “Ik vind dit zo fucking pijnlijk. <https://nrc.nl/nieuws/2021/01/17/belofte-na-brand-moria-niet-ingelost-a4027974>.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/debroervanroos/status/1351107532970975234>

¹³⁷ Bij1 [PolitiekBIJ1]. (2021, January 1). “De schandalige Moriadeal ging al over de ruggen van mensenlevens, maar zelfs van het absolute minimum komt niets terecht. Mensen op de vlucht zitten in de regen en de kou. Zonder enig perspectief. Dit kan en mag niet. Nu opvangen! Haal ze hierheen! #SpreekJeUitBekenKleur.” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/Politiek-BIJ1/status/1351226224526426116>

¹³⁸ Volt [VoltNederland]. (2021, March 13). “De Europese Unie verkeert in een beschavingscrisis en het vluchtelingenkamp Moria is van die crisis het symbool geworden. – Marieke.” Retrieved from <https://www.facebook.com/VoltNederland/posts/774250133199548>

¹³⁹ GroenLinks [@groenlinks]. (2021, April 12). “Het wantrouwen van de overheid in mensen is groot. Dat zagen we al in het toeslagenschandaal: waarbij slachtoffers - voornamelijk met een migratieachtergrond - de dupe werden van een rigide opstelling vanuit de overheid en institutioneel racisme, met verschrikkelijk leed tot gevolg. Vandaag presenteren advocaten een rapport waaruit blijkt dat migranten en asielzoekers een vergelijkbare behandeling krijgen. We moeten van wantrouwen naar vertrouwen, met oog voor ieder mens. Ons Kamerlid @corinneellemeet heeft hierover een debat aangevraagd.” Retrieved from https://www.instagram.com/p/CNkI-DIJ0GV/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link

¹⁴⁰ DENK [@DenkNL]. (2021, April 14) “Staatssecretaris Knol in de war en weet geen raad met schrijnende gevallen onder asielzoekers die verdrinken in hun IND-proces. @tunahankuzunl confronteert. Dit moet beter en humaner!” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/DENKNL/status/1382290852282822657>

[moria-niet-ingelost-a4027974.](#)”¹⁴¹

Volt: “For months there are more and more stories about the inhuman circumstances in refugee camps. Not only in Moria but also in camps such as the Bosnian Lipa, the situation is becoming worse. Devastating fires are succeeding each other, children sleep on the street between the vermin, and our government refuses to intervene.”¹⁴²

DENK: “Disgusting from the @VVD. It is unconstitutional to treat Mosques differently. There is no definition of ‘problematic behavior’ and an ‘unfree country’. @bentebecker was begging to receive compliments from the PVV because she lets children in Moria suffocate. Head of PVV chores.”¹⁴³

PvdA: “Dear @MarkRutte. Lilianne here. Something has to get off my chest. I’d rather tell you in a debate, but we don’t meet. Therefore it has to go like this. You came in again with your tough talks about migration. Did you mean by that that you want to continue the policy of this cabinet to let children suffocate in the hell that is Moria?”¹⁴⁴

Bijl: “Number 3 of @PolitiekBijl, @RebekkaTimmer about ‘reception in the region’, migration deals and Frontex. Stop the drowning of refugees in the Mediterranean! #Nohumanisillegal #Cometogether.”¹⁴⁵

Volt: “The government is consciously leaving people in this hell. Action is now necessary. Moria exists because of political unwillingness. We have seen it at the child benefits scandal: real injustice is only solved if someone stands up and continuously fights against this political unwillingness.”¹⁴⁶

SP: “What the VVD is doing is scapegoat politics and borders with that on the PVV: you cause a housing crisis, you cut back on mental healthcare and then state that we can’t handle more problems. The VVD is destroying it, not the refugee. - @RenskeLeijten at @WNLOpZondag.”¹⁴⁷

¹⁴¹ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 18). “Ik vind dit zo fucking pijnlijk. <https://nrc.nl/nieuws/2021/01/17/belofte-na-brand-moria-niet-ingelost-a4027974>” Retrieved from: <https://twitter.com/debroervanroos/status/1351107532970975234>

¹⁴² Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 14). “Er komen al maanden steeds vaker verhalen naar boven over mensonterende omstandigheden in vluchtelingenkampen. Niet alleen in Moria, maar ook in kampen als het Bosnische Lipa wordt de situatie steeds slechter. Vernietigende branden volgen elkaar snel op, kinderen slapen op straat tussen het ongedierte, en onze overheid weigert in te grijpen.” Retrieved https://www.instagram.com/p/CKCGbLqF_G3/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link

¹⁴³ DENK [@DenkNL]. (2021, January 22) “Walgelijk van de @VVD. Het is niet rechtstatelijk om moskeeën anders te behandelen. Er is geen definitie van “problematisch gedrag” en een “onvrij land”. @bentebecker die smeekte om compliment van PVV omdat ze kinderen in Moria laat stikken. Hoofd Pvv-Corfe.” Retrieved from https://twitter.com/F_azarkan/status/1352725147493531654

¹⁴⁴ PvdA [@PvdA]. (2021, March 12). “Beste @MarkRutte Lilianne hier. Er moet me iets van het hart. Het liefst had ik je dat in een debat verteld, maar wij treffen elkaar niet. Daarom nu zo. Lilianne Ploumen. Je kwam weer met stoere praat over minder migratie. Bedoel je daarmee dat je het beleid van dit kabinet om kinderen te laten stikken in de hel van Moria wil doorzetten?” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/PloumenLilianne/status/1370336585212911616>

¹⁴⁵ Bijl [@PolitiekBijl]. (2021, March 10). “Nummer 3 van @PolitiekBIJ1, @RebekkaTimmer over “opvang in de regio”, migratiedeals en Frontex. Stop het verdrinken van vluchtelingen in de Middellandse Zee! #GeenMensIsIllegaal #KomBIJ1.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/JazieAnthony/status/1369446277319172105>

¹⁴⁶ Volt [@VoltNederland]. (2021, January 24). “De regering laat mensen bewust in deze hel zitten. Actie is nu nodig. Moria bestaat dankzij politieke onwil. We hebben het gezien bij de toeslagenaffaire: echt onrecht wordt pas opgelost als iemand opstaat en continu tegen politieke onwil vecht.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/VoltNederland/status/1353310218256588801>

¹⁴⁷ SP [@SPnl]. (2021, February 29). “Wat de VVD doet is zondebokpolitiek en schuurt daarmee tegen de PVV aan: je zorgt voor een wooncrisis, je bezuinigt de geestelijke gezondheidszorg kapo t en zegt dan er kunnen geen problemen bij. De VVD maakt het kapot, niet de vluchteling.” - @RenskeLeijten bij @WNLOpZondag.” Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/SPnl/status/1365957590971252736>

INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRE; INTERNATIONAL SOLIDARITY AND COOPERATION

ChristenUnie (motion 676 on behalf of ChristenUnie, CDA, D66, GroenLinks, PvdA, SP and PvdD): "...requests the government to, in alignment with the task force of the European Committee, the improve the aid on the Greek islands by providing an additional financial contribution to the aid organizations, among which the already present Dutch one."¹⁴⁸

GroenLinks: "It's about the following, about which we have already had a discussion previously. The state secretary says: we don't work with ad-hoc solutions. By labeling it as 'ad-hoc solutions', you have actually already said: 'no we don't want that'. But this is not a proposition to choose for an ad-hoc solution. The proposition is to revive in European relations a mechanism that we already had for years: the reallocation mechanism. The Netherlands had made an important contribution to the success – or well, the relative success – of it."¹⁴⁹

SP (motion 2710): "...of opinion that the European Union has to better fulfill the shared responsibility of the wellbeing of unaccompanied children"¹⁵⁰

ChristenUnie (motion 2722): "... requests the cabinet to actively support the migration pact, to nudge other member states to do the same while simultaneously become part of a pioneer group with regard to the implementation of the pact of return, the selection at the European borders and a proportionate distribution amongst the member states of the Union..."¹⁵¹

INTERPRETATIVE REPERTOIRE; HUMAN DIGNITY

SP (motion 2710): "...Observing that the alien's policy by experts is compared with the child benefits scandal because asylum seekers are labeled as fraudulent in advance; of opinion that in the alien's policy there has to be space for a human dimension; request the government to research in which way the reasonability and proportionality could be better safeguarded in the execution of the alien's policy..."¹⁵²

ChristenUnie (motion 2723 on behalf of the ChristenUnie and SP) "... considering that several

¹⁴⁸ "...verzoekt de regering om in afstemming met de taskforce van de Europese Commissie de hulpverlening op de Griekse eilanden te doen verbeteren door een aanvullende financiële bijdrage te leveren aan de hulporganisaties, waaronder de al aanwezige Nederlandse." (Tweede kamer. (2021, January 27). *49e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/49)

¹⁴⁹ "Het gaat mij om het volgende punt, waarover we in ander verband al vaker hebben gesproken. De staatssecretaris zegt: we werken niet mee aan ad-hocoplossingen. Door er het etiket "ad-hocoplossingen" op te plakken, heb je eigenlijk al gezegd: nee, dat willen we niet. Maar dit is helemaal geen voorstel om voor een ad-hocoplossing te kiezen. Het voorstel is juist om in Europees verband een mechanisme dat we jarenlang hebben gehad in feite nieuw leven in te blazen: het relocatiemechanisme. Nederland heeft een belangrijke bijdrage geleverd aan het succes — nou ja, het relatieve succes — daarvan." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁵⁰ "...van mening dat de Europese Unie de gedeelde verantwoordelijkheid voor het welzijn van alleenstaande kinderen beter moet invullen." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁵¹ "...roept het kabinet op zich actief achter dit migratiepact te scharen, andere lidstaten daartoe ook te bewegen en tegelijk deel te gaan nemen aan een kopploeg met betrekking tot de uitvoering van het pact op de punten terugkeer, selectie aan de Europese grenzen en een evenredige herverdeling over de lidstaten van de Unie..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁵² "...constaterende dat het vreemdelingenbeleid door experts wordt vergeleken met de toeslagenaffaire omdat asielzoekers bij voorbaat als fraudeur worden bestempeld; van mening dat in het vreemdelingenbeleid oog moet zijn voor de menselijke maat; verzoekt de regering te onderzoeken op welke wijze de redelijkheid en evenredigheid beter kunnen worden gewaarborgd in de uitvoering van het vreemdelingenbeleid..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

migration lawyers and alien attorneys in an article and a book have raised the issue that within alien law there is barely any room for the human dimension and that this leads to injustice; considering that in an independent evaluation of the asylum chain which was requested by the state secretary, priority is given to the organizational and administrative matters and not to the substantive decision-making and execution of the human dimension; request the government to, next to this ongoing research, establish an independent research by experts from different disciplines about the substantive decision-making process about asylum request by the immigration service

DISCURSIVE STRATEGY; COMPASSION

GroenLinks (Motion 672 on behalf of GroenLinks, PvdA, SP and PvdD): "... request the government in the European context to plead for the relocation of 4000 unaccompanied children in Greece to benevolent EU member states, and if the Netherlands wants to offer reception of in total a maximum of 550 children."

ChristenUnie: "... in which the state secretary says to be worried about the humanitarian circumstance on the Greek islands. She also says that there should be habitable containers, but that there are all sorts of obstacles. I appreciate that the state secretary says this. Chairman, if I look at the footage on television, then I see that the circumstances are still very miserable. Therefore, I introduce the following motion..."

SGP: "...considering that at the moment still 4000 unaccompanied children in Greece are residing under lamentable and sometimes dangerous circumstances;..."

DENK (Motion 2717): "...considering that the immigration service in the case of Jacob and Tina has indicated that Jacob and Tina have no connection with the country to which they are about to be deported and that the immigration service sees that these children have developed attachments in the Netherlands; considering that there are more children and young adults, like the sisters from Amsterdam Sofia (24) and Najoua (21), who have been in the Netherlands for 20 years, and the brother from Amsterdam Erdem (16) and Furkan (19), who are born in the Netherlands;..."

¹⁵³ "...overwegende dat een aantal migratiejuristen en vreemdelingenadvocaten in een artikel en in een boek hebben aangekaart dat in het vreemdelingenrecht nauwelijks meer ruimte is voor de menselijke maat en dat dit leidt tot onrecht; overwegende dat in de onafhankelijke doorlichting van de asielketen waartoe de staatssecretaris opdracht heeft gegeven, voorrang wordt gegeven aan de organisatorische en sturingsvraagstukken en niet naar de inhoudelijke besluitvorming en de toepassing van de menselijke maat gekeken wordt; verzoekt de regering naast dit lopende onderzoek ook onafhankelijk onderzoek in te stellen door deskundigen uit verschillende disciplines naar de inhoudelijke besluitvorming over asielverzoeken door de IND..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁵⁴ "...verzoekt de regering in Europees verband te pleiten voor relocatie van de 4.000 alleenstaande kinderen in Griekenland naar welwillende EU-lidstaten, en als Nederland daarbij de opvang van in totaal maximaal 500 kinderen aan te bieden" (Tweede kamer. (2021, January 27). 49^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/49)

¹⁵⁵ "Daarin zegt de staatssecretaris bezorgd te zijn over de humanitaire situatie op de Griekse eilanden. Ze zegt ook dat er eigenlijk wooncontainers zouden moeten komen, maar dat er allerlei belemmeringen zijn. Ik waardeer dat de staatssecretaris dat zegt. Voorzitter. Als ik naar de camerabeelden op televisie kijk, dan zie ik dat de omstandigheden nog steeds heel belabberd zijn. Ik kom dus tot de volgende motie." (Tweede kamer. (2021, January 27). 49^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/49)

¹⁵⁶ "...constaterende dat momenteel nog circa 4.000 alleenstaande kinderen in Griekenland verblijven onder vaak erbarmelijke en soms gevaarlijke omstandigheden;..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁵⁷ "...constaterende dat de IND in de casus van Jacob en Tina heeft aangegeven dat Jacob en Tina geen binding hebben met het land waarnaar ze uitgezet dreigden te worden en dat de IND ziet dat deze kinderen al veel banden hebben opgebouwd in Nederland; overwegende dat er nog meer kinderen en jongvolwassenen zijn, zoals de Amsterdamse zusjes Sofia (24) en Najoua (21), die al twintig jaar in Nederland wonen, en de Amsterdamse broertjes Erdem (16) en Furkan (19), die in Nederland zijn geboren;..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). 68^e vergadering. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

SGP (Motion 2721): "...considering that at the moment many unaccompanied children in the refugee camps on the Greek island are residing under lamentable and sometimes dangerous circumstances; of opinion that the EU has to better fulfill the shared responsibility for the well-being of unaccompanied children; requests the government to plead in a European context in favor of the relocation of the unaccompanied children to the Greek mainland, to take care of accelerated judgment of the asylum procedure, to deport the rejected migrants to safe countries and consequently as the Netherlands receive a proportionate share of these children..."¹⁵⁸

DISCURSIVE STRATEGY; COUNTER-FRAMING

GroenLinks: "Do you know who you are letting hang endlessly because we invest too little in immigration service's capacity? That's not because of the actions of GroenLinks. These have been decisions from the cabinet that wants to invest less than required. That is what creates an unjust situation. That is what creates insecurity. I ask you to prevent now that in the upcoming months, weeks, while the new cabinet and new decisions are being negotiated, we send people away from who we know already, and who's lawyers and researchers say: these people are crushed by the system and don't receive the attention and the careful policy that they need. That is what I want to prevent, fortunately together with various colleagues in this room."¹⁵⁹

GroenLinks (Motion 673 on behalf of GroenLinks, PvdA, SP, PvdD): "Considering that the government only took in 2 unaccompanied children from Greece, while the state secretary on the 10th of September 2020 has promised to take 50 unaccompanied children to the Netherlands; requests the government to take in at least 48 more unaccompanied children within a month, to look at the selection only at security risks, and to not subtract these children from the quota for reallocation of other vulnerable refugees..."¹⁶⁰

GroenLinks: "It's about the following, about which we have already had a discussion previously. The state secretary says: we don't work with ad-hoc solutions. By labeling it 'ad-hoc solutions', you have actually already said: 'no we don't want that'. But this is not a proposition to choose for an ad-hoc solution. The proposition is to revive in European relations a mechanism that we already had for years: the reallocation mechanism. The Netherlands had made an important contribution to the success – or well, the relative success – of it."¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁸ "...Constaterende dat momenteel nog veel alleenstaande kinderen in de vluchtelingenkampen op de Griekse eilanden verblijven onder vaak erbarmelijke en soms gevaarlijke omstandigheden; van mening dat de EU de gedeelde verantwoordelijkheid voor het welzijn van alleenstaande kinderen beter moet invullen; verzoekt de regering in Europees verband te pleiten voor relocatie van de alleenstaande kinderen naar het Griekse vasteland, de beoordeling van de asielaanvragen versneld af te handelen, de afgewezen migranten uit te zetten naar veilige landen en vervolgens als Nederland een evenredig aandeel van deze kinderen op te vangen..." (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68^e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁵⁹ Weet u wie hier mensen eindeloos lang laat bungelen, omdat we te weinig investeren in IND capaciteit? Dat is niet door toedoen van GroenLinks. Dat zijn besluiten geweest van een kabinet dat minder wil investeren dan nodig is. Dát creëert een onterechte situatie. Dát creëert onzekerheid. Ik vraag erom nu te voorkomen dat wij de komende maanden, weken, terwijl er nog onderhandeld wordt over een nieuw kabinet en nieuwe besluiten, mensen wegsturen van wie we nu al weten, en van wie advocaten en onderzoekers zeggen: deze mensen raken vermalen in een systeem en krijgen niet de aandacht en het zorgvuldige beleid dat ze nodig hebben. Dat wil ik voorkomen, en met mij gelukkig meerdere collega's in deze Kamer. (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68^e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁶⁰ Constaterende dat de regering slechts 2 alleenstaande kinderen uit Griekenland heeft overgenomen, terwijl de staatssecretaris op 10 september 2020 heeft toegezegd 50 alleenstaande kinderen naar Nederland te halen; verzoekt de regering binnen een maand nog minstens 48 alleenstaande kinderen uit Griekenland over te nemen, bij de selectie slechts te kijken naar veiligheidsrisico's, en deze kinderen niet in mindering te brengen op het quotum voor herplaatsing van andere kwetsbare vluchtelingen..." (Tweede kamer. (2021, January 27). *49^e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/49)

¹⁶¹ Het gaat mij om het volgende punt, waarover we in ander verband al vaker hebben gesproken. De staatssecretaris zegt: we werken niet mee aan ad-hocoplossingen. Door er het etiket "ad-hocoplossingen" op te plakken, heb je eigenlijk al gezegd: nee, dat willen we niet. Maar dit is helemaal geen voorstel om voor een ad-hocoplossing te kiezen. Het voorstel is juist om in Europees verband een mechanisme dat we jarenlang hebben gehad in feite nieuw leven in te blazen: het relocatiemechanisme.

ChristenUnie: “I think the VVD is creating a false contradiction. The VVD as well has said that we have to take care of this in Europe. The Netherlands is not one of the pioneers in this. We are not in the pioneering group. Our motion asks to do this because this is not only of interest to the refugees but also of Europe and with that of the Netherlands. I think the VVD is agreeing on this, at least in the European context” “What I mean with a false contradiction is that the housing policy is not to blame on refugees who are yet to arrive, but amongst others on the VVD and the policy of the previous years. That is what I mean by a false contradiction. There is already a pioneering group with a view countries, of which one is Germany. This motion asks us to be part of this and to fulfill the promises that we – and hence the VVD; that is something I emphasize – in the European context have made. That is what this motion is asking.”¹⁶²

DISCURSIVE STRATEGY: LEGITIMATE SOURCES

ChristenUnie: “The research from several migration experts and alien attorneys that has been presented earlier this week, does not surprise the ChristenUnie. The ChristenUnie has seen these examples of unseen and unheard injustice very often already. Like we observe at the implementation of the government see in several areas, the human dimension seems to have disappeared, also in immigration law. This is why we find it important that there will be research into this matter. Therefore, a motion.”¹⁶³

SP (Motion 2710) “...Observing that the alien's policy by experts is compared with the child benefits scandal because asylum seekers are labeled as fraudulent in advance; of opinion that in the alien's policy there has to be space for a human dimension;”¹⁶⁴

ChristenUnie (Motion 2723): “... considering that several migration lawyers and alien attorneys in an article and a book have raised the issue that within alien law there is barely any room for the human dimension and that this leads to injustice;..”¹⁶⁵

DISCURSIVE STRATEGY; FIRM LANGUAGE

GroenLinks: “In the meantime, the situation for refugees is terrible in different places at the

Nederland heeft een belangrijke bijdrage geleverd aan het succes — nou ja, het relatieve succes — daarvan. (Tweede kamer. (2021, January 27). *49e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/49)

¹⁶² “Volgens mij creëert de VVD een valse tegenstelling. Ook de VVD heeft gezegd dat we dit moeten regelen in Europa. Nederland is daarin niet een van de koplopers. We zitten niet in de kopploeg. Onze motie vraagt om dat ook te doen, omdat het niet alleen in het belang is van vluchtelingen, maar ook in dat van Europa en daarmee ook Nederland. Volgens mij is de VVD het daarmee eens, tenminste in Europees verband..... Wat ik bedoel met een valse tegenstelling is dat het woonbeleid niet te wijten is aan vluchtelingen die nog moeten komen, maar onder andere aan de VVD en het beleid van de afgelopen jaren. Dat bedoel ik met een valse tegenstelling. Er is al een kopploeg van een aantal landen, waaronder Duitsland. Deze motie vraagt dat wij ons daaronder scharen en de afspraken die wij — dus ook de VVD; dat benadruk ik nogmaals — in Europees verband hebben gemaakt, gewoon nakomen. Dat is wat deze motie vraagt.”(Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁶³ Het onderzoek van een aantal migratiedeskundigen en vreemdelingenadvocaten dat eerder deze week is gepresenteerd, verbaast de ChristenUnie niet. De ChristenUnie heeft deze voorbeelden van ongezien en ongehoord onrecht ook al heel vaak gezien. Zoals we in de uitvoering bij de overheid op meerdere vlakken zien, lijkt de menselijke maat verdwenen, ook uit het vreemdelingenrecht. Daarom vinden wij het belangrijk dat ook hier een onderzoek naar komt. Daarom een motie. (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁶⁴constaterende dat het vreemdelingenbeleid door experts wordt vergeleken met de toeslagenaffaire omdat asielzoekers bij voorbaat als fraudeur worden bestempeld; van mening dat in het vreemdelingenbeleid oog moet zijn voor de menselijke maat; (motion 2710, 68th assembly).

¹⁶⁵ “...overwegende dat een aantal migratiejuristen en vreemdelingenadvocaten in een artikel en in een boek hebben aangekaart dat in het vreemdelingenrecht nauwelijks meer ruimte is voor de menselijke maat en dat dit leidt tot onrecht;...” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

borders of Europe, may it be the Mediterranean, Libya, Bosnia, or Greece, of which we receive more recent messages.”¹⁶⁶

GroenLinks (Motion 2713 on behalf of GroenLinks, PvdA, SP, PvdD, ChristenUnie): “Considering that migration experts in the book “Unheard, Injustice in alien law” rightfully conclude that people in the asylum chain as well through a lack of the application of the human dimension and distrust by the government fall between two stools and are almost crushed by the bureaucratic system;..”¹⁶⁷

GroenLinks: “Do you know what I think is a disgrace? I think it’s a disgrace that mister Wiersma calls this ‘mean’. Do you know what I think is mean? I think it is mean if we say to people from whom we know are stuck in the system, where there is no room for the human dimension; just leave, just go. That is what I think is mean. I rely on the findings of experts, lawyers and researchers who claim: we have to make sure that we are not making wrong decisions and crush people in the system. We have seen enough examples of this in the last months. I hope that now the VVD also want to conclude that if we really want to restore the trust between the government and the citizen, we have to pay attention to the human dimension. If we have learned one thing from the past few months, from the situation that has emerged, is that there is a need for the human dimension. I ask this cabinet to take into account this call from society and to consider the human dimension.”¹⁶⁸

CDA: “You can’t keep calling that people have to integrate successfully while denying basic requirements such as a passport. I ask the state secretary: what are doing? What is the state secretary doing if she announces to start another new investigation into something which has been investigated by the WODC, immigration service and the Ombudsman? It has taken too long. This is why emphasis again. Together with mister van Dijk we submit a motion. Let the people who have the right to a passport for years now receive it.”¹⁶⁹

DENK: “I think it is crazy that the state secretary claims that she thinks it is thorough that children, young adults, are waiting 22 years for a judgment in the Netherlands!”¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁶ Ondertussen is de situatie voor vluchtelingen op allerlei plekken aan de grenzen van Europa verschrikkelijk, of het nou gaat om de Middellandse Zee, Libië, Bosnië, waarover we steeds actuele berichten krijgen, of Griekenland (Tweede kamer. (2021, January 27). *49e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/49)

¹⁶⁷ “Overwegend dat migratiedeskundigen in het boek “Ongehoord. Onrecht in het vreemdelingenrecht” terecht constateren dat mensen ook in de asielketen door het gebrek aan toepassing van een menselijke maat en wantrouwen door de overheid tussen wal en schip raken en bijkans worden vermorzeld door een bureaucratisch systeem;” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁶⁸ “Weet u wat ik een gekke figuur vind? Ik vind het een gekke figuur dat de heer Wiersma dit “vals” noemt. Weet u wat ik vals vind? Ik vind het vals dat we tegen mensen van wie we weten dat ze vastzitten in het systeem, waar geen ruimte is voor dat maatwerk, zeggen: ga maar terug, ga maar weg. Dat vind ik vals. Ik baseer mij op bevindingen van experts, advocaten en onderzoekers die aangeven: we moeten ervoor waken dat we nu foute beslissingen nemen en dat mensen vermalen raken in het systeem. Daar hebben we de afgelopen maanden genoeg voorbeelden van gezien. Ik hoop toch dat nu ook de VVD tot het inzicht komt dat we, als we echt het vertrouwen tussen bestuur en burger willen herstellen, oog moeten hebben voor maatwerk. Als wij één ding hebben moeten leren van de afgelopen maanden, van de situatie die hier is ontstaan, is het dat er behoefte is aan maatwerk. Ik roep dit kabinet op rekening te houden met die roep uit de samenleving om oog te hebben voor maatwerk.” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁶⁹ “Je kunt niet roepen dat mensen succesvol moeten integreren, maar hun basisvoorwaarden als een paspoort ontzeggen. Ik vraag de staatssecretaris: waar zijn we nou mee bezig? Waar is de staatssecretaris nou mee bezig als zij aankondigt weer een nieuw onderzoek te beginnen naar iets waar al onderzoeken naar zijn gedaan door het WODC, de IND en de Ombudsman? Het heeft lang genoeg geduurd. Vandaar de streep onder de streep. Ik dien samen met de heer Van Dijk een motie in. Laat mensen die al jaren recht hebben op een paspoort dat nu uiteindelijk ook krijgen.” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

¹⁷⁰ “Ik vind het echt van de zotte dat de staatssecretaris dan aangeeft dat ze het zorgvuldig vindt dat kinderen, jongvolwassenen, in Nederland 22 jaar wachten op een beoordeling!” (Tweede Kamer. (2021, April 14). *68e vergadering*. Retrieved from https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/plenaire_verslagen/detail/2020-2021/68)

ANNEX 4. POLITICAL MOTIONS

	MO-TION NR.	INITIA-TOR	PRO/ ANTI / NEU-TRAL	CONTENT	RE-JECTED/A CCEPTED
January 27, 49th parliamentary assembly ¹⁷¹	673	GL PVDA SP PVDD	Pro	Request of taking in at least 48 more unaccompanied children from Greece within a month.	Rejected (71/149)
	672	GL PVDA SP PVDD	Pro	Request to plead in EU context in favor of the relocation of 4000 unaccompanied children within the EU, of which the Netherlands will provide shelter to 500 children.	Accepted (68/144)
	674	SGP	Anti	Request to not support the EU migration pact without agreement on ‘sharpening’ the EU Return Directive.	Rejected (57/149)
	675	SGP	Pro	Request for an European consultation about the improvement of asylum, return and integration.	Rejected (67/149)
	676	CU CDA D66 GL PVDA SP PVDD	Pro	Request for more additional financial support to aid organizations and insisting on the relocation of vulnerable refugees to the Greek mainland.	Accepted (93/149)
April 14, 68th parliamentary assembly ¹⁷²	2708	SP CU PVDA GL PVDD	Pro	Request to categorize Armenia no longer a safe country of origin or a safe third country.	Rejected (68/149)
	2709	SP CDA	Pro	Request to immediately naturalize 10.000 ‘pardonners’.	Accepted (84/149)
	2710	SP	Pro	Request to warrant reasonability and proportionality in implementation.	Rejected (72/149)
	2711	PVV	Anti	Request to arrest or deport all those who are illegal and to close the borders for those who come from Islamic countries.	Rejected (25/149)

¹⁷¹ Tweede kamer (2021) *Stemmingen over: moties ingediend bij het VSO Informele JBZ-Raad d.d. 28 en 29 januari 2021* (vreemdelingen- en asielbeleid). Retrieved from <https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/stemmingsuitslagen/detail?id=2021P02318>

¹⁷² Tweede Kamer (2021) *Moties ingediend bij het VAO Vreemdelingen- en Asielbeleid*. Retrieved from <https://www.tweedekamer.nl/kamerstukken/stemmingsuitslagen/detail?id=2021P06241>

2712	GL PVDA SP PVVD CU	Pro	Request to restrain return decision during the formation period.	Rejected (69/149)
2713	GL PVDA SP PVVD CU	Pro	Request to reintroduce the discretionary power as an instrument of customization in distressing situations.	Rejected (69/149)
2714	DENK	Pro	Request the return of the discretionary power.	Rejected (46/149)
2715	DENK	Pro	Requesting investigation by an external committee to investigate the possibility to bring back discretionary power.	Rejected (45/149)
2716	DENK	Pro	Request to expand the yearly national UNHCR quota from 500 to 5000 persons.	Rejected (67/149)
2717	DENK	Pro	Request to expand the current 'kinderpardonregeling' to young adults.	Rejected (36/149)
2718	PVDA GL CU SP	Neutral	Request of better supervision of the EU financial support to Greece	Accepted (121/149)
2719	JA21	Anti	Request to criminalizing illegality.	Rejected (64/149)
2720	SGP	Neutral	Request to look into the quicker and more efficient handling of asylum requests.	Accepted (140/149)
2721	SGP	Pro	Request to plead for the relocation of unaccompanied children to the Greek mainland.	Rejected (68/149)
2722	CU	Pro	Request to take part in a frontrunners group in the implementation of the EU migration pact.	Rejected (59/149)
2723	CU SP	Pro	Request for independent research about the decision-making process of the IND	Rejected (71/149)