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CHAPTER 4
The Single Male Guest Worker and the Angry Muslim Mob
CHAPTER 4
The Single Male Guest Worker and the Angry Muslim Mob: An Archaeology of Iterating Archival Images

Television images are cyclical, their recycling dependent upon the longevity of the news stories or the advent of new stories to which they are attached and re-attached.
Andrew Hoskins (2001: 342)

It is not only that symbolic meanings accumulate as an image moves forward in history (…) but that its new meanings have the effect of reframing the past (…).
W.J.T. Mitchell (2011: 147)

Over the course of more than fifty years television has generated an enormous amount of stories about Islamic immigration and has produced a collection of images that is still rapidly expanding. I begin this chapter by two sequences of images that represent two pivotal moments in the televisual narrative of Islamic immigration. The first sequence of images shows the recruitment by a Dutch official of cheap labour forces in Morocco: young men who have been queuing up all night, waiting eagerly for the moment that they will be called in for an interview, the apparently completely arbitrary selection procedure, carried out by the official for whom the presence of the camera seemed no reason to hide rudeness and disrespect, and the medical examinations to which the men were subjected. Made in 1969 by reporter Jaap van Meekren, this item of Televizier shows the practice of recruitment in an uncompromising and unsparing way. It is not surprising that these grainy black and white images have been recycled and reused extensively over the course of time. They inherently possess the emblematic quality of an accusation and they remind one of the practices of slavery or cattle-trade. They evoke shame and embarrassment and immediately generate various gloomy connotations. Besides all this, they have a strong potential to illustrate the literal beginning of the story of immigration, as they seemingly denote the “once upon a time” in the narrative of post-war labour immigration: the moment it all began.

Moving to the next sequence of images: it is March 1989, and the streets of The Hague and Rotterdam are crowded with angry Muslim men and veiled women and children carrying banners with the image of ayatollah Khomeini or with hate speech about Salman Rushdie. Some of them are furiously proclaiming “Death to

365 Televizier (AVRO, 21-10-1969).
Rushdie”, while others are burning the book *The Satanic Verses*. These images of the grim atmosphere in the Netherlands at the time of the Rushdie affair broadcast by *Journaal* have now become canonical. They too have an emblematic quality and immediately evoke grim connotations of Islamic peril and of fanatical bloodthirsty mobs. They have frequently been reused by television as an accusation: as an illustration of the failure of integration of Muslims and of the rise of Islamic fundamentalism within our own borders. These images can be seen as another landmark in television’s narrative of Islamic immigration and now stand for yet another beginning: the moment it started to go wrong.

In this chapter I further investigate what stories and images about Muslims have been canonized by television by analyzing the iterations of these archival images. I depart from the idea that the archive of Sound and Vision can be seen as an enormous reservoir of images that are constantly available for reuse and that the archive is not only a site where our cultural memory is kept but moreover a site where it is produced. Since television is a recursive medium that is constantly mixing together images from the past to frame the present, I assert that it is productive to examine what images have been brought into circulation and have entered the cultural canon. The aim of this chapter would be then to trace these images through television history and investigate how these images have been repetitively re-contextualized. I assert that tracing the iterations of these images and analyzing the stories and images to which they are re-attached provides insight into the changing televisual discourses of Muslims, and sheds light on how the logic of the medium of television has transformed these images into icons that now mark the specific “beginnings” in television’s narrative of the history of Islamic immigration.

There are several reasons why these specific images are interesting objects of research. Both images have been recycled frequently and have often been employed as visual illustrations of crucial moments in the history of Muslim presence in the Netherlands. Both images still appear on television and act in today’s media coverage of Muslims. Both images have taken on iconic qualities and have become part of cultural memory. They have often been employed as visual comparisons to prior and unfolding events and they have been used to review the past and to frame the present and the future. Due to the continuous emergence of new and competing televisual narratives on Muslim immigrants, the meaning of these images has constantly shifted. The new meanings that these images have accumulated during their travel through television history have in their turn, in retrospect
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366 *Journaal* (NOS, 03-03-1989 and 04-03-1989).
reframed the past. For these reasons, I presume that a close investigation of how and when the meanings of these images shift and change can shed light both on the multiple, competing and changing televisual discourses of Muslims, on television’s modes of representing and transforming the past, and on television’s symbiotic relationship with its own history in the shape of its archive. Despite the fact that the images have nothing in common except their constant reuse; they might yet be related by the intersections of thematic patterns of programs through which they circulate. This, I would suggest, is one of the most challenging questions to be answered in this chapter.

For more than a decade now the role of both visual media and the archive in transforming our historical imagination and shaping our cultural memory has been subject to intense academic discussion. In the first part of this chapter I explicate the constructivist paradigm of cultural memory that I draw on, I further theorize television’s complex temporal modulations, and I explore the nature of iconic images. From there, I move to an analysis of my two case studies. Where in the previous chapter I traced the coverage of Islamic rituals along the grain of the archive of Sound and Vision and regarded the collection and descriptions of the archive as a reflection of historical discourses of Muslims, in this chapter I focus on the consequences of the fact that documents in the archive are always open to reinterpretation, and I concentrate on the archive’s openness to the future. After providing additional methodological details, I first analyze the case of the images of recruitments and then turn towards the case of the images of the Rushdie affair. I begin each part with an analysis of the sequences of images in their original context. From there, I proceed to investigate in what new contexts they reappear. I peel back the various layers of meaning of these palimpsest images by analyzing them from both a diachronic and synchronic perspective: I trace them through television history, I examine to what stories and images they are attached at different historical moments, and I scrutinize how television’s activations of these archival images retrospectively reframe the past. Again, I combine archaeological discourse analysis with close textual analysis, and I examine the themes of the programs in which they reappear, the position of the images in these televisual narratives, and other images to which they are attached.
4.1 A Constructivist Model of Cultural Memory

Since this chapter centres on the circulation of archival images and departs from the idea that the archive of Sound and Vision could be considered a place where cultural memory is not only kept but also manufactured, I first elaborate on the concept of cultural memory that informs this case study. By consciously using the term “cultural” memory instead of other common terms such as “collective” memory (as coined by Maurice Halbwachs), “social” memory, or “public” memory, I want to take a constructivist position in the current debate on memory and draw on the work of Ann Rigney (2005). Rigney describes the theoretical evolution of the concept of “collective” memory to “cultural” memory in terms of a shift from what she calls a “plenitude and loss” model towards a “social-constructivist” model. She argues that, whereas the first model conceptualizes memory as something that if formed in the past, as something that can be preserved and be recovered from the past, and as something that is always diminishing, the latter takes as a starting point the idea that memories of the past are constantly constructed and reconstructed in the present and are products of mediation and representation. Rigney maintains that this conceptualization of cultural memory as something dynamic, as the result of recursive acts of remembrance, suggests a need to concentrate on the very cultural processes by which shared memories are produced and kept in circulation. In order to describe these processes, Rigney turns to Foucault’s *Archaeology of Knowledge* and Foucault’s development of the idea that culture is characterized by “scarcity”: “By this he means the fact that everything that in theory might be written or said about the world does not actually get to be said in practice” (16). It is my belief that Rigney’s translation of Foucault’s concerns with the field of discourse to that of cultural memory is highly relevant for me, and can help sharpen my archaeological approach to my research objects.

To explain how the principle of scarcity affects the working of cultural memory, Rigney draws attention to the fact that at the level of what she calls “selection” (16) memories are always scarce in relation to everything that might have been remembered. To clarify this process, she resorts to Aleida Assmann’s
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367 Rigney refers to the work of Maurice Halbwachs and Pierre Nora as influential examples of this approach.
368 Here she refers to the work of Jan en Aleida Assmann as being of great importance for the transformation towards a conceptualization of collective memory in terms of cultural processes.
distinction between “archival memory” and “working memory”. Archival memory is a latent form of memory: the storehouse of information about the past, which in itself is already scarce and limited, that may or may not be remembered, or – in Assmann’s own words – the part of materially retrievable information “that does not circulate as common knowledge” and “lingers in a state of latency” (2010: 43-44). Working memory is the result of the selective acts of remembrance of a society that provides it with a common frame of reference, and that is supported by validation of cultural institutions and the media (ibid). Assmann argues that the borders between archival and working memory are permeable in both directions: some memories may after a while fade out the centre of common interest and knowledge, whereas other memories may be recovered from the periphery (ibid). Rigney uses the principle of scarcity to emphasize the discursive mechanisms of selection that underlie the cultural processes that cause only certain archival memories to circulate as part of working memory. Cultural memory should thus be seen as something that is inherently partial, which is according to Rigney not a shortcoming but an inherent and vital quality.

Another dimension of cultural memory that is affected by the principle of scarcity is discussed by Rigney in terms of the “convergence of memories” (18). Here Rigney argues that Nora’s concept of “lieux de mémoire” is useful to account for the way certain locations, actual or virtual, tend to become the focus of remembrance and provide “a maximum amount of meaning in a minimum number of signs” (18). Scarcity should here be seen as the principle that reduces the creation of contrasting memories and instead provides society with common frameworks to understand the past by concentrating different memories in one single place. These sites are constantly reinvested with new meanings, as new events and new narratives are superimposed onto earlier ones to form what Rigney terms “memorial layers” (19). Memories tend to converge and conflate, as their cultural framework is recycled to deal with new events. Besides, Rigney relates the principle of scarcity to the way cultural memory is constructed through “recursivity”: “when acts of remembrance are repeatedly performed they can become part of a shared frame of reference” (20). Rigney emphasizes the fact that the “mobile media”, texts and images, play a crucial role in the formation of cultural memory, because they are not bound to place and time, and can freely circulate in order to
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369 Aleida Assmann herself uses the word “active memory” instead of “working memory” in an English article on memory formats (2010). Rigney refers to Assmann’s earlier book on memory that is written in German. I will hold on to Rigney’s translation.

370 Quoted in Rigney. This is Rigney’s translation of Nora’s phrasing.
connect people and form “imagined communities” (20). Here Rigney draws attention to the importance of (transmedial) recursivity in the formation of cultural memory.

The above described constructivist model of cultural memory as a dynamic process governed by the law of scarcity is in my view a helpful conceptual tool to account for the way television brings into circulation mediated memories by the repetition of certain images from its own archive. In this chapter I consider the archive of Sound and Vision as television’s “archival memory” and I analyze how and when images of recruitments and of the Rushdie affair have been brought into “working memory” and how they have been kept alive by television’s cyclical iterations of these images as flashbacks of history and as visual comparisons and frames of reference to interpret new events. I investigate how they accumulated new memorial layers, how they have been reinvested with new symbolic meanings, and how they conflate with other memories. Before I turn towards an engagement with these images I further theorize the impact of the electronic media on the formation of cultural memory, and sharpen my conceptual approach to the nature and the working of iconic images.

4.2. Television’s Complex Temporal Modulations, Media Templates and Audiovisual Lieux de Mémoire

During the last decade, many researchers working in the field of memory studies have acknowledged the centrality of media to the formation of cultural memory. In order to theorize the impact of electronic media on the way we experience the past and account for the way our relation to the past is increasingly electronically mediated and remediated in this era of global media dissemination, Andrew Hoskins has coined the concept of “new memory” (2001), which he redefined in his later work on television as the “collapse of memory” (2004a; 2004b). Hoskins argues that television is “a primary medium of memory and its collapse precisely because it is a medium of the present into which it interweaves fragments of the past” (2004a: 110). According to Hoskins, television collapses time through its real-time presentation of the recent and/or distant past. For him, the temporalities and temporal effects of television, its capacity to visually juxtapose multiple times, events and places, are defining for the medium.

371 Rigney here quotes Benedict Anderson.
In his work with O’Loughlin (2007 and 2010), he further elaborated on television’s complex temporalities by focusing on television’s reliance on its archival resources and on the function of “media templates” (Kitzinger 2000; Hoskins 2004b): “the principle mechanisms of instant comparison and contrast that television news employs to reinforce or reshape past events and also to direct those unfolding through its archival prism” (2007: 19). The capacity of the medium to instantly draw upon its own archives and create visual templates or “template series” is according to Hoskins and O’Loughlin unmatched by other media (ibid. 114-16). They distinguish between “retrospective templates”, that are past-oriented, and “speculative templates”, that are future-oriented and function as a pre-mediation of events, as “a means to provoke debate and action to respond to the prospects of the repetition of the past mistake” (2007: 113). They draw on the work of Jenny Kitzinger (2000), who argued that media templates are defined by “their lack of innovation, their status as received wisdom and by their closure” (ibid: 76; original emphasis). Kitzinger contends that templates are typically employed to explain current events, and often “reify a kind of historical determinism” because they anchor a “single primary meaning”, “promote one type of narrative” and have the inclination to “minimize opportunities for alternative interpretations” (ibid.). Hoskins and O’Loughlin furthermore state that media templates instigate the “ready collapsing of past/present/future into a single and immediate window of comparison” (94).

An important aspect of the formation of “new memory” (and “the collapse of memory”) is – as Hoskins has argued in several of his writings – television’s constant repetition of specific images from the same event (2001; 2004a; 2004b). Hoskins calls these images (or sequences of images) that have become almost instantaneously iconic through their mass repetition and that have come to represent by themselves a particular historical event or moment “media flashframes”: “images seemingly burned into history through their use as visual prompts in news programmes and other media so that they are instantly and widely recognizable as representing a particular event or moment in history” (2004b: 6). He argues that these flashframes are often employed as visual templates: “And it is precisely these flashframes of memory (…) that appear in television as “media templates”, i.e. as ways of presenting current events with visual reference to those past events which news and programme editors deem to be similar.” (ibid: 11). Flashframes, according to Hoskins, affect a collapse of memory, because television in this way “can be said to prevent memory through its satiation and overload of
images, yet at the same time it crystallizes memory of events around scenes it obsesses over” (6). Finally, Hoskins contends that in order to grasp the phenomenon of new memory it is crucial to investigate how these images re-enter in new times and contexts.

Various other researchers working in the field of media and memory studies have theorized the consequences of the repetition by the media of certain images over and over again. For example, Marita Sturken (1997) has conceived of iconic camera images as blurring the boundaries between “the image of history and history as an image” (24). With her concept of “tangled memories” she stresses that these camera images are sites where history and memory intersect, and sites that are often – quoting Benedict Anderson – “saturated with ghostly national imaginings” (1997: 25). In a similar manner, Thomas Elsaesser (2000) has conceptualized iconic images as “audiovisual lieux de mémoire”, as virtual anchor sites of memory. Finally, I think that this term “audiovisual lieux de mémoire” is especially suitable to account for the characteristics of iconic images that have been constantly repeated by the media. Although Nora’s original concept departs from a “plentitude and loss” model of cultural memory and of a romantic notion of natural memory as opposed to history, I argue – following Rigney – that (audiovisual) lieux de mémoire should rather be conceived of as dynamic, multilayered sites of memory, that capture “the maximum possible meaning with the fewest possible signs” (Nora 1989: 19), and that are constantly invested and renewed with new symbolic meaning.

PART ONE
THE TRANSFORMATION OF TELEVIZIER IMAGES INTO AUDIOVISUAL LIEUX DE MÉMOIRE

4.3 Guest Workers Waiting Eagerly For Recruitment

The nine minute and thirty-eight second item about the recruitment of Moroccan low-skilled workers that Jaap van Meekren made for AVRO’s Televizier372 was

---

372 Televizier (AVRO, 21-10-1969). Televizier was one of the early Dutch actuality programs, made by the broadcast organization AVRO. In the Dutch pillarized broadcast system, each broadcast organization used its own actuality program to propagate its theology and philosophy of life. The AVRO was the oldest broadcast organization and was known as neutral and independent, because it didn’t have affiliations with any of the religious or political pillars. Jaap van Meekren was one of AVRO’s most famous reporters. In fact, until 1985- when he changed the AVRO for Veronica- he was considered as one of the leading forces behind the AVRO and worked as editor, presenter and
broadcast on 21 October 1969, a few months after the Dutch government entered into a recruitment agreement with Morocco. The item opens with images of a mosque, accompanied van Meekren’s voice-over that introduces the viewer to the place: Oujda in Morocco. The item then cuts to images of van Meekren standing on a street, surrounded by Moroccan men and children and talking directly to the camera. He tells us that Morocco has supplied us, over the last years, with fifteen thousand labourers, who are called guest workers. However, he continues, on the one hand these guests have not always been received in a very hospitable way, and on the other they have not always behaved according to what we think we can expect from our guests. The item then cuts to various images of street scenes – people walking in crowded small streets and a spice market – while the voice-over continues and says that all this is understandable, because our guest accommodation is often a warehouse for humans, and because the guests came uninvited in the sense that they came on their own initiative, badly prepared and ill-informed. While the camera zooms in on the figure of a fully covered woman on the street, van Meekren’s voice-over concludes: “So there were and are problems of adaptation, because the medina of Oujda differs as much from The Hague’s Binnenhof, as the Moroccan women from the hippies in the Kalverstraat”.

---

reporter. He was known for his sense of justice, a quality of his character that was rooted in his experiences as a Jew in World War II. According to some of his friends, his report on the recruitments in Morocco was one of the items that he was very proud of. (Quoted from the special edition of Netwerk on the occasion of the death of van Meekren: Netwerk Extra (AVRO, 27-8-1997).

373 At this time, labour migration from Morocco had already gotten underway for some years. From 1965, an average of 3000 Moroccans had entered the Netherlands as spontaneous migrants (Vermeulen and Penninx, 2000:179). From May 1969 onwards, Moroccan labour migration became a bi-partite movement of migrants who came on their own initiative and workers who were actively recruited by the Netherlands.

374 Medina is the Arabic word for ‘city/town’. The Binnenhof is the building complex that is the center of Dutch politics. The Kalverstraat is Amsterdam’s largest shopping street.
The camera then shows the viewer images of a crowd of Moroccan men waiting in front of the fences of the employment agency, while van Meekren’s voice-over of continues and tells us that despite these problems the Dutch are coping with a constantly growing demand for labour forces, while Morocco has an enormous supply due to massive unemployment. Van Meekren informs us about the unemployment rate in Morocco and says that in order to make optimal use of this potential and in order to avoid more problems, the Dutch and Moroccan governments concluded a treaty in May. The camera then shows the arrival of the Dutch officer who is in charge of recruitments, while van Meekren introduces him as Simon Evert Jongejan from Sliedrecht, an official from the Ministry of Social Affairs who is responsible for recruiting and selecting workers. Finally, the item cuts to a lasting tracking shot of the long queue of men waiting along the fence, and while the camera moves along the faces of these men looking hopeful into the camera, the voice-over continues and explains that Jongejan has summoned two hundred unemployed men – “Morocco’s most important export commodity” – to gather here and wait in front of the employment agency fences which will open only the next morning.

After this opening sequence, the voice-over falls silent and the camera enters the office where the selections are taking place. Jongejan is sitting behind a desk and interviews (in broken French) the Moroccan men who one by one enter the room about their reading and writing skills and education. The first young man who
enters confirms Jongejan’s question – “do you speak French?” – and tells him he has been in school for eight years. Jongejan reacts immediately: “not accepted. I am looking for a different type”. Seemingly disappointed he slinks away. Then two men enter, who both get accepted after only answering “yes” to the question whether they speak French and whether they can read and write. Jongejan sends them away – “quickly quickly” – and tells them to wait in the garden. More men follow, some of them are sent away directly after entering the room and before they even get the chance to talk – “not accepted, quickly, quickly” – and others after only a few questions. Finally, another young man gets accepted and is also told to wait in the garden.

In the following scene, van Meekren interviews Jongejan about the selection procedures and asks him how he can so quickly decide to reject or accept someone. The camera shows Jongejan’s face in close-up, while he answers that, both the demands of the employer (age, married or single) and of his ministry (they have to be representative, literate, communicative) direct his choices, upon which van Meekren comments in a slightly cynical tone: “To an outsider your job seems very hard. It is almost like being on a slave-market.” This question is ironically illustrated with images of a scene of the actual selection procedure, in which a man is standing in front of Jongejan who gestures to him to turn around in order to check his backside. Jongejan reacts indignantly and tells him that this is not true, that in Holland too people who apply for a job need to go through strict selection procedures, and that he has only limited means: his intuition and his experience.
Then the item cuts to a scene in which Jongejan interviews, in a friendlier manner, a Moroccan man who has passed the selection procedures. After this scene, the interview with Jongejan continues. Jongejan talks about the high quality of Moroccan workers and sums up for which companies he is recruiting. One of the requests, by a factory of meat-products, is according to Jongejan a "reorder" (nabestelling). Van Meekren asks for clarification: “So they were satisfied and wanted more?”, whereupon Jongejan triumphantly repeats that it is indeed a reorder. The interview ends with Jongejan’s comment that he is now for the first time recruiting two women. This statement is illustrated with a scene from Jongejan’s interview with a young Moroccan woman in which he tells her that she has been accepted for a cleaning job in a hotel in the Netherlands and asks her whether she can leave within a week. The camera shows her face in close-up when she hesitantly answers affirmatively.

In the next scene, van Meekren interviews two Moroccan men who have been selected. The first man answers every question – “Are you happy to have been selected? Are you married? Do you have children? Is your wife happy too?” – with “yes sir”. After rightly answering van Meekrens’s question of what is the capital of Holland, the second man is interviewed and says that it will be slightly difficult to live without his wife and children, but that he is happy to be able to make available some money for his family and for the education of his children. Then van Meekren interviews a Moroccan official, who explains the procedure that follows: the men will leave in eight days, once the medical examinations and paperwork are done. This
sequence ends with images of these medical examinations: close-ups of men who get injections. The images are accompanied by van Meekren’s voice-over, who tells us that seventy men will arrive in Holland within a week, that they will receive the same conditions of employment as Dutch workers, that they will get a contract for one year and that their housing has been arranged for by their employers. Then the item cuts to images of Moroccan men who are congregating and jostling in front of the employment office, accompanied by the final thoughts of van Meekren on the selection procedure. He concludes that the procedure seems and actually is harsh, and that those whose hope has vanished into smoke in only a tiny moment, will remain unemployed; without any future perspective. The camera thereafter shows close-up images of the faces of the men queuing for the medical examination, while van Meekren ends the item with the statement that “seventy people have been given a new future today. A future, for that matter, without their wives and children, and in a strange country, a country that these men consider the Promised Land. The Netherlands”.

Considering the uncompromising portrayal of the recruitments and the critical tone of van Meekren, it is not surprising that the broadcasting of this item from Televizier immediately caused indignant and angry reactions among Dutch audiences.375 In order to grasp why certain sequences of images from this item have been canonized by television and turned into “audiovisual lieux de mémoire”, I first have a closer look at the manner in which the Moroccan guest workers have been depicted and at the way the Dutch nation has been imagined. The opening sequence lays emphasis, both in terms of imagery and commentary, on the cultural differences between Morocco and the Netherlands. The images of the mosque, the exotic streets and market, and the veiled woman belong to the realm of classic

375 The DAR- a foundation that defended the interests of Turkish and North-African workers sent a letter of protest to the ministers of Social Affairs. Also the Foundation for Foreign Workers raised its voice, whereupon questions were posed in parliament. See: Cottaar ea (2009: 24).
Orientalist imagery and are used to illustrate the otherness of the place. They function as an explanation for the adaptation problems of Moroccan workers that van Meekren is mentioning at that moment. However, by reflecting on the word guest worker, van Meekren explicitly declares that it is not only the guest but also the host who does not always live up to the rules of hospitality. So by taking into account both parties implied by the word guest worker, van Meekren overcomes a simplistic explanation for the adaptation problems, and takes from the outset a critical stance towards the hospitality of the Dutch nation.

This critical attitude of van Meekren towards the implications of the term guest worker could be seen as more than just a linguistic matter, and could actually be considered a reflection on the politics of the principal symbolism of the term. In her work *Postcolonial Hospitality*, Mireille Rosello (2002) argues that “the vision of the immigrant as guest is a metaphor that has forgotten that it is a metaphor” (3). She contends that the conceptualization of immigration in terms of hospitality, where the immigrant is the guest and the state is the host, creates apparently self-evident opposites that in fact are hegemonic constructions. Rosello maintains that the very reason why these “guests” were invited in the first place had nothing to do with hospitality: “(...) so called invitations had more to do with active recruitment. The unskilled workers who helped build French suburbs (...) were not regarded as guests in a house; they were hired” (ibid: 9). The comparison of a labour immigrant with a guest, as Rosello asserts, blurs the boundaries between “a discourse of rights and a discourse of generosity, the language of social contracts and the language of excess and gift-giving” (ibid). So obviously, van Meekren’s item makes visible and explicit the hegemonic power relations that underlie the discourse of hospitality. I contend that this is exactly what makes his reportage an instant accusation: the depiction of these guest workers and of their harsh recruitment clashes with the hegemonic discourse of Dutch hospitality.

Clearly, it is not only van Meekren’s explicit deconstruction of the term “guest worker” that causes the impact of the item. The narrative structure of the story, the editing, and the framing of images amplify the overall accusatory tone of the item. Jongejan is depicted as the cold blooded calculating bureaucrat who is carefully following orders, and for whom the young Moroccan men seem to be little more than commodities; as he talks about them in terms of numbers, quality and (re)orders. The black and white film images have been framed carefully to support this narrative, and the close-ups of Jongejan’s face during the interview by van Meekren (it seems as if the camera is trying to penetrate his thick-skinned
personality) reveal his lack of emotional response. And while Jongejan represents, both literally and allegorically, the Dutch government, van Meekren is the journalist with the human face who critically comments on the practices of the recruitments. Sometimes his critique is very explicit, for example when he says that he experiences the recruitments as being a slave-market, and at other moments it is more implicit, when he uses irony as a strategy to comment on what he sees. At crucial moments, in the scenes of the actual selection procedures, he is silent and lets the camera observe. Here the editing underlines the biting quality of the images, as a number of insensitive rejections by Jongejan have been put in sequence. Editing has also been used to ironically comment on Jongejan’s denial that his work compares to slave-trade, since this phrase is illustrated with images that suggest the exact opposite of what Jongejan says. Finally, the tracking shots of the faces of Moroccan men queuing and looking hopeful into the camera, frame them as docile victims of both the poverty in Morocco and of the unjust Dutch system of recruitment. These images have an almost instantaneous emblematic quality and operate as “nugget[s] of condensed drama” (Kitzinger 2000: 75), as they seem to symbolize the dehumanization of guest workers and their reduction to a commodity that this item from Televizier criticizes.

Before turning to an analysis of the iterations of images from this Televizier item, I first briefly discuss the way this item has been archived. Not surprisingly, the item has received the keyword “foreign workers” and has been described with the phrase: “interview by Jaap van Meekren with S.E. Jongejan about the recruitment of guest workers in Morocco”. The item has not been described on a detailed shot level, and no images have been highlighted by the archival descriptions. Although the archive of Sound and Vision does play a certain role in the later canonization of the images, since its selective power, its “archivalization” (Ketelaar 2001), has put these images on a pedestal (Nesmith 2002), it has not earmarked the images as reusable in the description of the original item. However, in the descriptions of many of the programs that repeated certain sequences, images of recruitments have been highlighted as shots that have a potential for reuse. And since the archive of Sound and Vision has recently digitized the item, whose original carrier is 16 mm film, the images have been put on yet another pedestal. Finally, I want to stress that I do not claim that the following overview of the programs that have recontextualized sequences of this Televizier item is complete. Sound and Vision has not documented the reuse of their material, and I only found the programs by systematically tracing the words “guest workers”, “foreign workers” and/or “recruitment”
(werving/ronseling) through the archive. Lastly, I structured the chapter around the historical moments at which the images start to accumulate new symbolic meanings.

4.4 The Guest Worker as Victim of Exploitation and Economic Recession

The first time that the Televizier images reappeared on television and entered working memory was in 1981, in Vragenvuur, a talk show lead by van Meekren.³⁷⁶ This means that during the seventies, in the discursive regime of the single male guest worker whose stay was considered temporary in nature, the images “lingered in a state of latency” (Assmann 2004) and existed only as part of archival memory. In the discursive regime of the eighties, in which the guest workers were replaced by ethnic minorities whose presence was rearticulated as permanent and in a period marked by economic depression and mass unemployment, the predominant themes that ran through the television coverage of ethnic minorities were, as I showed in chapter 2, their deprived socio-economic position, their unemployment, remigration and the second generation. In fact, these are precisely the themes of the six television programs that repeated the Televizier images and that transported them into working memory in this period. It is useful then to have a closer look at the way the Televizier images operated in these programs and analyse to what narratives and other images they have been attached and what new symbolic meanings they have accumulated.

The exploited and redundant guest worker

The first program that brought the Televizier images back into circulation, the 1981 episode of Vragenvuur, was dedicated to the issue of unemployment in the Netherlands. The description of the program does mention certain “dupes”, but the episode of Televizier (or a dupe saying “recruitment of guest workers”) has not been included. Before the actual conversations in the studio began, the talk show opened with a compilation of archival footage about the post-war reconstruction in the fifties and the flourishing economy of the sixties to contextualize the current crisis. A voice-over explains that the economy was growing in this period, and that the government and the trade and industry started recruiting thousands of labour forces abroad to do the dirty work. This phrase is illustrated by Televizier images of Moroccan men who are eagerly queuing in the hope of being recruited and employed in the Netherlands, and by other archival footage of guest workers in a factory and of a speech by Queen Juliana. The compilation ends with the voice-over’s statement that

³⁷⁶ Vragenvuur (AVRO, 01-03-1981).
the oil crisis in 1973 was the beginning of the economic recession. Then the ministers of Economic and of Social Affairs are present in the studio to answer phone calls from citizens. Van Meekren says that he is hesitant to bring up the subject of the foreign workers and explains that it might be a good idea to provide the audience with some clarifications about their presence, because it seems that many people think the problems can be solved by sending these people home for there are as many unemployed people (350,000) as foreign workers. The minister of Economic Affairs explains that this is nonsense and that the Netherlands still cannot do without foreign workers, who do the low-skilled work that the Dutch refuse to do. The rest of the talk show is dedicated to other issues that have arisen as a consequence of the economic problems.

In this archival compilation the Televizier images of waiting men in queues have been employed to mark the beginning of labour immigration in the Netherlands and to show the huge contrast between the economic situation during the sixties and at the current moment. Here the faces of the Moroccan men waiting in line are the faces of the men who have come to the Netherlands as a result of an active policy of the government and who have, in retrospect, done the dirty work for us and are now victims of the economic recession. The archival images have been reused in a generic manner and the fact that the men were Moroccan has not been mentioned. Rather, they stand for the anonymous guest worker who helped us out when all went well, and was treated like a cast-off when the economy crashed. The faces of the waiting men have been attached to archival footage of the rebuilding of Dutch industry and of guest workers in factories, and they operate as an accusation of the treatment of foreign workers as redundant commodities.
The way the _Televizier_ images have been recontextualized by this episode of _Vragenvuur_ is exemplary for the way the images circulated through working memory during the eighties. _Achter het Nieuws_, the actuality program of the VARA, has broadcast three items in which the _Televizier_ images have been reused in almost identical archival compilations, and that all deal with the issue of remigration. In 1984, _Achter het Nieuws_ has dedicated an item to the mass unemployment among former guest workers. The description of the item mentions the “dupe” from _Televizier_ (“official S.E. Jongejan from Utrecht (sic) recruits Moroccans”). The item opens with the _Televizier_ images of the arrival of Jongejan in Oujda, accompanied by melancholic music and a voice-over that explains that the Dutch official Jongejan visited Morocco in order to recruit unemployed men who will work as guest workers in Holland. This phrase is illustrated by the _Televizier_ tracking shot of the Moroccan men waiting in the queue. The voice-over continues and says that the Dutch economy was coping with a lack of labour forces and that the solution was found in the countries around the Mediterranean. And again, the images of waiting men are shown. The voice-over explains that the surplus of workers in Morocco was so enormous that the Dutch official could recruit in a very selective manner. This phrase is illustrated with the _Televizier_ sequence of Jongejan’s first insensitive rejection of a young man: images of Jongejan saying rudely “not accepted, quickly!”, and images of the astonished look on the face of the man. Again, gloomy music has been added to these archival images. The voice-over continues and tells us that times have changed, that the foreign workers were the first to become redundant, and that many of them are now unemployed. The rest of the item is about the issue of how the Dutch government can help these unemployed people return to their countries and shows interviews with an unemployed Turkish man, with the director of the Dutch Centre for Foreigners, Mohammed Rabbae, and with two members of parliament. The overall argument of the item is that the Dutch government should help the foreign workers return to their countries, because it was the government that brought them to Holland in the first place. So in this item of _Achter het Nieuws_, the _Televizier_ images have clearly been employed as a political statement. The added morose music amplifies the victimization of the Moroccan men waiting in the queue and the rejected young man, who are now victims of the Dutch endeavour for wealth and of the current economic crisis. The images of Jongejan’s arrival in Oujda

---

377 _Achter het Nieuws_ (VARA, 17-11-1984). The description has highlighted the following dupe: “black and white images of official S.E. Jongejan from Utrecht (sic) who is recruiting Moroccans (1969/AVRO).”
stand for the responsibility of the Dutch government for bringing Moroccan men to the Netherlands and for its responsibility to help them return, now that they have become unemployed.

Furthermore, in the two other items that Achter het Nieuws broadcast on the issue of remigration, the Televizier images operated as a political statement. In 1985, Achter het Nieuws followed a delegation of members of parliament that travelled to Morocco to investigate the possibilities for guest workers to return, and that visited people who returned with the help of subsidies from the Dutch government.\(^\text{378}\) The item opens with a short version of the same compilation of the 1984 episode: it shows the images of the waiting men, accompanied by the same grim music, and a voice-over explaining that fifteen years ago these men were queuing to apply for a job in the Netherlands. The compilation ends with Jongejan’s rejection of the young Moroccan man. The other item of Achter het Nieuws, also broadcast in 1985, portrayed Moroccan children of the second generation who re-migrated with their parents and who wanted to return to the Netherlands because they did not feel at home in Morocco.\(^\text{379}\) Once again, this item opens with the same compilation of the Televizier images. Thus, in both items, the Televizier images function as an illustration of how immigration had begun and as a demonstration of the responsibility of the Dutch government to solve the problems of these people who have done our unpalatable work and have been left without any future perspective.

The Televizier images as illustration of Turkish recruitments

In this period, various programs employed the inherent emblematic quality of the Televizier images – their potential to illustrate the beginning of immigration and their biting nature – to illustrate stories about Turkish immigration. In 1984, the IKON actuality program Kenmerk dedicated an episode to the portrayal of a Turkish girl from the second generation, who travelled to Sweden and Germany to visit contemporaries and to find out how children of the second generation are treated in diverse European countries and how their legal status differs.\(^\text{380}\) The program opens with a compilation, in which contemporary images of Turkish men sitting in a bus from Central Station to Schiphol are juxtaposed to archival images, accompanied by a voice-over that says: “In the sixties the Netherlands made a selection”. This phrase

\(^{378}\) Achter het Nieuws (VARA, 19-01-1985).

\(^{379}\) Achter het Nieuws (VARA, 11-12-1985). The descriptions mention the following dupe: “recruitment (ronseling) of guest workers in the 60s”.

\(^{380}\) Kenmerk (IKON, 05-09-1984).
is illustrated by the Televizier images of a number of Jongejan’s rude rejections, and by images of medical examinations in Turkey. The voice-over continues and says: “Immigrants, foreign workers, labour forces, we have recruited them thousands of kilometres from here to do the work that the Dutch don’t want to do, and they have assured us of our wealth”. This phrase is illustrated by the Televizier images of the Moroccan men waiting men in the queue, and by archival images of trains full of guest workers leaving with big suitcases, accompanied by nostalgic music of Astor Piazolla. After this introduction, the item follows the Turkish girl on her travels through Europe. During the twenty-three minute episode, images from the Televizier item reappear once again in a scene about the current situation in the Netherlands, in this case the sequence of images of the Moroccan man who is asked to turn around, accompanied by Piazolla music that replaced the original sound. The voice-over explains that in 1964 a recruitment treaty with Turkey was concluded, that it took until 1979 before the Dutch government realized that the stay of the guest workers would not be temporary, and that with the implementation of a minority policy the Dutch government had acknowledged that the Netherlands has become an immigration country.

Thus in this item, the Televizier images have again been reused in order to reflect how the guest workers came to the Netherlands in the first place, and how they are now victims of the economic depression. The tone of the item is nostalgic and the music of Piazolla amplifies this mode, in which the viewer is invited to empathize with the fate of the guest workers and to reflect upon the problems that the second generation is facing now that the economic tide has turned. By mixing together the Televizier images with archival images of medical examinations and goodbye scenes from Turkey, together with the commentary, this television program has symbolically transformed the faces of the waiting and rejected Moroccan men into faces of Turkish men. Nonetheless, the description of the program mentions the dupe from Televizier as: a “selection of guest workers in Morocco”.

A comparable editing strategy has been used in an episode of Feduco’s Ruim Baan, a series about work and unemployment, that was broadcast in 1985 and that revolved around the future of second generation guest workers. The starting point of the episode is a boat trip organized for unemployed second-generation Turkish youth. The program opens with a historical compilation of archival footage of Dutch people who have emigrated in the fifties in search of a better future. An old Dutch song about the difficulties of emigration accompany the archival images of the
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381 Ruim Baan (Feduco, 18-11-1985) The episode is named: From Far and Away.
goodbye scenes in the harbour and of the crying and waving of family members and friends who stayed behind. These images alternated with archival footage of Turkish men saying goodbye to their families, and of guest workers in factories, while a voice-over describes how the Dutch industry kept growing after the war, soon came in need of workers and began recruiting foreign workers. Then an archival compilation, announced as “archival film from 1965”, shows images of Turkish recruitments combined with the scene from the Televizier item in which Jongejan makes his “reorder” remark. The voice-over explains that working in Holland for a few years seemed the perfect solution for these unemployed Turkish men. The rest of the item is about how their expectations did not come true because it was hard to save enough money, which made them postpone their return, and finally made them decide to stay because of their children. The item ends with some remarks on the difficulties with which these children cope. The history of Turkish immigration has thus been told in comparison with Dutch emigration of the fifties, and this televisual strategy of comparison invites the viewer to identify with the Turkish immigrant. Again, the Televizier images (this time of Jongejan’s blunt statement) have been employed to make a statement about the responsibility of the Dutch government. The juxtaposition of the Televizier images with archival footage of the Turkish context, in a compilation that has been announced as dating from 1965, has canalized their meaning into images of Turkish recruitments in 1965. And in this case, the archival description of the program reflects this televisual strategy of generic reuse of archival material, as it only mentions a dupe of the recruitment of Turkish workers.  

4.5 The Guest Worker as Victim of the Lack of Integration Policy and as Having Brought Islam to the Netherlands

In 1989, the Televizier images were recycled by an episode of VARA’s actuality program Impact that revolved around the issue of the integration of allochtonen. While in the eighties the guest workers of the Televizier episode have retrospectively been transformed into victims of Dutch exploitation and of the economic crisis, from 1989 onwards the Televizier images began to accumulate new symbolic meanings. In 1989, the publication of WRR report Allochtonenbeleid had ushered in the era of a “new realism” (Prins 2000) of the nineties. In this discursive regime, of the
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382 The dupe mentioned says: “Turkish workers in front of office for recruitment”.  
383 Impact (VARA, 18-05-1989).
allochtoon who should integrate, television privileged stories about young Moroccan criminals, impoverished city neighbourhoods, racism, and other integration issues, such as the emergence of black schools and the continuing deprived socio-economic position of minorities. In this period, the Televizier images were mainly brought into circulation by programs that surrounded the issue of integration. Besides, for the first time, they have been employed to mark the coming of Islam to the Netherlands. Therefore, I now zoom in on the eleven programs that I found to analyse exactly how the images operated in this period.

The transformation of the guest worker into a deprived allochtoon
In May 1989, on the occasion of the publication of the WRR report, VARA’s Impact devoted a fifty-minute episode to the failure of minority policy and to the disadvantaged position of ethnic minorities. To historically contextualize the current situation, the program opens with a compilation of archival images, accompanied by the voice-over of the presenter Paul Witteman. This historical review opens with the Televizier images of the Moroccan men queuing, while the voice-over explains that in the sixties we took thousands of guest workers to Holland, and that now, thirty years later and despite efforts of the government to design minority policy, these allochtonen still suffer from a deprived position in our society. Again, the tracking shot of the waiting men appears, followed by the sequence of Jongejan’s rude rejection of the astonished young Moroccan man. This scene is accompanied by melancholic music and by the voice-over that describes the depressing situation in which these guest workers were living. The rest of the historical review tells the story of their arrival in the Netherlands, of their miserable housing, of the dirty hard work they executed in factories, of the economic depression and their resulting unemployment, of their final settlement and family reunion, and of the birth of new generations.384 After this archival compilation, the episode of Impact consists of a portrayal of a Turkish family intermingled with interviews with various immigration experts, schoolteachers, politicians, problem-causing Moroccan youngsters, and Islamic girls. Over the course of the program, various themes related to the issue of integration are discussed, such as the failure of minority policy, problems among the second generation, black schools, Islamic schools, segregation in old city neighbourhoods, criminality, and language problems. What is remarkable about this

384 Remarkably, the archival description does mention a variety of dupes of footage of the initial years of immigration (such as “guest workers in a factory”), but it doesn’t mention the Televizier images of the recruitments.
episode of *Impact* is that the *Televizier* images have not only been employed to mark the beginning of immigration, but also to mark the emergence of all sorts of societal problems that are a result of the failure of the Dutch government to come up with an effective integration policy. In this program, hopeful faces of waiting men are not only faces of anonymous victims of our pursuit for wealth, but they are also faces of victims of a lack of a proper policy for their integration. They are not specifically Moroccans, but stand for *allochtonen* in general, whose lack of integration is described as the final responsibility of the government. The sad music in this archival compilation underlines the humiliation that the guest workers had to undergo and amplifies their victimization.

In an episode of *Brandpunt* that was part of a series about the old city neighbourhood of Zuilen in Utrecht and that was broadcast in 1992, the *Televizier* images have also been linked to the issue of the problematic position of the *allochtoon* as a result of the lack of a state policy in the past. The item portrays a Turkish former guest worker who lives in the old city neighbourhood of Zuilen in Utrecht and who has been unemployed for eleven years and now wants to return to Turkey. To explain how he has ended up in this difficult situation in the first place, the program opens with a short compilation of archival material from the sixties, accompanied by a voice-over that recounts the historical background of post-war labour immigration. Archival images of the blossoming Dutch industry illustrate the voice-over’s comment that the Dutch economy was in need of low-skilled labour forces and even sent officials abroad to recruit guest workers, followed by the *Televizier* images of the arrival of Jongejan, of the Moroccan men waiting in the queue, and of the first rude rejection of the young Moroccan man. The compilation ends with images of the factory where he was employed. Then the item tells the story of the difficult situation the man is now encountering. Much attention is paid to his lack of knowledge of the Dutch language due to the absence of an integration policy. The program clearly portrays the man as a dupe of both past Dutch economic policy and the indifference of the Dutch government towards the fate of their former guest workers. So once again, the accusatory quality of the *Televizier* images has been directed towards the Dutch government and its miscalculation to hold onto the idea that guest workers were not here to stay. And once again, the *Televizier* images have been reused in a very generic manner, to illustrate the tragic personal story of a Turkish man who has never integrated in all those years. Strikingly, the archival description of the program reflects this generic strategy of
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reuse, as it has incorrectly labelled the dupe as: “black and white images of officials in Turkey to recruit guest workers”.

In this period, television’s tendency to repeat the Televizier images to illustrate the roots of the current integration problems of allochtonen is reflected in various more programs and items. In 1994, the program *De tijd staat even stil*, a talk show that discusses important events from the past, dedicated an episode to the arrival of guest workers in the Netherlands.\(^{386}\) After a compilation of archival footage of Dutch emigration, of the Televizier images (the scenes of the arrival of Jongejan, of the men waiting in the queue and of the rejection of the young astonished man), and of goodbye scenes and men in trains and busses carrying suitcases, of miserable housing and of labour in factories, the talk show starts and revolves in particular around the current discrimination of the former guest workers, and around the indifferent attitude of the Dutch government that is the source of current integration problems. The host of the talk show, the journalist Philip Freriks, explicitly designates the practices depicted by Televizier images as cattle trade, critically ask his guests about their experiences with Dutch hospitality, and finally states that the guest workers have contributed to our wealth. So again, the Televizier images have been employed to illustrate the source of the current problems, to raise empathy for allochtonen, and to accuse the Dutch government of disinterest for the consequences of labour immigration.

Also the actuality program *Twee Vandaag* has employed the Televizier images to contextualize the current integration problems of allochtonen. In an episode broadcast in 1996, an item about the psychiatric problems of allochtonen opens with a historical compilation about the initial years of labour immigration: images of immigrants in trains with suitcases, and the Televizier images of the man who is summoned by Jongejan to turn around, accompanied by melancholic music.\(^{387}\) A voice-over states that many of these guest workers are now coping with psychiatric problems as a consequence of adaptation and integration problems. Two years later, in 1998, *Twee Vandaag* dedicated an item to the subject of “thirty years of Moroccans in the Netherlands”.\(^{388}\) The item, that revolves around the issues of integration problems of the second generation and criminality among the third
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386 *De tijd staat even stil* (NCRV, 24-05-1994). The dupes mention, among others: “recruitment foreign workers and their arrival in the Netherlands”.
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 generation, opens with the *Televizier* tracking shot of the Moroccan men queuing. In a similar manner, the actuality program *Babylon*, that discussed the issue of how sports could advance the integration of *allochtonen*, showed the Televizier images of the men queuing in a historical compilation about the initial years of labour immigration. Importantly, in all these television items, the *Televizier* images have been employed to illustrate the beginning of labour immigration and to locate the source of current integration problems. Furthermore, the *Televizier* images have been kept alive by an educational program, *De Multiculturele Samenleving*, and by an episode of *Netwerk* on the occasion of the death of van Meekren, that both showed a substantial part of the *Televizier* item of the recruitments.

**The labelling of the Moroccan guest workers with an Islamic identity**

Besides the issue of integration, a newly emerged issue in programs that repeated the *Televizier* images is the Islamic religion. In 1993, the *Televizier* images appeared in the first episode of the educational series *Islam in the Netherlands*, which revolved around the coming of Islam to the Netherlands. The first part of the episode is dedicated to the arrival of Muslims as a consequence of the Dutch colonial history and accounts of the coming of Moluccan and Surinamese Muslims. This part is illustrated with photographs of the Moluccan camps and with archival images of the Mubarak mosque and its imam Hafiz. Then the voice-over explains that the majority of Muslims came to the Netherlands for completely different reasons, illustrated with the *Televizier* images of the waiting men in the queue. The voice-over states that in Morocco and Turkey people were queuing to do the distasteful work that the Dutch refused to do, and then a lengthy sequence of Jongejan’s rejections is shown without commentary. This sequence is followed by interviews with former guest workers from Morocco and Turkey, who talk about the difficulties they experienced in those years to practice their religion due to a lack of facilities such as mosques and holidays during Ramadan. Then Dutch imam van Bommel elaborates on the current prejudice against Islam, and he pinpoints the Iranian revolution and ayatollah Khomeini’s rise to power as the source of this prejudice. Archival footage of the masses proclaiming the Islamic revolution in Iran and of Khomeini illustrate van Bommel’s phrases. The program ends with various

---

389 *Babylon* (IKON, 3-12-1998). The description mentions the dupe: “guest workers and ethnic minorities in streetview”.


391 *Islam in Nederland* (NOS, 10-10-1993). The description mentions the dupe: “black and white: selection future guest workers in Morocco (?)”.
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statements of former guest workers that argue that the current suspicion of Muslims is unjust and that Muslims do indeed want to integrate into Dutch society.

So in this program, the Moroccan men waiting in the queue have been explicitly labelled with a religious identity, and the Televizier images now mark the arrival of Muslims in the Netherlands. They are not only victims of poverty and Dutch economic policies, but also of a lack of possibilities to properly profess their faith in the past, and of the current Dutch prejudice towards Islam. So yet again, this reuse of the Televizier images shows how every activation of these archival images not only adds new symbolic meaning, but also how this new meaning, according to the principle of retrospective causality, has the effect of reframing the past. For the first time, the Televizier images have been connected to a story about the coming of Islam to the Netherlands and been attached to archival footage of the Mubarak mosque and of the Iranian revolution, and to generic images of communal prayers and women with headscarves walking on the street.

Similarly, in an episode of Het Andere Gezicht, a series of portrayals of various people that was broadcast in 1998, the Televizier images have been employed to illustrate the personal history of a Moroccan man who was explicitly depicted as a Muslim. The episode portrays a former guest worker that is now retired, and tries to set up an Islamic home for the elderly, with facilities such as a mosque and halal food. To contextualize his current situation, the program opens with an archival compilation about the history of labour immigration: images of the post-war rebuilding of the Netherlands, of guest workers in trains packed with suitcases, the Televizier images of the arrival of Jongejan and of the men queuing, images of guest workers in factories and images of the miserable housing situation. Strikingly, this compilation is the exact same (including titles, music and voice-over) as the one that was shown in the 1995 episode of De Multiculturele Samenleving. After this compilation, the episode follows the efforts of the Moroccan senior to provide Islamic elderly with proper facilities, and shows him praying in a mosque and talking about his experience of being a Muslim in the Netherlands. So in this case, the anonymous faces of the Moroccan men waiting in the queue have become the face of an individual Muslim who is struggling for more recognition of his Islamic religion.
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392 Het Andere Gezicht (IKON, 22-10-1998). The description mentions, among other, the following archival material: “black and white and colour : images of the rebuilding of the Netherlands and of the recruitment and housing of guest workers”.
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And finally, the Televizier images recurred in an episode of the series *Muslims in Europe* that was broadcast by NMO, the Dutch Muslim Broadcast Company. Remarkably, the episode is about the current social position of Muslims in Belgium. The program explains that the presence of Muslims in Belgium is mainly the result of labour immigration in the sixties. A voice-over talks about the Belgian selection procedures of guest workers and introduces the Televizier images with the statement that these images show how a Belgian-Dutch selection team proceeded to pick the men with the greatest physical strength. A lengthy sequence of the Televizier images (the men waiting in the queue and various rejections by Jongejan) is shown, accompanied by Oriental music. The rest of the program deals with the racism in Belgian society, with the problems with Moroccan youth, and with the foundation of the Flemish extreme right party. So in this case, the Televizier images have been reused in quite a generic manner and employed to mark the coming of Islam to Belgium. Again, this case shows how television, by employing the iconic and biting quality of the Televizier images, has often denied the specific and original meaning of the material.

### 4.6 The Transformation of the Guest Worker into an Allochtoon and Muslim Whose Integration Has Ultimately Failed

In the first decade of the new century, the above-described tendency of television to repeat the Televizier images in programs that addressed the issue of integration persisted. In this period of rupture and trauma, the issues of multiculturalism, integration and Islam had become increasingly intertwined, and the predominant themes that ran through the television coverage were the assumed failure of integration and of integration policy, related problems such as black schools, segregation, Moroccan criminality, the radicalization of young Muslims, home-grown terrorism, hate-preaching imams and repressed veiled women. Again, the Televizier images circulated in programs that addressed these issues and that showed compilations of archival footage to provide these current problems with a historical framework. It is useful to have a closer look at the iterations of the Televizier images during this period and turn to the twenty programs that brought the images into working memory.
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394 The description mentions, among others, the following archival material: “selection of Moroccan guest workers.”
The *Televizier* images as illustration of the origin of current integration problems

I begin the analysis of the circulation of the *Televizier* images in this period with the remarkable case of an episode of *Andere Tijden* about the issue of black schools, broadcast in 2001.395 *Andere Tijden* (*Former Times*) is a history magazine of the VPRO and NTR, which revolves around topics from the 20th century, inspired by actual events and aimed at telling unknown stories and showing unfamiliar archival material.396 The episode is about the emergence of black schools (schools with at least seventy percent *allochtone* students) and opens with an introduction by the presenter, Hans Goedkoop, in which he states that black schools are breeding grounds for all sorts of "*allochtonen* problems" such as segregation and criminality, and that they are not a new phenomenon, but instead have a history that goes back at least twenty five years. The episode then recounts the history of one of the first black schools, *Combinatie 70*, in an old quarter in Rotterdam, *Het Oude Noorden*. In the opening sequence, current street shots of the neighbourhood are shown (houses with satellite dishes, *allochtonen* and a veiled woman walking on the street), after which archival images that were set in Turkey in 1970 are used to introduce a Turkish former student of the school. Then the *Televizier* images appear: images of the waiting crowd in front of the employment office and a sequence of the actual selection procedure, with the original sound and without commentary, but with titles saying Morocco 1969. After that, a former Moroccan student of the school is introduced. The rest of the episode tells the history of the school and juxtaposes archival material with interviews of former students and teachers. So yet again, the *Televizier* images operate to mark the beginning of immigration, and to tell in a nutshell the personal history of one of the main characters of the episode. What is remarkable, however, is that the sound during the sequence of the selection procedure has been manipulated. In the original item the young man is rejected by Jongejan after replying he went to school for eight years, but in this milder version of *Andere Tijden* he is suddenly accepted. Both in the original French dialogue and in the Dutch subtitles the word “not” has been removed from the phrase “not accepted”. In the original item Jongejan tells the young man that he is looking for a different type and then the young men slinks away with an astonished expression on

395 *Andere Tijden* (VPRO, 4-9-2001).
396 Since the opening of the new building of Sound and Vision in 2006, the program is recorded in Sound and Vision.
his face, but now the scene ends with Jongejan’s “acceptance”. The result of this adjustment is that the images lose a bit of their accusatory tone and now illustrate the beginning of immigration in a more neutral mode. This is yet another example of how television can transform the meaning of archival material into a direction that suits its specific purposes.

Furthermore, the actuality program Netwerk has apparently come across the Televizier images, and has discovered their biting quality, since it has repeated them in the exact same historical compilation in four different episodes, all revolving around the assumed failure of integration. In 2002, an episode took the announcement that a parliamentary inquiry would investigate the results of Dutch integration policy as an incentive to revisit the history of this policy. The episode opens with a compilation of archival images, announced as “archival film 1965”, accompanied by melancholic music and a voice-over that tells about the initial years of immigration. It first shows other archival images of recruitments and medical examinations of guest workers (these are images shot in Turkey in 1965), followed by a sequence of the Televizier interview with Jongejan that ends with his statement about the reorder. This part of Netwerk’s archival compilation derives from the program Ruim Baan (1985) that I described earlier. The rest of the compilation shows images of leaving and arriving guest workers, and their labour in factories. Then the episode shows interviews with various experts who critically comment on the consequences of the former policy of “integration with maintenance of personal identity”, and who argue that this policy has intensified ethnic differences and has frustrated integration. The program extensively addresses the role of mosques in the emancipation process of Islamic guest workers during the seventies and eighties (according to the principles of pillarization), and criticizes this policy for having resulted in an increased power of the mosques. Images of a communal prayer in a mosque are shown. The program ends with the voice-over that states that the fear of discrimination has for too long made it impossible to openly talk about integration problems, accompanied by generic images of allochtonen on the street, people leaving a mosque, and houses with satellite dishes: visual symbols that supposedly signify the failure of integration. So in this episode of Netwerk, the Televizier images of Jongejan’s blunt statement have been employed to mark the beginning of immigration, and they retrospectively symbolize the responsibility of the Dutch government for the current failure of integration due to its miscalculations in the

397 Netwerk (AVRO, 19-11-2002).
398 Ruim Baan (Feduco, 18-11-1985).
past. They have been pulled out of their original context and been attached to archival images of recruitments in Turkey, dated 1965. Clearly, Netwerk has exploited this sequence of the Televizier item for its potential to stand for and to criticize the accountability of the Dutch government for the current problems, but has failed to do research about the actual origin of the footage and has simply copied the sequence from Ruim Baan.

This is also the case in the episode of Netwerk that was broadcast on the occasion of the publishing of the report of the parliamentary inquiry in 2004, which concluded that the integration of the majority of allochtonen was at least partly successful. In this episode various people who disagree with these conclusions are interviewed. During an interview with a local official from Amsterdam about the lack of policy during the first twenty years of immigration, the same compilation that was used in the episode from 2002, again announced as “archival film 1965” is presented. Once more the images of Jongejan’s blunt statement seem to be the perfect demonstration of everything that went wrong on the side of the Dutch government. One of the people interviewed in this episode is Frits Bolkestein who complains that the final report of the committee does not pay attention to the issue of Islam. He argues that it is impossible to talk about integration without taking into account the role of Islam and he extensively elaborates on undesirable developments such as Islamic schools and radical imams. In 2006, the exact same compilation was also used in an episode of Netwerk that portrayed an elderly Moroccan man who was threatened with being sent back to Morocco, because he had temporarily lived in Morocco after his retirement. He says he is being treated like a cow that no longer gives milk and is therefore brought to the slaughterhouse. These words are illustrated with the compilation of archival material, and Jongejan’s phrase “it is a reorder” underlines this accusation against the attitude of the government.

399 The description only mentions the archival footage: “guest workers arrive in the Netherlands in 1965”.
400 Netwerk (NCRV, 19-01-2004). Here the description mentions: “black and white: arrival and medical examination of guest workers in the Netherlands”.
401 Netwerk (NCRV, 11-1-2006). Here the description mentions the following archival material: AVRO ‘Netwerk’(archival film 1965 arrival guest workers in the Netherlands).
In yet another episode of Netwerk that was also broadcast in 2006, the compilation of archival material has once more been employed, but this time without the caption saying “archival film 1965”. The episode revolves around the rising juvenile criminality among the Moroccan population. The program first shows the mayor of Amsterdam, Job Cohen, who visits a Moroccan youth organization. Then, the presenter, Fons de Poel, interviews Ahmed Aboutaleb, an Amsterdam alderman with a Moroccan background, about the constant security he receives as a consequence of the prominent role he played during the public debate after the murder of van Gogh. Familiar flashframes of the murder are shown as illustration. They talk about the current problems as offshoots of a much bigger and older problem, namely the miscalculations of the government during the first twenty years of immigration. The presenter then states that the first generation was literally ordered by the Netherlands and that in hindsight these images are very disturbing. Then an archival compilation about the initial years is shown, accompanied by a voice-over. It opens with images of poverty in Morocco, followed by a lengthy sequence of footage that shows recruitments for the DAF factory in Tunisia. Then the same assemblage of archival images as in the other episodes of Netwerk is shown: the images of recruitments and medical examinations (the material shot in Turkey) and then finally, the Televizier footage of the interview with Jongejan.
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402 Netwerk (KRO, 22-1-2006). The description mentions, among other, the following archival footage: "in a Moroccan village inhabitants are selected, arrival guest workers in the Netherlands, diverse of guest workers in factories".

403 These images originate from an episode of Tijdschrift (NOT) from 1975.
voice-over repeats Jongejan’s phrase “reordered”, and explains that the economic crisis in the eighties caused major unemployment among the immigrants, and that the lack of policy resulted in the emergence of ghettos in large cities, where it was no longer necessary to speak Dutch. Images of satellite dishes accompany these words. Then the item cuts back to the studio, where Aboutaleb and de Poel discuss the images of the recruitments and the amount of shame that they evoke. Aboutaleb concludes that nowadays the immigrants are solely burdened with the responsibility of today’s drama, while what is forgotten is that the Dutch government and Dutch industry are also very much to blame. Thus in this episode, the Televizier images have once again been employed to demonstrate the accountability of the Dutch government for the failure of integration and for the yielding of Moroccan youth to criminality.

Besides Netwerk, various other actuality programs that revolved around the issue of integration have repeated the Televizier images. In 2002, NOVA/Den Haag Vandaag dedicated four episodes to the issue of integration policy. The third episode, that addressed the issue of unemployment among allochtonen, began with a historical review of immigration. This compilation of archival footage opens with the Televizier tracking shot of the Moroccan men waiting in the queue, accompanied by melancholic Oriental music and a voice-over that recounts the history of the initial years of immigration. Then, a lengthy sequence of the Televizier images of the recruitment procedure is shown (the entrance of the young Moroccan man and the rude rejection by Jongejan), followed by images of a Turkish family walking on the street in a Dutch town, while the voice-over narrates about family reunion in the eighties. Then the voice-over elaborates on the current problems, such as unemployment among allochtonen, language problems, and the concentration of allochtonen in old city quarters. These words are illustrated with generic images of youth hanging around in the streets, of balconies with satellite dishes, and of a veiled woman walking on the street. So once again, the Televizier images have been employed in an archival compilation that traces back current integration problems to their supposed origin. Their attachment to the visual symbols of the failure of integration transforms their meaning retrospectively into the moment in which all these societal problems are rooted. This televisual logic of visually juxtaposing multiple times and places is reflected in the archival description of the program, as it mentions the following archival material: “black and white images of guest workers

404 Nova/Den Haag Vandaag (NPS, 13-12-2002).
in the 60s and 70s, allochtone hangjongeren (loiterers), black veiled woman on the street, balconies with satellite dishes”.

In an item of Twee Vandaag, broadcast in 2003, the Televizier images operate in a similar manner. On the occasion of the ongoing parliamentary inquiry into integration, the item looks back at the failure of thirty years of integration policy. After an interview with Stef Blok – the leader of the inquiry – the item zooms in on the issue of the impoverishment of the old city neighbourhoods of Rotterdam. To historically contextualize the current problems, the item shows a compilation of archival material: it opens with the Televizier images of the men waiting in the queue, accompanied by a voice-over and Oriental music, followed by archival images of their labour in factories and of the 1972 riots against Turkish guest workers in the Afrikaanderwijk. Then the voice-over narrates about the emergence of minority policy in the eighties and about the growing discontent in the nineties, illustrated with images of women with headscarves at the market, and images of various politicians who critically addressed immigration, such as Janmaat, Bolkestein and Pim Fortuyn, oscillates with interviews of former local politicians and the former mayor of Rotterdam. So in this archival compilation, the Televizier images of the waiting Moroccan men operate generically, and now, in hindsight, stand for the allochtone in the old city neighbourhoods of Rotterdam whose integration has failed. Yet again, the images have been attached to stereotypical images of veiled women at a market that symbolize the old city quarters with a majority of allochtonen.

The Televizier images as illustration of the origin of (Islamic) threat to the Dutch cultural identity

Besides the above-described programs about the failure of integration and integration policy, the KRO actuality program Reporter repeated the Televizier images in various episodes that revolved around the threat of immigration and of Islamic fundamentalism to Dutch values. In 2004, a few months before the murder of van Gogh, Reporter broadcast a triptych that was dedicated to the Dutch cultural identity (Het Nederlandgevoel). The theme of the third episode was “the preservation of Dutch culture and the influx of immigrants”. The episode opens with a scene in which the presenter announces that, according to a questionnaire,
which was carried out for the program, half of the inhabitants of the Netherlands want to stop immigration in order to preserve Dutch culture. Then an interview with Ayaan Hirsi Ali is shown, in which she argues that immigration threatens our sexual freedom. This interview is illustrated with archival images of the Gay Pride parade in Amsterdam juxtaposed with archival images of the contested statements of imam El Moumni about the malignance of homosexuality. The program further interviews various experts about the limits of Dutch tolerance, about the failure of integration and the parliamentary inquiry, about the murder of a teacher by a Turkish student at the Terra College, and about the values of Dutch culture. The episode then looks back at the history of immigration in a compilation of historical footage, accompanied by a voice-over and Oriental music: the Televizier images of the Moroccan men waiting in the queue illustrate the voice-over’s statement that the Dutch did not want to do the dirty jobs, and an extended sequence of the selection procedure by Jongejan is shown, followed by archival images of guest workers with suitcases, of goodbye scenes and of their labour in factories. Then a sociologist argues that it was the initial policy of integration with the preservation of identity that has caused the current problems. The rest this Reporter episode discusses the tensions between different sections of the population. So once again, the Televizier images have been employed to mark the beginning of immigration and to pinpoint the source of all sorts of societal problems. The images of Jongejan’s rude selection procedure again seem the perfect accusation against the way the Dutch government has failed to foresee the long-term consequences of labour immigration. And in this case, the waiting Moroccan men in the queue have transformed into poorly integrated allochtonen who threaten Dutch values such as sexual freedom.

In 2007, Reporter again recycled the Televizier image in an episode about financing mosques in the Netherlands (of which an actualized version was broadcast some months later). The episode addresses the issue of the financing of mosques in the Netherlands by foreign moneylenders from countries such as Dubai, Pakistan and Libya who have ties with Al-Qaeda fundamentalists such as Osama bin Laden. It discusses various contested mosques, such as the Westermoskee (of Milli Görüs) and the Taibah mosque in Amsterdam, and the Assalam mosque in Rotterdam. After the opening sequence, the program looks back at the history of Islam in the Netherlands
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408 These images derive from the actuality magazine NOVA (NPS/VARA, 03-05-2001), that caused the El Moummi affair in 2001 and that I have mentioned in Chapter 2.
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in a compilation of archival footage, that opens with archival images of Indonesian president Soekarno, accompanied by a voice-over that says that once upon a time the Netherlands was the biggest Islamic kingdom in the world, a period that ended when Soekarno declared the independence of Indonesia. It then tells the history of the guest workers that brought Islam to the Netherlands, illustrated with the Televizier images of the waiting men in the queue and by a sequence of the job interviews by Jongejan. The voice-over further narrates about the lack of facilities to practice their faith in the past, accompanied by archival images of a communal prayer during a Ramadan celebration. Then the voice-over talks about the rising numbers of mosques ever since that time, as Islam has now become the fastest growing religion in the Netherlands, illustrated with a graphic of the map of the Netherlands, with minarets popping up everywhere. The rest of the program deals with the danger of the rise of fundamentalism within our borders as a result of the foreign influence on Dutch mosques. Throughout the episode, various flashframes of 9/11, footage of Osama bin Laden, and of hate-preaching imams in Dutch mosques are presented, juxtaposed with images of communal prayers in various mosques.  

Figure 43 a-i. Sequence from Reporter (KRO, 04-02-2007).

So in this episode, the Televizier images have once again been employed to mark the coming of Islam to the Netherlands, and here the Moroccan guest workers in the
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410 The footage of the hate-preaching imams originates from the influential NOVA episode (NPS, 13-06-2002), that I have mentioned in Chapter 2.
queue have retrospectively turned into Muslims who are susceptible to fundamentalism and who form a threat to Dutch secular society. For the first time, the *Televizier* images have surfaced in a program that has also employed imagery that symbolizes (international) terrorism and fundamentalism.

**The *Televizier* images in educational programs and in personal portrayals**

Besides the more mainstream actuality programs, various educational program have brought the *Televizier* images into working memory in this period. In an episode of *Arbeid en Zorg van A tot Z* (2000) about the history of the division of roles between men and women, the *Televizier* images are employed to illustrate the post-war Dutch industry’s need for workers. The voice-over states that in order to fulfil this need for male labour, the government started recruiting guest workers, and came up with a different strategy to fulfil the need for female labour and started recruiting married Dutch women. The rest of the episode tells the story of the emancipation of women and their increasing participation in the labour market. Again, the series has used the potential of the *Televizier* images to stand for the beginning of labour immigration. What is remarkable is that it ignored (like all the other programs that repeated the *Televizier* images) the *Televizier* sequence that shows the recruitment of the Moroccan women. Apparently, only the single male guest worker fits the televisual story of the beginning of labour immigration.

In programs such as *Het Allochtoon videocircuit* (2001 and 2003), *Nederland Migratieland* (2007), and *Herinnert u zich deze nog* (2007), the *Televizier* images of the waiting men in the queue, the selection procedures and the interview with Jongejan are shown in historical reviews on labour immigration and are employed to produce historical knowledge and a consciousness of how it all began.⁴¹¹ In an episode of *De Grote Geschiedenis Quiz* (2004), a yearly quiz on Dutch history, a lengthy sequence of the *Televizier* images is used as an introduction to the question “how many Moroccans were working in the Netherlands in 1960?”.⁴¹² None of the candidates produce the right answer (three) to this question, and then the presenter, Jan Tromp, uses the presentation of the *Televizier* images to ironically comment on the strict immigration policy in the present. So in this program, the *Televizier* images have been explicitly referred to as belonging to our cultural canon. It is evident that the program has shown the *Televizier* images primarily because of their biting

---


⁴¹² *De Grote Geschiedenis Quiz* (NPS, 12-04-2004). The description mentions: “selection of guest workers in Morocco”.
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quality, as the program has disregarded the fact that the images were made in 1969 instead of 1960.

Furthermore, the *Televizier* images continued to be employed by various programs to illustrate personal histories. In *Het Geheime Boek Van* (2007), a magazine on literature, a lengthy sequence of the *Televizier* images is employed to illustrate the personal history of the Dutch-Moroccan writer Abdelkader Benali.\(^{413}\) In an episode of the series of portrayals *Profiel* (2008) about the local Amsterdam politician Ahmad Marcouch, the *Televizier* images (the queuing men and the first rejection by Jongejan) illustrate the interview in which he explains how his father came to the Netherlands.\(^{414}\) In an episode of *Holland Doc* (2009) which portrays various Moroccan men of the first generation and their sons, a lengthy sequence of the *Televizier* images (beginning with the queuing men, followed by the rejections and by the interview with Jongejan, with the original sound and without commentary and/or music) operates as demonstration of the stories of the men about the humiliations to which they were submitted.\(^{415}\) And finally, in an episode of the actuality program *Netwerk* (2009) a former Moroccan guest worker is portrayed and looks back at his life.\(^{416}\) Here, the *Televizier* images of the men waiting in the queue and the first rejection by Jongejan once again illustrate his personal story. Remarkably, this time *Netwerk* has selected different scenes of the *Televizier* images than in the four earlier episodes, and despite the fact that the historical compilation opens with archival images of poverty in Morocco accompanied by titles saying “Morocco 1965”, in the archival description of this *Netwerk* episode the *Televizier* footage has been dated correctly.\(^{417}\)

**Concluding Remarks**

By demonstrating how the *Televizier* images have constantly been reinvested with new meaning over the course of more than forty years, I have revealed how the recursive logic of the medium of television have transformed them into “*audiovisual lieux de mémoire*”. The vitality of the *Televizier* images clearly lies in their evocative


\(^{414}\) *Profiel* (IKON, 03-12-2008).

\(^{415}\) *Holland Doc: Een Beter Leven* (IKON, 22-01-2009).

\(^{416}\) *Netwerk* (NCRV, 15-05-2009)

\(^{417}\) It mentions: “meager huts in Morocco in 1965” and “a queue of Moroccans in 1969 for examination for immigration to the Netherlands.”
nature and their capacity to provoke powerful emotions. They began to circulate through living memory at the very moment that the collective symbolism of the immigrant as guest was abandoned, and they have not only proven to have the potential to reveal the fact that this symbolism hides hegemonic power relations, but also to stress the fact that in retrospect it turned out to be a complete miscalculation to speak of immigrants in terms of guests. The images have constantly been employed to mark the beginning of labour immigration, and also to mark the moment to which retrospectively all problematic consequences of immigration can be traced. As true “audiovisual lieux de mémoire” the images have adopted, absorbed and added new meaning through time, while appropriating dominant themes of the televisual narrative of immigration at various historical moments.

The Televizier images have constantly been used to stimulate historical reflection, to evoke contradictions and tensions in the attitude of the Dutch government, and to promote an alternative interpretation to hegemonic integration discourse. As the Televizier images moved forward in television history and accumulated new symbolic meanings, these new meanings constantly reframed the past. In the original item, the Moroccan workers were depicted as victims of dehumanization by the Dutch government. In the eighties, the Televizier images began to operate as a reminder of the fact that the guest workers had come to the Netherlands as a result of an active policy, that they had been economically exploited during the prosperity period, and that they were now being swept aside without any future prospects. In the nineties, they began to be employed to critique the indifference of the Dutch government and its failure to come up with proper integration policies. In retrospect, they began to operate as an illustration of the coming of Islam to the Netherlands. Finally, in the last decade, the images surfaced in programs about black schools, the failure of minority politics, segregation in old neighbourhoods, criminality of Moroccan youth, unemployment among allochtonen, and the dangers of Islamic fundamentalism. In this period of widespread anti-immigration and anti-Islam sentiments, the Televizier images continued to victimize the immigrant and they continued to operate as a reminder of the responsibility of the Dutch government. A government that first dehumanized the guest worker, and then economically exploited him, further failed to make proper policy once his stay turned out to be permanent, and then finally came up with a strategy of multiculturalism that led to the ultimate failure of his integration. All these critiques of hegemonic discourse now constitute multiple memorial layers of these “audiovisual lieux de mémoire”.
Furthermore, by tracing the *Televizier* images through television history I have not only shown how the discursive principle of scarcity has caused these very images instead of others to enter the cultural canon and circulate as part of working memory, I have also exposed how the principle of scarcity – the selective acts of television’s remembrance – has caused only certain sequences of the *Televizier* reportage to remain alive. In particular, the images of the waiting men in the queue, of the rude rejections by Jongejan, and of his phrase “it’s a reorder” have been reused extensively. These are clearly the scenes that are most confronting and that most explicitly criticize and deconstruct the myth of Dutch hospitality, and that are – as true “audiovisual *lieux de mémoire*” – most capable of providing a “maximum of meaning in a minimum number of signs”. The images of the faces of the Moroccan men waiting in the queue have this capacity to operate as “nugget[s] of condensed drama” (Kitzinger 2000: 75) that can stand for the decisive emblematic moment of the beginning of labour immigration, and they seem to be tailor-made for representing the generic identity of the victimized guest worker, and his later retrospectively constructed generic identities of the poorly-integrated *allochtoon* and the Muslim who might be susceptible to fundamentalism. It is their formal quality – the framing of the anonymous faces of the Moroccan men, hopefully staring into the camera – that constitute the power of these images and that make them so capable of inviting projections and associations. The images of Jongejan’s rude rejections and of his blunt statements, in their turn, have the capacity to instantly evoke outrage; they seem to be made to measure for symbolizing the responsibility of the Dutch government for the dehumanization, exploitation and the failure of the integration of these generic figures of the guest worker, *allochtoon* and Muslim. In this respect, it is telling that various programs have disregarded the historical specificity of the *Televizier* images and reused the images in generic and not always historical accurate ways, and have used editing strategies and music to intensify the bitter tone of the images. Over and over again, the images have been employed to illustrate personal stories and to symbolize generic identities.

And finally, while certain sequences of the *Televizier* reportage have transformed into “audiovisual *lieux de mémoire*”, others have always lingered in a state of dormancy in the archive and have seldom or never been activated in working memory. The sequence of the recruitment of the Moroccan women, for example, has never been reused and remains part of archival memory only. Perhaps this points to aspects of historical reality that might be hidden behind the visibility of the *Televizier* images: also women were employed in the Netherlands. Besides, not
all guest workers were recruited and many came on their own initiative. These stories are obscured by the visibility of the Televизией images. The victimization of the guest worker is a simplification of historical reality and maybe even a cliché that does not necessarily do justice to the experiences of the first generation. Television's obsession for these kinds of condensed and concise pieces of drama has transformed the Televизией images into a stereotyping symbol of the past. The guest worker is once and for all single, male and a victim of all sorts of injustice.

PART 2
THE RE-APPROPRIATION OF THE RUSHDIE AFFAIR

4.7 Angry Muslims proclaiming “Death to Rushdie”

The events that followed the publication of Salman Rushdie’s The Satanic Verses in September 1988 lead to a worldwide wave of fear for the Muslims who publicly expressed their anger about the book and proclaimed death of the author. What has become known as the Rushdie affair was in fact, a whole range of transnational events over an extended period of time. In January 1989, the anger and grief of British Muslims led to book burnings in Bradford and demonstrations in Hyde Park. In February, violent demonstrations and riots broke out in Pakistan and India. And on 14 February, Ayatollah Khomeini issued his fatwa on Rushdie, which stated that the author was an infidel and should be killed for insulting the Quran and the Prophet. The next day, Khomeini placed a reward of three million dollars on Rushdie’s head and in Teheran demonstrations took place in front of the British embassy. In March, the grim atmosphere and sense of crisis also reached the Netherlands and various Dutch Muslims proclaimed “Death to Rushdie” during demonstrations organized in The Hague and Rotterdam. The images of these demonstrations form the starting point for yet another archaeological expedition through recent television history.

The demonstration in The Hague took place on 3 March 1989 and was covered by the NOS Journaal, the public news magazine.418 It opens with images of the demonstrators filmed from above, followed by an image of a man screaming “Death to Rushdie” while carrying an effigy of Rushdie. A voice-over explains that at three o’clock that day around 4000 Muslims had gathered in front of the central station, then moved through the city centre while shouting slogans such as “Death
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418 Journaal (NOS, 03-03-1989).
to Rushdie”, and finally reached the Ministry of Justice where they had offered a petition that requested the prohibition of The Satanic Verses. Images of a group of veiled women and of a small boy screaming slogans illustrate the voice-over. It further explains that the protesting Muslims want Rushdie to be punished for his contested book. Then some of the men on the street are given a chance to speak. One of them states that Rushdie is an animal, and others talk about jihad and their right to use violence to defend Islam against insults. The item ends with the statement of the voice-over that the demonstration ended at five o’clock, after the burning of a book and a portrait of Rushdie in front of the British embassy, illustrated with a close-up of a man holding the burning book.

The next day, on the fourth of March, the NOS Journaal covered the demonstration that was organized in Rotterdam.419 The item opens with a studio interview with Joris Voorhoeve, the chairman of the Liberal Party, who states that Muslims have the right to demonstrate, but must also respect that Dutch law does

419 Journaal (NOS, 04-03-1989).
not allow calls for murder and that he wants to create a dialogue between the Dutch government and Muslim organizations in order to avoid further escalation. This interview is followed by images of a man screaming “Death to Rushdie” through a megaphone, while a voice-over clarifies: “It wasn’t by far the thousands of demonstrators that the Pakistan Islamic Centre in Rotterdam had hoped for; however, the demonstration of 700 people of various Islamic organizations was very heated. And despite the fact that the organizations had beforehand assured that it would not happen, people constantly called for the death of the British author”. Images of various demonstrators carrying banners with “Death to Rushdie” and proclaiming this slogan illustrate the voice-over. The item further shows images of children carrying banners of Khomeini, veiled young girls walking along in the parade, images of a burning effigy representing Rushdie, and of a man hitting an image of the devil with his shoe, followed by demonstrators who declare that according to the sharia Rushdie should be punished by being put to death. The voice-over closes the item with the announcement that the demonstration ran further without incidents.

Figure 45 a-i. A selection of stills from Journaal (NOS, 04-03-1989).
Before tracing the iterations of these images, I briefly sketch the connotations of religious hysteria that these images trigger, since they certainly did not appear out of thin air. As Edward Said has shown in his *Covering Islam* (1997 [1981]), the figure of the angry and fanatical mob of Muslims was already a dominant and persistent cliché in the media coverage of Islam at the moment that the images of demonstrations against Rushdie were broadcast. According to Said, the Iranian revolution (1979) had given a new impulse to the longstanding hostile Western attitude towards Islam, and had led to a revival and re-appropriation of Orientalist ideas. Said has argued that since the Iranian revolution, Iran and ayatollah Khomeini had come to represent all that was despicable and appalling about Islam, and that the media coverage of this event (and other events in the Middle East) has canonized Islam as hostile and dangerous. According to Said, the depiction of Muslims as bloodthirsty mobs has become one of the clichés that constitute the iconography of Islam (97: 6). So when in 1989 the images of demonstrations against Rushdie were broadcast, they recalled the images of masses on the streets of Teheran and were directly emotionally charged with connotations of Islamic peril and Muslim fundamentalism. Since it was ayatollah Khomeini who had issued the *fatwa* on Rushdie, the images seemed to once again confirm the presumed malice of the Iranian regime.

Despite the fact that the *Journaal* items reported on the demonstrations from the objective, factual and distant viewpoint of the news, the images were charged with connotations of collective Muslim rage. In various shots the images are framed in ways that accentuate the collectivism of the crowd. The close-ups of individual demonstrators, in their turn, seem to be picked to stress their irrationality. The two news items both focus on individuals who burn books, carry a banner with hate speech, who loudly proclaim “Death to Rushdie” or state that Rushdie is the devil and should be murdered. These are also the images that have been highlighted by archival descriptions. Inevitably, the images evoke connotations of an Islamic threat that, as Said has argued, already has a long history:

In newsreels or newsphotos, the Arab is always shown in large numbers. No individuality, no personal characteristics or experiences. Most of the pictures represent mass rage and misery,
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420 *Journaal* (NOS, 03-03-1989). The item has been archived with the keyword: “Muslims” and “Demonstrations”. The description has highlighted the following shots: “slogans screaming young boy and women”, “Diverse statements by Muslims”. *Journaal* (NOS, 04-03-1989). This item has been archived with the key word “Muslims” and the description has highlighted the following shots: “the burning of a effigy”, “slogan: Death to Rushdie”, “demonstrating children”, “discussion with bystander”, “counter-demonstrant with T-shirt I am Rushdie”.
or irrational (hence hopelessly eccentric) gestures. Lurking behind all of these images is the menace of jihad. Consequence: a fear that the Muslims (or Arabs) will take over the world.

(Said, Orientalism: 287)

In Said’s view, this kind of imagery of Muslims is symptomatic for the media’s tendency to reduce Islam to a handful of generalizations. The depiction of Muslims as a furious anonymous mass of fanatics could be considered the visual equivalent of the linguistic undifferentiated treatment of Islam and promotes the idea that all Muslims are the same.

In this respect, it is striking that the voice-overs in the Journaal items hardly give any information about the background of the demonstrators. The items mention the number of “Muslims” (the item about The Hague) or “Muslims from various Islamic organizations” (the item about Rotterdam) that have gathered. None of the items differentiates between Shiite and Sunni Muslims, or between the various ethnic backgrounds of the demonstrators. So once again, despite the fact that the news items intend to give a neutral account of the demonstrations, their subject matter and imagery already have strong connotations that can easily activate a framework of reference in which Islam is a monolithic and dangerous religion.

Due to the fact that the Rushdie images differ in important aspects from the Televizier images, since the Rushdie images refer to a very specific and contested historical event that was widely covered by the media, that generated political debates about Islamic fundamentalism, and that has become a framework of reference in debates about fundamentalism and freedom of speech, my approach in the second part of this chapter differs slightly from the first. By tracing the Rushdie images through working memory, I investigate how the Rushdie affair in general has been re-appropriated throughout the years. While I still take the iterations of the images of the demonstrations in The Hague and Rotterdam as a starting point, I take a somewhat broader perspective and investigate the shifting historical trajectory of the media template of the Rushdie affair and its key images. Finally, this means that I not only look at the programs that have repeated the images of the demonstrations in The Hague and Rotterdam, but also at programs about the Rushdie affair (or programs that present the Rushdie affair as template) that have not repeated these very images of the Dutch context but other key images instead.
4.8 The Angry Muslim Mob as Fifth Column of Foreign Islamic Fundamentalism

During the remainder of 1989 and the rest of the nineties, the Rushdie images have predominantly been recycled by programs that reported on actualities both in the Netherlands and abroad during the lengthy aftermath of the affair. However, images of the demonstrations against Rushdie soon enough also began to appear in programs that did not specifically address the actual events of the Rushdie affair. During this period, as I established in chapter two, television privileged stories about integration issues such as Moroccan criminality, impoverished old city neighbourhoods, black schools and Dutch racism, and it began to address the issue of Islamic fundamentalism within Dutch borders, and of the emerged hostility towards and fear of Islam. In order to demonstrate how the Rushdie images circulated through living memory in this period, I first analyse some exemplary programs that directly referred to the actual events of the Rushdie affair and show how the Rushdie affair has gradually been condensed into a small amount of key images or “flashframes” (Hoskins 2004b). Then, I focus on a selection of programs that repeated the Rushdie images in more generic manners, and investigate how the Rushdie images operated in these instances.

Covering the Aftermath

During the nineties, the Rushdie images have often been repeated by programs that addressed the reaction of the Dutch government to the events, to the personal situation of Rushdie and to the annual commemoration of the fatwa. In these programs the Rushdie images have merely been repeated in archival compilations that look back at historical events. For example, the day after the demonstration in Rotterdam, the actuality program Achter het Nieuws opened with a compilation of images from the demonstration in Rotterdam: the man screaming “Death to Rushdie” through the megaphone, the two girls with headscarves, people carrying a “Death to Rushdie” banner, the man burning the effigy, the man hitting an image of the devil with his shoe, and the man who states that Rushdie should be murdered according to the sharia.421 Then the program begins and shows an interview with this very man who turns out to be Agha Mohsin, the secretary of the Pakistan Islamic Centre, the organization that initiated the demonstration in Rotterdam. Mohsin explains that his utterance about the necessity to kill Rushdie was merely meant in a

421 Achter het Nieuws (VARA, 05-03-1989).
symbolic way. Journalist Paul Witteman reacts ironically, points to the recent threat of a bookseller and the Dutch publisher of *De Duivelsverzen* (*The Satanic Verses*), and finally suggests that these kind of statements fuel needless xenophobia. What is interesting is that, even while the background of Mohsin is only addressed implicitly and the background of the other participants of the demonstration is not an issue, the program does not homogenize the entire community of Muslims. Witteman addresses Mohsin’s personal responsibility for stirring up racism, and the images of the anti-Rushdie demonstration seem to illustrate and underline this concern.

The NOS *Journaal* has also repeatedly recycled its own archival material during the aftermath of the affair. The day after the Rotterdam demonstration, *Journaal* dedicated an item to a statement of Mohammed Rabbæe, the director of the Centre for Foreigners, who publicly condemned the call for Rushdie’s murder. Images of the Rotterdam demonstration (the man shouting “Death to Rushdie” through the megaphone and the crowd walking through the city centre) open the item. The next day, *Journaal* reported on the debate that took place in parliament’s Lower Chamber in reply to the demonstrations. The item opens with a voice-over that says that the publication of *The Satanic Verses* has led to exceptional reactions that shocked the administration. Images of the demonstration in The Hague (the veiled women and crowd filmed from above) illustrate the voice-over. The rest of the item shows the debate in the Chamber and the announcement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs van Dijk that he invites all minority organisations for a conversation about our legal order and about the position of minorities in our country. Also, the *Journaal* item about this meeting held on 22 March opened with images of the demonstration in The Hague (of the man holding the burning book). It further shows images of the actual meeting, while a voice-over explains that the minister was quite satisfied with the meeting, because all the organizations that were present distanced themselves from the call to murder Rushdie.

Over the course of the nineties, various programs have shown the Rushdie images in short archival compilations placed alongside images from the transnational context to quickly contextualise new events. For example, in August 1989 an episode of *Achter het Nieuws* reported on a bomb explosion in a hotel in London that was probably an attempt on the life of Rushdie. The item opens with a triptych of archival footage: images of demonstrations against Rushdie in Iran and
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close-ups of Rushdie and ayatollah Khomeini are juxtaposed with images of the demonstration in Rotterdam (the screaming man, the girls with headscarves, the burning of the book and the man hitting the devil), and with images of the hotel after the explosion. Then the Dutch correspondent in London explains that Rushdie is still hiding and probably will never be able to lead a normal life again. The rest of the item is about Rushdie’s difficulties with being forced to live in isolation and losing his freedom to live a public life. In 1990, the actuality program Kenmerk dedicated an item to an interview with Rushdie.\textsuperscript{426} It opens with a compilation of archival images, accompanied by a voice-over: a close-up of Rushdie typing, images of demonstrations against him in Iran, Lebanon, and Germany, images of a bombed bookstore in New York, images of the bombed hotel in London, images of the demonstrations in The Hague and Rotterdam (the police officers trying to control the crowd, the man with the dummy, the man hitting the devil, the statements about the sharia), and images of ayatollah Khomeini. These kinds of template series began to be exemplary for the way television looked back at the Rushdie affair.

Gradually, the Rushdie affair was consolidated into a small variety of flashframes. In most of the template series no differentiation was made between the several demonstrations around the world, and the crowd of angry Muslims became a generic figure. This interchangeability of the various demonstrations against Rushdie is also reflected in some of the archival descriptions of the broadcast material. In 1991, for example, NOS Laat dedicated an item to Rushdie’s first appearance on television since the fatwa was issued.\textsuperscript{427} The item opens with a compilation of the familiar archival images: ayatollah Khomeini issuing the fatwa, demonstrations in Iran and Pakistan, and the demonstration in The Hague (the man holding the burning book). The rest of the item is dedicated to Rushdie’s television performance and to his conversion to Islam that he had announced two weeks earlier. The description of this episode has highlighted the following archival material: “Rushdie”, “Khomeini” and “demonstration against Rushdie by angry Muslims.” In this case, the visual unit of the “demonstration against Rushdie” thus refers to archival images of several demonstrations that took place in different parts of the world. Also in an episode of Nova on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of the fatwa in 1995, a similar archival sequence has been employed to open the item.\textsuperscript{428} The compilation shows images of the demonstration in The Hague (the man holding the burning book and the people

\textsuperscript{426} Kenmerk (IKON, 30-09-1990).
\textsuperscript{427} NOS Laat (NOS, 03-01-1991)
\textsuperscript{428} Nova (NPS, 13-02-1995).
holding the banner “Death to Rushdie”), a close-up of the cover of *The Satanic Verses*, images of riots in Pakistan, of the bombing of the New York bookstore, of a crowd of women in black chadors, of ayatollah Khomeini, of a crowd of angry people in Iran, of ayatollah Khamenei reconfirming the fatwa, and a close-up of Rushdie typing. The description of the dupes mentions, among others, “demonstrations against Rushdie”. Finally, also an 1996 episode of *Middageditie* on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the fatwa opened with a compilation of the familiar images: close-ups of the cover of *The Satanic Verses* and of Rushdie typing, images of the demonstration in The Hague (the banner “Death to Rushdie”), images of demonstrations elsewhere, of a crowd of women in black chadors and of ayatollah Khomeini. The archival description has summarized the sequence as follows: “Rushdie”, “cover of The Satanic Verses”, “demonstrating Muslims”, “Khomeini”. Again, the category of “demonstrating Muslims” emerged as an overarching classification for a variation of worldwide demonstrations, and was made easily repeatable by Sound and Vision’s descriptions.

Finally, also the programs that have not repeated the very archival images of the Dutch context, but images of demonstrations abroad (and the descriptions of these programs) display the high degree of iterativity of the figure of the crowd of angry Muslims. For example, in 1993, *Brandpunt* opened an item on the fourth anniversary of the fatwa with a sequence of footage of a book burning, of various demonstrations, of Khomeini issuing the fatwa, and of Rushdie typing, accompanied

---
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by ominous music. And in 1998, on the occasion of the eradication of the fatwa, Nova opened the item about Rushdie’s press conference with a historical review: a close-up of The Satanic Verses, footage of ayatollah Khomeini, of various demonstrations against Rushdie, and of the aftermath of the murders of the Japanese translator and the attempted murder of the Norwegian publisher. And again, the description mentions, among others, “demonstrating Muslims with banners”. Thus these programs show how, over the course of the nineties, a cluster of constantly repeated flashframes began to constitute the televisual iconography of the Rushdie affair, in which the images of the various different demonstrations seemed to have become substitutable.

The Rushdie images as illustration of Iranian (and other Islamic) peril

Whilst the Rushdie affair advanced, some television programs started to repeat the Rushdie images in episodes that revolved around the Iranian regime or around specific events in Iran. In June 1989, the images of the demonstration in Rotterdam for the first time reappeared in a program that did not specifically centre on the Rushdie affair. The actuality program Panoramiek broadcast an episode on the occasion of the death of Khomeini, and provided a historical review of the Iranian Revolution, the rise to power of Khomeini, and the events that took place during the ten years of his rule. It opens with images of Khomeini in hospital, and masses of mourning people in Teheran. Then a compilation of archival footage accompanied by a voice-over and grim music is shown to tell Iran’s recent history: footage of Khomeini in exile in Iraq and Paris, demonstrations against the Shah in Teheran, Khomeini’s return from exile, his return to Teheran, cheering crowds on the streets of Teheran, women in black chadors, and masses performing communal prayer. The voice-over explains that Khomeini has always been a fundamentalist Shiite who soon after his rise to power installed Shiite Islam as the state religion, forced women to wear traditional clothes, prohibited alcohol and began a campaign against homosexuals. It further states that he gradually increased his hold over the country

430 Brandpunt (KRO, 14-02-1993). The archival description has highlighted the following dupes: “protest of Muslims against Rushdie”, “call for murder of Rushdie by ayatollah Khomeini”, “Salman Rushdie working”.

431 Nova (NPS, 25-09-1998).

432 See for more examples of this televisual logic during the coverage of the aftermath: Paspoort (NOS, 10-03-1989), Fietsen door de jaren ’80 (VPRO, 16-7-1989), Alsof de duivel ermee speelt (IOS, 09-03-1989), Jaaroverzicht Journaal (NOS, 29-12-1989), Televizier (AVRO, 11-06-1990), TV Show (TROS, 27-02-2001).

433 Panoramiek (NOS, 4-6-1989).
by eliminating his political enemies (illustrated with footage of the hanging of members of the opposition) and that he finally annexed dictatorial power. Then the voice-over narrates about the hostage of the American embassy and “the holy war” that Khomeini waged against Iraq, intersected with archival footage of these events. The voice-over continues and states that this “holy war” was soon fought in other parts of the world such as Lebanon, and that many of the attacks in Lebanon have been executed by Shiite Muslims. This phrase is illustrated with images of bleeding people flagellating themselves on the streets of Beirut. These images clearly depict the celebration of the Shiite festivity of Ashura, but the voice-over denies us this information. Finally, the voice-over states that the call for Rushdie’s death is the most recent example of Iran’s interference in foreign countries. The historical review ends with a sequence of images of the demonstration in Rotterdam (people screaming “Death to Rushdie”, the veiled women, and the burning of the effigy) while the voice-over explains that also in the Netherlands fundamentalists demonstrated against Rushdie. During the rest of the episode, journalist Bertus Hendriks, a Middle East expert, speculates about Khomeini’s successor and about future developments in Iran.

Clearly, this episode of Panoramiek fits the general tendency of the media as identified by Said (1981) to depict the Iranian regime, and in particular ayatollah Khomeini, as the source of Islamic fundamentalism that is spreading over the world and is threatening our Western way of living. In the statement of the voice-over, the qualification of the Iranian regime as Shiite seems to be equivalent to fundamentalist. The grim music that accompanies the compilation of archival footage amplifies the assumed danger of the Iranian regime. And the denial of crucial information about the context of the images of people celebrating Ashura reinforces stereotypical connotations of Islamic irrationality. While in the coverage of the aftermath of the Rushdie affair Dutch demonstrators were implicitly depicted as being implicated in foreign fundamentalism – by the repeated juxtapositions of images of the Dutch context with images of the foreign context – in this episode of Panoramiek they have explicitly been depicted as puppets of ayatollah Khomeini, as a fifth column of the evil leader of Islamic fundamentalism. The images of the Rotterdam demonstration against Rushdie have been attached to many images that belong to what Karim H. Karim (2003: 68) has identified as “the set of visual
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434 Ashura is the festivity that closes the 11 days of mourning in the month Moeharram, during which the martyrdom of imam Hussein who died in Kerbala in 680 is commemorated. During Ashura people flagellate themselves to identify with Hussein.
signifiers in the transnational media imaginaries of “Islamic fundamentalism”. These include Muslim women wearing hijab, the figure of ayatollah Khomeini, people prostrating in Islamic prayer, domes of mosques, Arabic writing and children at Quran School. So in this episode of Panoramiek, the Rushdie images operate as evidence of the vast and sweeping reign of the fundamentalist Iranian regime in general and of Ayatollah Khomeini in particular.

In the documentary Night after the Revolution (Nachtf na de Revolutie), the Rushdie images operated according to a similar logic. The documentary revolves around the history of censorship and religious intolerance in Iran, and opens with a compilation of archival footage of several demonstrations and book burnings, a close-up of The Satanic Verses, images of riots, and of the demonstration in The Hague (the man holding the burning book, the man with the effigy, and the statements about jihad), accompanied by a voice-over that says that, although the West is shocked by the Rushdie affair, for Iranians it is but one of the many incidents and violations of human rights. The rest of the program portrays Iranian writers and artists who have been the victim of censorship by the Islamic clergy. Again, Dutch demonstrators against Rushdie have been portrayed as marionettes of the Iranian fundamentalist regime. The archival description of this documentary does not mention the Rushdie images, but instead it mentions: “throughout the program shots of rallies of fundamentalist Iranians”. So not only in the program itself but also in Sound and Vision’s descriptions, the several different rallies and demonstrations have become one distinct category of imagery.

Also various programs that have not repeated the archival images of the Dutch context but other transnational imagery of the Rushdie affair display this tendency to portray the demonstrators against Rushdie as a fifth column of the evil Iranian regime. For example, a few days after the demonstration in Rotterdam, the actuality program Tros Aktua dedicated an episode about the “origin of this Islamic rage”. Before it shows an interview with one of the organizers of the Rotterdam demonstration, Moshin, it first tells the history of ten years of Islamic revolution in Iran in an archival compilation with all the familiar images of ayatollah Khomeini’s return from exile, cheering crowds, women in black chadors, the Friday prayer, the hanging of members of the opposition, exteriors of mosques, the cover of The Satanic Verses. An episode of Achter het Nieuws about the death of ayatollah Khomeini has effectively demonized Khomeini in a very similar archival compilation
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of, among others, crowds carrying Khomeini’s portrait, Khomeini’s return from exile, executions, the typing Rushdie, and a rally of blackly veiled women carrying anti-Rushdie banners. These programs show how transnational imagery of the Rushdie affair has gradually become canonized as a visual signifier of Islamic fundamentalism, whose source is located in Khomeini’s Iran.

Finally, in an episode of Achter het Nieuws broadcast in 1990, the Rushdie affair operated as a speculative media template in an item about the Gulf War. The actuality item centres on Saddam Hussein’s call for a *jihad* against the United States. Before the item interviews professor Anton Wessels, who specializes in religion and Islamic studies, about the meaning of *jihad*, the item shows a template series of so-called historical precedents: images originating from a fiction film of the crusades, images of Rushdie typing, images of various demonstrations against Rushdie, and images of Saddam Hussein’s call for *jihad*. The accompanying voice-over states: “already last year it became clear what hazards Islamic extremism can cause (imagery of Rushdie affair), and that the holy war that Saddam has waged against the US thus means a serious threat, because fanatic Muslims, from the time of the crusades until the current time of Saddam Hussein, consider it an honour to die for their Allah.” So clearly, the images of demonstrations against Rushdie (as well as the images of the crusades) are used to interpret and explain the current events, they operate as proof of an ongoing problem, and as speculation on the future threats of Islam. The meaning of both the crusades and the Rushdie affair is taken completely for granted here, and the citation of these historical events already entails an interpretation of the events. Obviously, this item is a clear example of how media templates often reify historical determinism and how the historical analogies and associations that they establish often lead to a simplification of (historical) reality (Kitzinger 2000: 76). In this case, the result is a narrative in which the historical analogies are informed by very old stereotypical assumptions about Muslims, a narrative in which the complexity of the concept of *jihad* is completely disregarded, and finally, a narrative in which Saddam’s pragmatic reasons for calling his struggle a *jihad* have been ignored.
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The Rushdie images as warning sign against Dutch racism

During the nineties, the Rushdie images have been repeated as visual templates in various actuality programs that revolved around Dutch internal affairs. Strikingly, in this coverage the Rushdie images have often been employed to illustrate the source of the fear of Islam that had emerged in the Netherlands, and as a template that warned against the stigmatizing of the entire Dutch Muslim community. For example, in 1990 Brandpunt has dedicated an item to the forthcoming publication of The Decline of the Netherlands (De Ondergang van Nederland), the pamphlet written by the mystery figure of Mohammed Rasoel that warned against the dangers of Islam.\footnote{Brandpunt (KRO, 14-10-1990). I have described the Rasoel affair in chapter 2.} The episode opens with archival footage of the demonstration against Rushdie in Rotterdam, accompanied by the voice-over of the journalist Fons de Poel who states that everyone would probably remember these images, and then asks the question of whether the Netherlands is on the threshold of yet another affair. He explains that the pamphlet, that will be published this week, argues that Muslims will destroy Dutch culture within thirty years if the Netherlands remains so tolerant. He further says that the identity of the author is unknown, that he appears in public in disguise only, and that he explicitly assumes a Muslim identity, but might as well be your Dutch neighbour. After this introduction, de Poel interviews Gerard Timmer, the publisher of the book, and M. Ates, the director of the Turkish Islamic Federation in the studio. De Poel asks the publisher why he publishes a book that is openly racist, and he dismisses the publisher’s justification for publication – the freedom of speech – and states that he offers a platform to opinions for which Janmaat and LePen would not be ashamed. Ates then states that the book is a racist provocation and that the publisher is trying to create the Dutch Rushdie. De Poel ends the item with a final statement, saying that if the book is meant as a contribution to the discussion about fundamentalism, it has failed completely, because it is oversimplified and simply racist.

This item of Brandpunt thus clearly takes a position that opposes the book’s generalizations of Islam, and the book’s homogenization and stigmatizing of the
entire Muslim community. Here, the Rushdie images operate as a speculative template: as an illustration of what could possibly happen if this racist book would be published, and as a warning sign against possible new and unnecessary societal upheaval. Again, the meaning of the Rushdie affair is taken for granted, and the fuzzy historical analogy that is instigated here between the artist Rushdie who wrote a fictional novel and the unknown writer of a deliberate provocation is used to underline the program’s aversion of the intentional provocation of Muslims, and to warn against the possible turmoil that these kinds of provocations can fuel.

In an item of *NOS Laat*, broadcast a couple of years later, about the publication of the BVD report that concluded that fundamentalism of Muslims abroad can spread to the Netherlands, the Rushdie images operated according to a similar logic. The item opens with a voice-over that explains that the BVD report has designated the radicalisation of Muslims as a serious threat to state security, that this is the first time that the BVD makes public one of its reports, that the Chamber is quite shocked by this new openness and that the report raises the question of whether the BVD is seeking a new enemy now that the Cold War has ended. Then the item shows the extremely critical reaction of Dijkstal, a MP for the Liberal Party, who states that the BVD is just trying to market itself with this report. The voice-over adds that the Christian Party is also very critical, because “it would too quickly recall images like this”. Now a lengthy sequence of images of the demonstration in The Hague is shown, accompanied by the voice-over that explains that this was a demonstration of Muslim fundamentalists that supported the call for Rushdie’s death. The compilation of Rushdie images is followed by an interview with the spokesperson of the Christian Party, who states that it is dangerous to stigmatize our fellow Islamic citizens only because of developments in foreign countries and that the report consequently runs the risk of generating hostility against a group of our population. Then Dijkstal asserts that the BVD abuses our internal debate about *allochtonen*, and that these internal affairs have nothing to do with foreign terrorism. The item ends with an interview with Ates, who dismisses the report as complete nonsense that stirs up racist feelings and that creates an atmosphere of hostility.

So again, the Rushdie images have been recycled by a program that takes a critical stance against the stigmatization of the Islamic religion and its worshippers. Here, the Rushdie images function as a retrospective template. And although the item explicitly refers to the images as depicting a demonstration against Rushdie, it certainly also employs the Rushdie images as an illustration of the generic figure of Muslims.

angry demonstrating Muslims. Revealingly, instead of activating the existing connotations of the images, the program uses the images to deconstruct the very myth of the mob of angry, irrational and fanatic Muslims, to reflect on the stereotypical imagery of Muslims, and to dismiss the fear for Muslims as ungrounded.

In 1993, the Rushdie images were repeated by the NOS series *Islam in the Netherlands* to mark the moment that the fear of Dutch Muslims emerged in the Netherlands. This episode revolves around the wide variety of Muslim organizations that exist in the Netherlands. It opens with a compilation of the familiar archival footage of several rallies in Iran during the Iranian revolution and images of ayatollah Khomeini, while the voice-over states that spectacular foreign events had already led to a negative impression of Islam. Then the images of Iran dissolve into images of the anti-Rushdie demonstration in Rotterdam (the man carrying Khomeini’s portrait, the man screaming “Death to Rushdie”, and the burning of the dummy), while the voice-over continues and says that this aversion to Islam worsened, when in 1989 Dutch Muslims called for Rushdie’s death on the streets of Rotterdam. The voice-over explains that the Rushdie affair lead to the foundation of the *Islamitisch Landelijk Comité*; an overarching organization that publicly condemned Rushdie’s death warrant. The rest of the episode shows interviews with spokesmen of various Muslim organizations. So here, the demonstrations against Rushdie have been depicted as the result of the influence of foreign fundamentalism, which marks the rise of Islam’s bad reputation in the Netherlands.

The tendency of television to reuse the Rushdie images to warn against stigmatizing the Dutch Muslim community can also be detected in an episode of the talk show *Babylon*, broadcast in 1999, about the efforts of Turkish inhabitants of Sliedrecht to found a mosque, a struggle that already had been going on for six years. The talk show is set in the Sultan Ahmet Mosque in Zaandam, where various supporters and opponents of the founding of a mosque in Sliedrecht have gathered. The presenter of the talk show first interviews various opponents, mainly strict Christians who have religious motives to fight the plans. Then the program shows a compilation of archival footage to contextualize the current fear of Islam. It opens with black and white images of the pilgrimage to Mecca, accompanied by Oriental music, and a voice-over that says that these are impressive images from a country
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very far and away, and that by now Islam has also reached the Netherlands (images of the Taibah mosque in the Bijlmer), which has led to discontent about issues such as the headscarf, *halal* slaughter, and Islamic schools (images of women with headscarves on the street, and of an Islamic school), and to the emergence of rigid stereotypes. It says that time after time Islam has been given a yellow card by the tolerant Dutch, and that a true fear of Islam emerged as a result of the Rushdie affair. A sequence of images of the demonstrations in The Hague is shown, followed by footage of demonstrations in Iran. The voice-over explains that a mass gathering of the Turkish organization Milli Görus was the next event that triggered the fear that Muslims were flooding the Netherlands. The compilation ends with the statement that some politicians use the fear of Islam to profile themselves, illustrated with images of a speech by Bolkestein. Then the talk show continues, and Arabist Hans Jansen gives his expertise on the matter. He rejects the notion of a clash of civilizations and asserts that there is no reason to fear Muslims in the Netherlands, because they do not tend to support fundamentalism.445

This episode of *Babylon* clearly takes a stance against the dangers of hackling an entire religion and aims to generate more understanding and tolerance towards Islam. Again, the Rushdie images, put together with footage of demonstrations abroad, have been used to mark the moment that Islam became an object of popular panic and the moment that Dutch fear of Islam began to emerge. The existing connotations of the images have been employed to visually illustrate the verbal commentary that addresses the widespread idea that Muslims are flooding the country. The images of the rallies of angry Muslims – both in the Netherlands and abroad – must illustrate the source of the popular fear of Islam, a fear that the program clearly deconstructs as ungrounded and unnecessary. So this episode of *Babylon* is yet another example of television’s tendency to frame Islamic fundamentalism as a mainly foreign problem during the nineties, and to employ the Rushdie images to argue that these events should not result in an ungrounded fear of Dutch Muslims.

445 After the murder of van Gogh he radically changed his opinion and became one of the leading experts who advocated anti-Islam sentiments, he became a personal advisor of Geert Wilders, and recently he became a candidate for Wilders party PVV in the European Parliament.
4.9 The re-appropriation of the Rushdie affair after 9/11 and the murder of Theo van Gogh

In the first decade of the new millennium, the meaning that television ascribed to the Rushdie affair began to shift radically. While in the nineties, the Rushdie images circulated mainly in televisual narratives about foreign (mainly Iranian) Islamic peril on the one hand, and about the ungrounded fear of Dutch Muslims on the other hand, in the 2000s the Rushdie images attained new meanings, as the affair was used to interpret several unfolding events. In this period of rupture after 9/11 and the murder of van Gogh, the predominant themes that ran through the television coverage of Islam were the radicalizations of young Muslims, homegrown terrorism, hate-preaching imams, and the failure of integration of Muslims. Several television programs now referred to the Rushdie affair as the historical precedent of new affairs, in which the freedom of speech and Muslim rights came head to head, such as in the debates about Submission and the Danish Cartoon crisis. The significance of the Rushdie affair was retrospectively reframed as the earlier hurdle that preceded what Hirsi Ali and van Gogh had come to face. In this period the Rushdie affair began to categorically operate as a media template.

The Rushdie affair as a history lesson and a fortune-teller

The first case that I look at in detail is an episode of Andere Tijden about the Rushdie affair, broadcast in 2004, three weeks after the assassination of van Gogh.446 As I mentioned earlier, Andere Tijden is a history magazine that is recorded in the archive of Sound and Vision and that draws archival material from its holdings. This episode is obviously heavily informed by the current crisis of the aftermath of the murder of van Gogh and pinpoints the Rushdie affair as the beginning of the rise of fundamentalism among Dutch Muslims. In order to disclose how this episode of Andere Tijden has reframed the Rushdie affair, I provide a close reading of the episode, in which I look at the selection of archival material that is used to tell the story and the framework of reference that is invoked by the voice-over of Hans Goedkoop.

In the opening sequence of the episode, Goedkoop introduces the topic by drawing a parallel between the debate in the Chamber about the law against scornful blasphemy (smalende godslastering) – a debate that was invoked after the murder of van Gogh – and the events of the Rushdie affair. He then states that at the

end of the eighties, we could not imagine that we would ever have to be frightened of Muslims in our country. He explains: “For weren’t we doing our best for them? We gave them a job or an allowance, we increasingly treated them as fellow citizens, and since 1986 they were even allowed to vote for the municipal elections, and politicians tried to reach them in person”. This phrase is illustrated with an excerpt of Televizier (1986), that shows minister Brinkman visiting a mosque in Amsterdam and that shows an infomercial in which prime-minister Lubbers, in Arabic, calls on everyone to vote. Then Goedkoop’s voice-over continues, illustrated with generic images of women with headscarves at a market and with other street shots with allochtonen. He continues:

Use your vote; participate, even if you don’t speak a word of Dutch. That’s how we all thought about it in these days. You didn’t mention the lack of language skills of allochtonen, you didn’t even address them as allochtoon, because that was stigmatizing, and we had already experienced with the Jews during the war what that could lead to. However, the result of all this goodwill was that we weren’t aware of the opinions that were held in this community, we thought on behalf of Muslims instead of with them, and we only discovered what a mistake that was after the publication of The Satanic Verses.

Images of riots in Pakistan and India are shown, and the voice-over concludes the introduction with the statement that all of a sudden the unthinkable happened: the Muslim rage spread to Europe.

After this opening address, the program elaborates on the course of events in the United Kingdom and in the Netherlands. Interviews with the Dutch translator (unrecognizable), with the publisher of The Satanic Verses, with the Dutch writer Adriaan van Dis, with imam van Bommel, and with the former minister of internal affairs van Dijk are contrasted with archival footage of demonstrations and book burnings in Bradford, images of an interview with Rushdie by van Dis, images of Khomeini issuing the fatwa, a lengthy sequence of the Journaal images of the demonstrations in The Hague and Rotterdam, and an excerpt of the Achter het Nieuws interview with Mohsin. The voice-over then narrates the story of the threatening of a Dutch bookseller, of the attacks on the Norwegian and Italian publishers, and of the murder of the Japanese translator, illustrated with archival images of these events. Finally, the episode cuts back to Goedkoop in the studio, who directly addresses the viewer, and says that the police surveillance that the
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447 The archival description incorrectly says: “Prime-minister Lubbers addressing the Turkish community in Turkish”.
Dutch translator was subjected to was quite unprofessional and that there was not much public support for her. He continues:

Unlike in the current situation, the idea was to not expose the threatened people to the media, and to keep quiet and calm. The consequence was, however, that we didn’t realize what exactly was happening. And of course the Dutch translator might have not been Khomeini’s main target. Probably, it didn’t even really revolve around Rushdie. Khomeini had just seized the occasion to promote his Islamic revolution, and his fatwa against foreigners had a mainly domestic purpose. So soon enough, the Rushdie affair faded from public attention, and we all got down to business as usual – except for a few people who feared that we had not yet got rid of this issue.

The last part of episode revolves around the lengthy aftermath of the Rushdie affair, and around the activities of the Rushdie committee that was founded five years after the fatwa by Adriaan van Dis. Van Dis explains that they have always aimed to have a dialogue with Dutch Muslims and to avoid criminalizing them. Generic images of women with a hijab walking along houses with satellite dishes illustrate the voice-over that talks about the activities of the Rushdie committee. After an account of the final eradication of the fatwa, the episode ends with a concluding reflection from Goedkoop: “even 15 years later, caution is needed, (...) and Rushdie will probably always need protection for the rest of his life. And this might foretell something about Ayaan Hirsi Ali’s future. And it certainly makes the story of this episode somewhat painful. Even when people among us were actually threatened – a simple translator – we have not wanted to face what could be awaiting us.” So clearly, this episode of Andere Tijden has framed the Rushdie affair as the historical precedent of the current crisis that is the result of the murder of van Gogh.

Already in the opening sequence, Goedkoop draws a parallel between the current situation and the events of the past, and he continues to do so during every intervention he makes when he directly addresses the audience to tell us exactly how we should interpret this history lesson. The ‘us-them’ rhetoric of the opening sequence constructs the Dutch nation as hospitable, generous and – in retrospect – slightly naïve and it homogenizes the entire Muslim community. The archival material of Brinkman visiting the mosque and of Lubbers speaking Arabic must illustrate and underline the goodwill of the Dutch towards “the Muslim community” and the “allochtoon”. Alternative interpretations of what these archival images depict are disregarded (for example, the material might as well show the opportunism of politicians who were trying to win the vote of this new electorate, or the ignorance of the Dutch government of the fact that most Dutch Moroccans
speak Berber instead of Arabic). So already in the opening sequence, the tone is set, and the history lesson to be learned here seems to be: how could we have been so blind to the threat of the Muslim community in our country.

This moralizing tone persists through the rest of the episode. The episode shows all the familiar key images of television’s visual repertoire of the Rushdie affair, and the focus of the narration is on the threats of the Dutch translator. When Goedkoop intervenes for the second time and talks about the detached and inadequate reactions towards these threats, he once again lectures that we have failed to see what was actually happening. In the last part of the episode, Goedkoop employs the Rushdie affair very explicitly as a speculative template, as he uses the past events to predict Hirsi Ali’s future. Again, he accuses “us” of blindness: we did not only refuse to see what was actually happening then, but moreover we refused to see what was lying ahead of us. So now the Rushdie affair becomes the history lesson that we should have learnt, but failed to do so. Clearly, the episode marks the Rushdie affair as the moment that Islamic fundamentalism rose within our borders and that events escalated for the first, but not the last time. Furthermore, the episode reasons that our blindness in the past finally culminated in the murder of van Gogh. Yet again, this shows how media templates often reify historical determinism and teleology, and “filter out dissenting accounts, camouflage conflicting facts and promote one type of narrative” (Kitzinger 2000: 76). The historical analogy that is instigated here surely, I would argue, disregards the complexities of both the historical and current events, hides the many differences between them, and finally results in a form of history writing that is heavily informed by anxieties, obsessions and stereotyped suppositions of the present.

The Rushdie affair as a retrospective media template
In the IKON series Vriend and Vijand broadcast in 2005, the Rushdie affair is retrospectively framed according to a similar logic.448 The episode entitled the “Thunderstorm from the East”, centres on the figure of the Eastern enemy throughout the century and draws a line from Germans and communists to Muslims. It opens with an interview of a Turkish imam who participated in the demonstrations against Rushdie, contrasted with a sequence of images of the anti-Rushdie demonstration in The Hague. A video-editor and the director comment on the images (mainly of the various statements by demonstrators about Rushdie) and criticize the account of the imam who explains why Rushdie had insulted the

448 Vriend en Vijand (IKON, 30-08-2005).
prophet. While watching the images, they draw a parallel between the Rushdie affair and the crisis that followed the broadcast of Submission, they discuss the freedom of speech, and finally they state that fanatic believers are the real danger that haunts our society. Then, the program cuts back to the more distant past and addresses the period in which Germans and later communists constituted the enemy. After that, a sequence of BVD surveillance images of communists dissolves into a sequence of images of women wearing hijab and a man wearing a djellaba, accompanied by Quran singing, while the two commentators talk about the difficulties of identifying the exact enemies. Then a compilation of images of several terrorist attacks throughout Europe is shown, after which the Turkish imam states that the people who have committed these attacks do not deserve to be called Muslim. The commentators thereupon conclude that the imam is in denial, and that – because we want to hold on to a positive image of Muslims – we say that the people who have committed these attacks are inhuman instead of Muslim. The episode ends with flashframes of the murder of van Gogh, accompanied by a final statement of the commentators who say that once again we are confronted with fanatics, from whom we should protect our constitutional state.

So again, the Rushdie affair operates as a retrospective template that foreshadows the fate of van Gogh. The historical meaning of the affair is taken for granted and no contextual information or temporal reference is provided. Despite the fact that this program aims to deconstruct the figure of the Eastern enemy throughout a century, I would argue that above all it constitutes Islam (or “the fanatic Muslim”) as the current enemy. Once more, the televisual logic at work here – the suggestive editing sequences of archival images of terrorist attacks, the parading of the stereotyped images of Muslims on the street, the historical analogies that are drawn – results in a history lesson that supports rather than deconstructs a polarized discourse of us versus them, and Dutch versus Muslim.

In the years following the murder of van Gogh, several actuality programs and talk shows verbalized an analogy between Rushdie and Hirsi Ali. Besides, several programs have mentioned the Rushdie affair when covering unfolding events such as the Danish Cartoon crisis. These are – although beyond the scope of my project – telling examples of how the template of the Rushdie affair has encouraged a

449 The reuse is so generic that the description mentions: “diverse attacks by Islamic extremists”.
450 The description mentions: “the body of Theo van Gogh covered with a white blanket”.
451 For example: Nova (NOS, 20-11-2004), Tegenlicht (VPRO, 23-01-2005), Nova (NOS, 26-08-2006), Nova (NOS, 01-10-2007), Pauw & Witteman (VARA, 11-02-2008).
452 For example: Nova (NOS, 06-02-2006).
particular interpretation or even explanation of these unfolding events. Here, only the mentioning of the name “Rushdie” produces an array of associations related to Islamic fundamentalism and the violation of freedom of speech. Before concluding this section, I have a closer look at a few more programs that have not only verbalized but also visualized the Rushdie affair as a historical precedent of current affairs (albeit not with images of the Dutch context) by parading key images of the Rushdie affair in template series that are so typical for the current televisual logic of covering news events through its own archival prism, and for television’s ability to visually link multiple times, events and places.

Two weeks after the events of 9/11, the actuality program Twee Vandaag dedicated an item to “the ABC of Islam”. The item alternates several template series that revolve around an Islamic concept – such as jihad and fatwa – with an interview with the Dutch imam Haselhoef who explains the meaning of these concepts. The template series of jihad involves images of speeches of Bin Laden, and of representatives of Saddam Hussein and Hamas, and flashframes of 9/11, accompanied by gloomy music. The template series of fatwa contains images of Khomeini proclaiming Rushdie’s death sentence, close-ups of The Satanic Verses and the Quran, the typing Rushdie and shouting crowds of Muslims. So here, the Rushdie affair is used yet again as a historical precedent of ongoing problems, and now becomes retrospectively associated with 9/11 and the issue of Islamic terrorism.

What is problematic, I would suggest, about these kinds of suggestive template series is that, despite the fact that imam Haselhoef tries to explain the complexity of such Islamic concepts, and argues that Bin Laden abuses them, the interplay of the archival stock footage results in an oversimplified and stereotyped illustration of what according to this item’s “ABC” belongs to the essence of Islam. The archival images seem to be repeated because they are so instantaneously recognizable, and this kind of reuse results in a reinforcement of the stereotypes of Muslim rage that are associated with these images.

---

Television’s tendency to use retrospective template series to quickly contextualize and interpret current events can also be found in an item of NOVA, broadcast in 2007, about the foundation of the ‘committee for ex-Muslims’ by Ehsan Jami. Jami is interviewed in the studio about his apostasy. Then Arabist Hans Jansen gives his expert opinion about the dangers of openly leaving the Islamic faith, and designates Rushdie as one of the very first cases. This is illustrated with a template series that contains images of Khomeini announcing Rushdie’s death sentence, demonstrations against Rushdie, images of Hirsi Ali, of a Norwegian ex-Moslima, of an Egyptian ex-Muslim, and of the Dutch-Iranian Islam critic Ahsfin Elian. And in an item of NOVA broadcast a few months later, revolving around a small controversy about the director of a museum in The Hague who refuses to exhibit photographs that associate the prophet Muhammad with homosexuality, a retrospective template series is used to give earlier examples of artworks that have provoked Muslims. It contains the familiar images of Rushdie typing, a close-up of The Satanic Verses, an excerpt from Submission and images of the Danish Cartoon crisis. Finally, also in these cases, stock images of the Rushdie affair are used as points of reference without a caption or further explanation of the time and context of their filming. This kind of reuse above all activates their stereotypical connotations of Muslim rage, intolerance and disrespect for the freedom of speech.

454 Nova (NOS, 02-05-2007).
455 Nova (NOS, 07-12-2007).
Concluding Remarks

Where in the first part of this chapter I demonstrated how a sequence of ordinary television images have been canonized through their constant repetition, in this part I focused on the iterations of television images that refer to a very specific historical event. I revealed how the Rushdie images, which were already instantly burdened with connotations of Islamic rage and fundamentalism, have circulated through working memory and have re-entered in new times and contexts. I showed that during the nineties television condensed the transnational Rushdie affair into a set of compulsively repeated key images and demonstrated that television had begun to use images of various different demonstrations against Rushdie without differentiation. Furthermore, I have shown that in the nineties television repeated the Rushdie images in narratives about foreign Islamic fundamentalism on the one hand, and in narratives about the dangers of stigmatizing the Dutch Muslim community on the other. Strikingly, this framing of Islamic fundamentalism as a foreign problem and the depiction of the demonstrators against Rushdie as puppets of ayatollah Khomeini abruptly came to an end after the traumatic event of van Gogh’s murder. The meaning of the Rushdie images was subject to a radical contextual shift, as the Rushdie images began to systematically operate as a media template that offered an ignored history lesson. The Rushdie images now started to function as a trope of the Netherlands losing its innocence for the first time, and this kind of reuse sustained and amplified the discourse of the threat of Islamic terror.
Obviously, despite the fact that the Rushdie images have a degree of historical specificity that the Televizier images lack, their operation is quite similar. Both have often been reused without temporal reference and verbal explanation in typical televisual sequences in which the past has been reassembled as a series of memorable image fragments. The Televizier images have often been used to open up historical reflection and to counter hegemonic integration discourse. While in the nineties various programs reused the Rushdie images to deconstruct the stereotype of the angry Muslim mob, after the murder of van Gogh they rather began to be used as a window of comparison between past, present and future, and constructed a closed condensed narrative of Muslim rage and disrespect for Western values such as the freedom of expression. After the murder of van Gogh television mainly recycled the Rushdie images as visual templates that reinforced stereotypes associated with the images, which inhibited alternative frames of reference, and often resulted in a reductive view of historical causality. As the Rushdie affair was retold through the prism of present anxieties, its meaning was retrospectively reshaped – despite the many asymmetries between past and present – into the historical precedent of current problems. The Rushdie template now provided leverage to the idea that the past Dutch reaction to the Rushdie affair has been a mistake that should not be repeated, and that the threat of radical Islam should finally be taken seriously.

Finally, both the reiterations of the Televizier images and the Rushdie images have shown how television is inclined to crystallize memory of the past around certain images that it compulsively repeats at the exclusion of others. Both examples have shown that television’s dominant mode of visualizing the past is through a montage of archival images that connects multiple times and places, without an account of the selection and juxtaposition of the images. Both examples exposed how television is constantly reshaping the past through the prism of the present. Lastly, both examples illustrated that recurrently used images often become stereotyped symbols of the past. And since the single male guest worker has transformed into a Muslim during the last decade, the symmetrical inverted figures of the single male guest worker and the angry Muslim mob have begun to circulate through programs with similar thematic patterns and with similar stock footage of the recent perils of Islam. In the coda that follows, I look at a recently broadcast historical series that featured both the Televizier images and the Rushdie images. This time, instead of focussing only on television’s remembrance of the past, I finally also reflect on its forgetting.