



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Cultural corporatism and the COC: gay and lesbian social movement advocacy in the Netherlands and Dutch political culture, 1986-1994

Davidson, R.J.

Published in:
Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies

DOI:
[10.5117/TVGN2015.2.DAVI](https://doi.org/10.5117/TVGN2015.2.DAVI)

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Davidson, R. J. (2015). Cultural corporatism and the COC: gay and lesbian social movement advocacy in the Netherlands and Dutch political culture, 1986-1994. *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies*, 18(2), 153-172.
<https://doi.org/10.5117/TVGN2015.2.DAVI>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Cultural Corporatism and the COC

Gay and Lesbian Social Movement Advocacy in the Netherlands and Dutch Political Culture, 1986-1994

Robert J. Davidson

TVGN 18 (2): 153–172

DOI: 10.1557/TVGN2015.2.DAVI

Abstract

Debates on gay and lesbian advocacy in the Netherlands have often revolved around the role of the political culture of pillarisation in facilitating or hindering the gay and lesbian (GL) social movement. Pillarisation ended, however, just as the GL movement was beginning to gain momentum. In this article, gay and lesbian advocacy is examined from 1986-1994, during which the government engaged in designing a national policy to combat anti-homosexual discrimination. After describing the transition from a political cultural of pillarisation to one of corporatism, I will investigate the extent to which corporatism was extended to the gay and lesbian social movement and structured relations between the government and the gay and lesbian social movement. Last, I will examine the ways in which a political culture of corporatism affected gay and lesbian advocacy. In extending corporatism to the GL social movement, the government created strong partners with whom policy could be negotiated and developed. Incorporation empowered some GL SMOs and secured their 'place at the table'. Once incorporated into the formal political arena, the SMOs were able to achieve a number of policy advancements, but they also had to compete with much stronger players. Despite the strong position of some GL SMOs, and the COC in particular, some political party opposition to the GL movement resulted in the GL movement's failure to achieve its most central goal.

Keywords: social movements, gay and lesbian Politics, the Netherlands, political culture, corporatism, cultural corporatism, neo-corporatism, civil society

While the Dutch gay and lesbian¹ social movement was successful in securing from the government an active national policy to fight anti-homosexual discrimination in the 1980s, gay and lesbian advocacy since the 1970s has largely been ignored by scholars of Dutch gay and lesbian activism. The fact that coordinated anti-discrimination policy was developed in relation to gay and lesbian issues in the 1980s is itself somewhat surprising. In many other countries similar policies would only be developed much later. Even within the Netherlands it is surprising that a new policy terrain would be established and financed during a period generally characterised by budget cuts and austerity measures. Additionally, during all of the years of the first wave of coordinated policy on homosexuality (1986-1992), the prime minister was a Christian Democrat (Ruud Lubbers), and the largest party in parliament was the Christian Democratic Party (CDA).

Another surprising element of the policy is the degree to which organisations of the gay and lesbian movement were involved in the policy's development and execution. That policy was developed with close contact and even partnership with civil society, as some of the organisations of the gay and lesbian movement were involved in its development and execution. That model of civil society engagement is very different from the way in which the governments of most other countries interacted with civil society. Duyvendak (1996) describes the ways in which the French government, for instance, was unwilling to listen to the policy demands of gay and lesbian activists, particularly in relation to HIV/AIDS. In contrast, the relations between gay and lesbian civil society and the government in the Netherlands seem to have been more cooperative than competitive.

The engagement of civil society (organisations) by the Dutch government is not unique to the gay and lesbian political minority. Elements of the feminist movement and the (post-)migrant movement were also institutionalised and subsidised by the government and were consulted in the development of policy. The inclusion of the organisations of some political minorities has been a part of Dutch political culture throughout the 20th century. The specific form taken by political culture and the specific ways in which government relations with political minorities were structured, however, shifted through time. Political culture 'defines and explains or questions the rules of the political game, and at the normative level it justifies or denies the authority of those who play it and of the institutions within which the players interact' (Aronoff, 2001, p. 11640). In line with De Rooy (2014), political cultures here will not be compared between countries. Instead, the focus will be on shifts in political culture within one national context.

Pillarisation and the gay and lesbian movement

The so-called 'politics of accommodation', associated with the political culture of pillarisation, has received extensive attention in the literature on Dutch political culture. Some scholars have specifically examined the ways in which the political culture of pillarisation related to and structured advocacy by the gay and lesbian political minority. The late 19th century until the 1960s (Kennedy, 1995; Kickert, 2003) was characterised by a political culture known as 'pillarisation'. During that period, Dutch society was made up of four dominant social groups (Protestants, Catholics, socialists, and liberals), all of which were minorities. In the absence of a majority, political scientists wondered how the Netherlands was able to function with such a relatively high level of democratic stability instead of existing in a state of constant conflict between the minority factions (Lijphart, 1969).

The solution was found in the embrace of the goal that elites would work together and compromise with each other in order to reach agreement instead of remaining in a state of competition and conflict. Political elites were pragmatic in their interactions and negotiations with each other; they did their best to avoid alienating any party or making enemies, as they would perhaps have to work together with that party in a future coalition. In the interest of future collaboration, a number of strategies were developed to facilitate compromise when possible and to depoliticise when compromise proved too difficult (see Andeweg & Irwin, 2005, p. 32).

That style of government has received a number of names. In the English language it is often termed the 'politics of accommodation' (Lijphart, 1968), as the 'Big 4' minority groups and their interests were accommodated and respected in the interest of keeping the peace. In the Dutch language that governmental style is more commonly referred to as 'pacification democracy'² (Duyvendak, Koopmans, van der Heijden, & Wijmans, 1992), as the goal of the accommodation of minority interests was the pacification of the socio-political groups and the prevention of conflict that would be socially, economically, and politically disruptive.

Several scholars have investigated the relationship between the political culture of pillarisation and the gay and lesbian movement. Tielman (1982) argued that pillarisation was particularly helpful to gay and lesbian advocacy, because it facilitated elite-level negotiation; by negotiating with political elites behind closed doors, the gay and lesbian movement was shielded from the (assumed negative) effects of public opinion. Wansink (1985) challenged Tielman's position, arguing that pillarisation strength-

ened confessional political parties that were (at least until the 1980s) overwhelmingly conservative with respect to homosexuality and almost completely opposed to the demands of the GL SM. Hekma and Duyvendak (2011) side more with Wansink (1985) in arguing that the demise of pillarisation and the rise of secularisation facilitated gay and lesbian political demands. Schuyf and Krouwel (1999) add that, through the politics of accommodation and elite negotiation, GL civil society and the COC³ in particular were able to harness resources from the Dutch state.

Regardless of whether elite negotiation or religious political opposition had the largest impact on the gay and lesbian social movement, the analysis of the authors cited is focused on pillarisation. They end their analyses before a phase of far greater GL cooperation with the government would take place (1986-1992), during which the Dutch national government engaged in coordinated policy on homosexuality. That coordinated policy would be developed and executed within a different political culture, as both Lijphart (1969) and Kennedy (1995) argue that pillarisation had already broken down or was in the process of breaking down in the 1960s.

New 'rules of the political game'

While the social pillars of pillarisation withered throughout the 1960s, the representation of minority political interests was somewhat expanded from the 1970s to include the representation of some issues that arose from the shift to post-materialism (Inglehart, 1981) and some of the political groups that followed in the footsteps of the 'new social movements' (Duyvendak, 1995; Kriesi, Koopmans, Duyvendak, & Giugni, 1995). The new manner of minority political representation was corporatism.

Corporatism is essentially a particular style of institutionalised interest representation and is not a particularly Dutch phenomenon but a style of governance employed in many countries (Esping-Andersen, 1990). According to Schmitter:

Corporatism can be defined as a system of interest representation in which the constituent units are organized into a limited number of singular, compulsory, noncompetitive, hierarchically ordered and functionally differentiated categories, recognized or licensed (if not created) by the state and granted a deliberate representational monopoly within their respective categories in exchange for observing certain controls on their selection of leaders and articulation of demands and supporters. (1974, pp. 93-94)

Andeweg and Irwin add to this definition by highlighting that corporatism is, 'an empirical relationship between interest groups and the government that is based on exchange (influence for support), and on cooperation [between interest groups and government] rather than competition' (2005, p. 149).

Studies of corporatism have primarily focused on economic relations, in which the government acts as a broker between employers' organisations and unions to ensure compromise and agreement instead of friction and strikes (Visser & Hemerijck, 1997). A few authors have also paid attention to the ways in which corporatism was extended to political minority groups. Regarding the incorporation of political minorities outside of the unions and employers' organisations, the government usually did not act as a broker but directly engaged with the organisations that were meant to represent minority interests to the government. Andeweg and Irwin describe government-civil society relations under corporatism in the following way:

Pressure groups no longer observe their definitional limits of organizations attempting to influence governmental policy-making *from the outside*, without taking part in the decision-making or accepting responsibility for the resulting policies; instead, organized interests are incorporated into the policy-making process and defend the outcomes to their members. The theoretical boundaries between the roles played by political parties and by interest groups are blurred. (2005, p. 149, emphasis in original)

Several authors have mapped the ways in which corporatism was extended to specific political minorities. In a study of the ways in which women were represented on consultative councils to the government in the Netherlands, Oldersma (1996) uses the term 'neo-corporatism' to describe the relations between the government and civil society. Oldersma explains that 'this incorporation extends so far that interest groups are given administrative responsibility. There is often also an exchange relationship: policy concessions in exchange for the group's support of the policy' (1996, p. 22).

In work on the institutionalisation of the (post-)migrant movement in the Netherlands, Musch (2009) re-framed neo-corporatism as 'cultural corporatism' to make the distinction from economic corporatism more explicit and to highlight the cultural aspect of structuring the representation of the interests of particular social groups in ways that are (to a degree) formalised by the state and institutionalised. Musch (2009) examined the ways in which 'ethnic minority' group representation in the Netherlands

was structured in ways that met with many of Schmitter's criteria of corporatism: the representative organisations were partly created by the state, compulsory, non-competitive, and hierarchically ordered. Musch (2009) studied the umbrella organisation institutionalised to represent (post-)migrant interests, the National Advisory and Consultation Structure of Minorities Policy (LAO)⁴, and showed that the LAO had a formalised relationship to the government and could 'give solicited and unsolicited advice to the minister' (2009, p. 6). Additionally, the organisations that formed the LAO were initially encouraged by the government to formally organise.

While corporatism has been examined in relation to the women's movement and the (post-)migrant movements, the effects of corporatism on the gay and lesbian movement have been overwhelmingly ignored. That is surprising, given the fact that organisations of the gay and lesbian movement were consulted in the development of coordinated policy on homosexuality and explicitly mentioned in those policy documents. A few scholars have briefly mentioned the relationship between some organisations of the gay and lesbian movement and the Dutch government between the mid-1980s and the early-1990s, but those scholars neither mentioned corporatism as a structuring factor nor examined the particular form that government-civil society partnership took. Hekma (2004) mentions that the government partnered with the COC in the 1980s but neither expands on the reasons behind that partnership nor on the effects of that partnership. Duyvendak (1996) highlights a particular relationship between the gay and lesbian and the government during the late 1980s and early 1990s but only in relation to policy on HIV/AIDS, which was a policy domain separate from gay and lesbian policy already from the parliamentary year 1987-1988. Schuyf and Krouwel (1999) are more precise in describing the ways in which the 'homosexual emancipation movement', as they call it, interacts with arms of the government. They ultimately found that, 'the COC is rarely represented as such in official government bodies' (Schuyf & Krouwel, 1999). They did not, however, describe the ways in which the GL movement was able to influence policy and harness government resources in less formal or official ways than the women's movement and the (post-)migrant movement.

The following question remains unanswered and will be the focus of the remainder of this article: How was (cultural) corporatism extended to the gay and lesbian political minority, and how did the corporatist structuring of government-civil society relations affect gay and lesbian advocacy from 1986-1994? The research question will be examined through a textual analysis of documents gathered from the archives of gay and lesbian social

movement organisations and government policy documents. As the period of analysis began almost 30 years ago, documents produced during that time period have been chosen as the most reliable and thus primary data source. This article is part of a PhD trajectory, and the larger research project will be supplemented by including data from interviews with key actors.

There have essentially been two periods in which national government policy in the Netherlands has been specifically directed toward homosexuals, with the first period lasting from 1986-1992 and the second from 1999-the present day⁵. The documents from the first period are entitled *Government Policy and Homosexuality*⁶. That group of documents carries the parliamentary number 19504, and contains 22 separate documents, numbered respectively 19504 no. 1 – 19504 no. 22. Among those documents are three memoranda⁷ that detail the policy in a number of areas for the coming years (19504 nos. 2, 11, and 19). The other documents in the 19504 packet are additions and/or responses to the memoranda.

The analysis in this paper is focused on the first period and includes in the analysis documents 19504 no. 1 – 19504 no. 22, as that period coincided with the incorporation of gay and lesbian organisations. 19504 no. 1 was introduced to parliament in 1986 as a direct reaction to a policy proposal entitled *Homosexuality in Government Policy*⁸ that had been submitted to the government in 1983 by the COC. That policy proposal has therefore also been included in the analysis. Additionally, the Ministry of Wellness, Public Health, and Culture (WVC), then responsible for coordinating homosexual policy, organised a meeting to evaluate the response by gay and lesbian organisations to 19504 no. 2. That session took place on 25 May 1987, and a text of the proceedings was published by the Ministry of WVC in 1988 entitled *Gay and Lesbian Organisations Have Their Say*⁹. That document has also been included in the analysis. The analysis of the policy documents has further been supplemented by the inclusion of the minutes of 'Extensive Committee Meetings' (UCVs), in which parliamentarians met to discuss gay and lesbian policy¹⁰.

The first phase of coordinated policy on homosexuality was enacted from 1986-1992. The period of analysis, however, ranges from 1986 to 1994. The years 1992-1994 are included in the analysis, because, in 1994, a general anti-discrimination law was passed in the Netherlands¹¹. That law has been included for three reasons. First, codifying anti-discrimination legislation was a central goal of GL advocacy organisations, and, second, the government justified the end of coordinated policy on homosexuality with the reasoning that an anti-discrimination law would be sufficient. Third, de-

bates around the AWGB between the GL movement and the CDA provide insight into the effects of the corporatist structuring of state-civil society relations.

Documents were collected from the following three archives: the International Institute for Social History (IISG), the International Gay and Lesbian Archives (IHLIA), and Staten-Generaal Digitaal (SGD, Archives of the Dutch Parliament). The textual analysis was executed using Atlas.ti. Citations from the documents have been translated from the original Dutch into English by the author of this article.

Short history of the movement

As this study is focused on one specific time period within the movement trajectory of a social movement that has existed for almost 70 years, a very brief history will be given of the movement and the process of agenda-setting that led to the phase of cooperation that will occupy the central focus. The primary organisation of the movement, the COC, was founded in 1946. For roughly the first 20 years of its existence, it was primarily internally oriented, offering support and the ability to build a social network for gays and lesbians (Hekma & Duyvendak, 2011), although some scholars have also identified some outwardly political activities of the COC in its early years (see Van Alphen, this volume). In the 1960s, the COC became more outwardly political in advocating for social and legal changes for gays and lesbians (for further reading see Tielman, 1982; Warmerdam & Coenders, 1987; Swiebel, 2011). In the 1970s, a discussion began regarding a change to Article 1 of the Dutch constitution. That change would forbid discrimination on a number of grounds and was interpreted to include forbidding discrimination based on homosexuality. A number of other movement organisations also arose during the 1970s, many of which focused on radical cultural change.

In 1982, a gay and lesbian demonstration in the city of Amersfoort called Pink Saturday was disrupted by rioting youth, who threw onions, eggs, and stones at the gays and lesbians present. That event, widely reported in the media and contextualised by the discussion on the constitutional change, led to many discussions on the development of national government policy coordinated among the ministries to actively combat the discrimination of gays and lesbians.

In 1983, the COC sent a policy brief to Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers (CDA) with more than 70 specific policy proposals, organised according to

each ministry, that the COC argued should be implemented to combat the discrimination of gays and lesbians. The parliamentarian Len Rempt-Halmmans de Jongh (VVD) made a motion to parliament on 19 November 1984 in which it was requested that the government adopt policy to combat the discrimination of homosexuals, appoint a coordinating minister for the policy, and present a policy proposal to accomplish those tasks before the summer recess of 1985 (Tweede Kamer, 1984-1985). The motion was passed, and, after that point, combatting discrimination based on homosexuality was officially on the agenda of the national government in the Netherlands.

During the first wave of coordinated policy on homosexuality, which began in 1986 under the cabinet Lubbers I (CDA and VVD), the Dutch state highly engaged the COC in the development and execution of that policy. The first ministry to take the role of coordinating the policy was the Ministry of Justice (under Frits Korthals Altes, VVD), but, after the elections of 1986, the Ministry of WVC was responsible for coordinating policy on homosexuality. In 1989, the Minister of WVC, Elco Brinkman, asked the COC to develop a plan for the reorganisation of its national office and a strategy for its politics in the 1990s. The plan led to the employment of a director of the COC from 1989, which was paid for by the Ministry of WVC. During that period, the COC received subsidies from the government, including subsidies to pay for the director's salary. The first wave of coordinated policy on homosexuality ended in 1992, and a general anti-discrimination bill (AWGB) that included homosexuality was made into law in 1994.

Extending corporatism to the gay and lesbian political minority

The definitions of Andeweg and Irwin (2005) and Schmitter (1974) contain four central elements regarding the ways in which organisations A) relate to the government (cooperative); B) are organised; C) are recognised; and D) are granted representational monopolies. Those four criteria will be evaluated in relation to the textual data in order to evaluate the extent to which corporatism was extended to the gay and lesbian movement.

A) Cooperative as opposed to competitive relations

The government was rather clear that it would partner with civil society organisations in its development and execution of specific policy on homo-

sexuals and homosexuality. For instance, in a policy brief presented to the Dutch parliament, the minister of WVC, Elco Brinkman, wrote, 'A specific policy to improve the position of homosexual men and lesbian women and to promote tolerance and acknowledgement is unthinkable without the efforts of civil society organisations' (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988, pp. 8-9).

The government utilised gay and lesbian organisations in order to benefit from their expertise and to better understand problems of discrimination within (subgroups of) the homosexual community. The function of organisations in providing knowledge and expertise to the government in general terms is noted (UCV 17-11-1986, p. 7), and there is also mention of the provision of expertise in relation to specific areas focused upon in homosexual policy, such as matters dealing with the police (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988, p. 13).

In addition to providing knowledge and expertise, gay and lesbian organisations were utilised by the government to identify and point out discrimination, both in general terms and in relation to specific subgroups. In a policy brief presented to the Dutch Parliament on behalf of the government¹², the Minister of WVC, Hedy d'Ancona, wrote the following:

The gay/lesbian movement in our country has made an important contribution to making discrimination visible. A number of gay and lesbian organisations are busy supporting emancipating homosexual men and lesbian women, making discrimination visible, and formulating proposals to eliminate discrimination and ensure that people with a sexual preference other than the heterosexual one are no longer ignored by society. (Tweede Kamer, 1991-1992a, p. 5)

In the period studied in this article there was a general consensus between the government and the gay and lesbian social movement that policy should be enacted to fight gay and lesbian discrimination. Not all actors of the movement agreed with all actors of the government, but there was nonetheless general agreement to cooperate in the development and execution of policy instead of competing against each other.

B) Organisation: 'limited number of singular, compulsory, noncompetitive, hierarchically ordered and functionally differentiated categories' (Schmitter, 1974, pp. 93-94)

In this section, the number and type of organisations engaged by the government will be examined. The documents contain a number of references to the role of gay and lesbian organisations, and those groups are

often praised for their identification of discrimination generally or among specific subgroups, such as lesbian women (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988, p. 15) and elderly homosexuals (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988, p. 9).

While the COC had a dominant position within the field of gay and lesbian activism, the government also interacted with other gay and lesbian organisations. One organisation that was also significantly funded by the government was the Schorer Foundation. In the first phase of gay and lesbian policy, which corresponded with the height of the AIDS crisis, the Schorer Foundation was particularly utilised by the government and structurally funded in order to provide health services (Tweede Kamer, 1985-1986, p. 17; Tweede Kamer, 1991-1992a, p. 27) and decrease public health risks (UCV 17-11-1986, p. 7). The Schorer Foundation and the COC were complimentary rather than competitive organisations. The COC was responsible for political representation and general consultation with the government, while the Schorer Foundation's mandate was specifically related to gay and lesbian health.

The COC was understood as being the dominant political representative of gays and lesbians in the Netherlands. Nonetheless, some other groups were included if they either provided services, such as the Schorer Stichting, or focused on a very specific subset of the gay and/or lesbian population. Beyond the COC and the Schorer Foundation, there were 20 other gay and lesbian organisations with whom the government consulted and that received some funding. The funding for those organisations was primarily project-based instead of structural, meaning that they were funded for a short period of time to achieve a specific goal.

The 20 organisations included in the memoranda aside from the COC and the Schorer Foundation can be grouped according to those with a specific task and those focusing on a specific group. Organisations were incorporated that were focused on the following specific tasks: keeping a lesbian archive (Anna Blamanhuis); documenting discrimination against gays and lesbians (CadH); running a switchboard; providing gay and lesbian radio and television (MVS Gaystation and Stichting RTV Urania); engaging in research on sexuality (NISSO); providing sexual education and preventing STIs (Rutgers); and organising exhibitions on gay and lesbian history (Vae Volis).

In addition to the task-oriented organisations, a number of organisations directed their activities toward a specific sub-group of the homosexual population. A number of organisations were religiously oriented, from organisations for Christians (De Kringen) or Jews (Sjalhomo) in general to organisations for Christian youth (CHJC) and organisations of supportive

churches¹³. Others were focused on youth (LHJO) or women over 40 (Groep 7152). Some were oriented toward women (Stichting de Maan) or parents (SLOW). There were organisations focused on bisexuals¹⁴ and on married homosexuals and bisexuals¹⁵. Additionally, there were organisations focused on those in the armed forces¹⁶ and the police force¹⁷.

While many organisations were incorporated by the government, they fit Schmitter's (1974) criterion in that they were functionally different (directed toward either a specific task or sub-population) and non-competitive.

C) Organisations 'recognized or licensed (if not created) by the state' (Schmitter, 1974, pp. 93-94)

In contrast to the organisations studied by Musch (2009) that made up the LAO, organisations of the gay and lesbian movement were generally not created by the state. The organisations primarily arose from civil society initiatives. While there was no formal way in which gay and lesbian organisations were licensed, some organisations were bestowed with legitimacy by the state. Additionally, many organisations were strengthened and supported by the state by being given subsidies.

The COC was most explicitly legitimated in the policy documents analysed. A key aspect of legitimating the COC was the production of a historical narrative in which the COC was presented as long-standing, innovative, and successful. Minister Brinkman (WVC) goes as far as presenting gay and lesbian history in the Netherlands as originating in and through the COC: 'As emancipation progressed the vanguard of the COC dared to go public. In the 1970s, through the COC the movement fanned out. Gay/lesbian groups started in political parties, universities, unions, churches, and humanist organisations' (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988, p. 4).

The COC was not only presented as being the most historically important 'mover and shaker' of gay and lesbian advocacy; it was also seen as the most important player during the first phase of gay and lesbian policy. In one UCV, it is noted by parliamentarian Peter Lankhorst (PPR) that in the development of gay and lesbian policy, 'It will be necessary that much interaction takes place between civil servants and representatives of interest organisations, with the 40-year-old COC as the most important' (UCV 17-11-1986, p.11). The emphasis on the age of the COC serves to demonstrate its longevity and stability over time.

In the same UCV, parliamentarian Louise Groenman (D66) remarked:

I think that the cabinet must recognise that most of what's been done until now regarding gay and lesbian policy is thanks to the gay and lesbian movement itself. If the minister wants to pursue gay and lesbian policy, he can't sit in the front row for a penny, while the COC does all of the work. (UCV 17-11-1986, p. 10)

The COC was the gay and lesbian SMO most often explicitly mentioned in the documents analysed, and it was also the SMO granted the most legitimacy.

Government-civil society partnership was further facilitated by regimes of subsidisation. Once an organisation (or a number of organisations) had been selected by the government to become a partner and once that organisation was deemed legitimate it was often granted subsidies. Two types of subsidies were granted. Structural subsidies were generally reserved for the dominant political representative of a social group, in this case the COC, and often created a degree of SMO dependence upon the state. Project-based subsidies enabled the government to work in a directed way through a number of smaller organisations with expertise in a specific area.

In a policy brief presented to parliament on behalf of the government¹⁸, Minister d'Ancona (WVC), sums up the stated reasons behind and goals of subsidisation:

Regarding gay and lesbian emancipation policy, the Cabinet finds it important that space is created for the many facets of the process of emancipation. The strengthening of individuals' self-respect as well as increasing social freedom and standing up for one's own interests deserve support from the government. Subsidies are thus given to diverse organisations that contribute to realising those goals. (Tweede Kamer, 1991-1992a, p. 5)

While the above quotation constructs the government's role in subsidisation as benevolent, subsidies were not given to all organisations but only those that fit the government's criteria and agenda.

Minister Korthals Altes (Justice), on behalf of the cabinet, presented a similar image of generosity in writing, 'Through subsidy policy gay and lesbian organisations are able to defend the interests of their group' (Tweede Kamer, 1985-1986, p. 6). That idea is again presented by Minister Brinkman (WVC):

In the framework of homosexual emancipation policy, the Cabinet finds it very important that the own values and self-awareness of lesbian women and homosexual men are strengthened. The emphasis in that respect should be placed on increasing the social resistance of the group in question. (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988, p. 9)

By legitimating certain organisations, particularly the COC, the government provided a degree of recognition to the gay and lesbian movement. The government also facilitated the gay and lesbian movement by subsidising the activities of a number of advocacy organisations. In that way, government relations with the gay and lesbian movement fit the third criterion of corporatism.

D) 'Granted a deliberate representational monopoly within their respective categories in exchange for observing certain controls on their selection of leaders and articulation of demands and supporters' (Schmitter, 1974, pp. 93-94)

The word 'monopoly' here may be confusing in the case of the gay and lesbian movement, as so many organisations were involved. There was one organisation that functioned as an umbrella to represent general gay and lesbian interests to the government, and that was the COC. The other organisations incorporated were specifically focused on a task or subgroup.

The COC became the main political representative of homosexual interests in the Netherlands and was, in corporatist terms, the gay and lesbian 'union'. Minister d'Ancona (WVC) even compared the COC to a labour union (Tweede Kamer, 1991-1992b, p. 13). In Minister Brinkman's (WVC) policy brief to parliament, it is acknowledged that there are more groups active than only the COC: 'The Dutch gay and lesbian movement is a diverse movement; aside from the COC there are a number of different gay and lesbian groups and organisations' (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988, p. 5). This citation is relevant for the way in which it simultaneously points to the existence of other groups while reinforcing the focus on the COC as the most important; the other groups were apparently not even worth mentioning by name!

While the COC was seen by the government as the most important political representative of gays and lesbians in the Netherlands, other organisations were also provided with project-based funds in the interests of providing services and paying attention to specific subgroups within the

category homosexuals. Furthermore, the COC played the most important role in the formulation of government policy on homosexuality, whereas the other organisations primarily played a role in executing that policy. The COC was, thus, a dominant player in the advocacy field, but it was far from being the only group involved in GL politics and policy.

The ways in which government-social movement relations were structured also fit this fourth criterion of corporatism. Gay and lesbian organisations had less formal ties to a particular ministry than the (post-)migrant organisations studied by Musch (2009), and cultural corporatism was extended to the gay and lesbian movement in a 'light' way. Nonetheless, it structured relations between the government and GL civil society and affected GL advocacy.

Effects of corporatist relations

The advocacy field was affected by the partnership with and legitimacy granted by the government. The COC was produced by the government as a legitimate civil society representative of gay and lesbian interests, and its organisational structure was largely determined and financed by the government. In general terms, policy influence and subsidisation could be counted as successes, as they resulted in a well-funded, professionalised movement.

Specific policy goals were also attained. For instance, the discrimination of homosexuals was fought against in a number of ways. The discrimination of homosexuals in government workplaces was already forbidden in 1985 (Tweede Kamer, 1985-1986). Several research projects were initiated to measure anti-homosexual discrimination in primary schools (Tweede Kamer, 1986-1987a) and within higher education (Tweede Kamer, 1986-1987b). Many police programmes were initiated to combat anti-gay violence (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988). Additionally, an anti-gay violence registration centre was begun to track anti-gay violence (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988; Tweede Kamer, 1991-1992a). Publicly insulting homosexuals was made punishable by law (Tweede Kamer, 1991-1992a); the production of educational materials and films to promote the acceptance of gays and lesbians were funded by the state (Tweede Kamer, 1987-1988); and an exhibition on gay and lesbian history in the Netherlands was also partially funded by the state (Tweede Kamer, 1991-1992a).

Perhaps the single most important success for the gay and lesbian movement was the codification of the General Law on Equal Treatment

(AWGB), although the law allowed for exceptions that many gay and lesbian organisations found problematic. The AWGB would only be formalised into law in 1994, but it was anticipated long before then. Minister Brinkman (WVC) explained that:

In the proposal for a general law on equal treatment, discrimination on the grounds of religion, life philosophy, political disposition, race, sex, homo- or heterosexual orientation, or civil status is forbidden in those areas in which the social functioning of individuals can be hindered by the discrimination.

(Tweede Kamer, 1987-88, p. 11)

In the time between when the previous citation was written and the formalisation into law of the AWGB (1994), the AWGB would become a central focus of gay and lesbian organisations. The AWGB would acquire an almost magical status, as it was believed by state-actors and gay and lesbian organisations that it would end discrimination against homosexuals. Gay and lesbian organisations, while attaining the formalisation of the AWGB, ultimately did not achieve their most common and outspoken goal: an AWGB without exceptions. While many successes were achieved, the most significant failure of gay and lesbian organisations within the first period of gay and lesbian government policy was that the AWGB formalised into law allowed for exceptions through the so-called 'sole-fact construction'¹⁹.

Discussions on the AWGB had been going on longer than the discussion over homosexual policy. The COC already expressed concern in the policy proposal it sent to the government in 1983 that the AWGB would allow for exceptions. The COC wrote, 'In discussions over the Proposed Law for Equal Treatment, it has come up that some people do not want to give homosexuals equal rights in schools' (Nederlandse Vereniging tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit, COC, 1983, p. 5). This relates to a longer-standing debate on religious freedom in the Netherlands resulting from the so-called 'Pacification of 1917', in which religious schools were able to receive government funding for their educational activities and maintain a certain amount of autonomy regarding their own rules and regulations.

While gay and lesbian organisations were incorporated and granted a place at the table, that meant that they had access to a new terrain in which they had to negotiate cooperation and competition with actors that often had more material resources and political power. The Christian Democratic Party (CDA) was willing to support the AWGB but only on the condition that the autonomy of religious schools would not be compro-

mised in the process. The solution to this deadlock was the inclusion in the law of the 'sole-fact construction', which dictated that someone could not be discriminated against solely based on one characteristic, such as being homosexual, but could be discriminated against in cases of 'special circumstances'²⁰. What 'special circumstances' entailed was left intentionally vague, and in practice that meant that religious schools could continue to discriminate against homosexuals. As long as the school could claim some sort of 'special circumstance', it would not be in violation of the AWGB.

That exception to the AWGB is directly opposed to the single greatest desire of the gay and lesbian organisations. In the meeting entitled 'Gay and Lesbian Organisations Have Their Say,' almost all of the organisations present advocated for an AWGB without exception as the single most important goal of their organisation specifically and of the movement generally (Ministerie van WVC, 1988). While incorporated gay and lesbian organisations achieved a number of successes during the first period of coordinated policy on homosexuality in the Netherlands, they were unable to secure their greatest demand: an AWGB without exceptions. The government, however, saw the formalisation of the AWGB as a sufficient enough barrier to discrimination that it ceased formulating policy specifically on homosexuality in 1992. Specific policy on homosexuality would only return from 2000 and then under rather different circumstances.

Conclusions

As Dutch political culture shifted through time, the ways in which relations between the government and the gay and lesbian movement were structured also shifted. According to the four criteria derived from Andeweg and Irwin (2005) and Schmitter (1974), corporatism was extended to the gay and lesbian movement in the Netherlands. That form of cultural corporatism was, however, extended somewhat late to the gay and lesbian movement and in a more informal way than the way in which cultural corporatism was extended to some other political minority groups.

Cultural corporatist relations resulted in the ability of gay and lesbian organisations to harness material resources from the government in order to pursue their goals. Additionally, gay and lesbian organisations were able to participate in the formulation and execution of policies on homosexuality. Corporatist relations facilitated the movement in specific ways and allowed some organisations of the social movement to engage in high levels of government decision-making, where they could lay the founda-

tion for the enactment of a number of specific policy goals. That 'place at the table' also meant, however, that those organisations would, at times, have to compete with more powerful actors. Cooperative relations does not mean that consensus always prevails, and the case of the COC's interactions with the CDA demonstrates that, while the Christian Democrats agreed to enacting measures to combat the discrimination of gays and lesbians generally in society, they were powerful enough to retain the ability for Christian schools to discriminate. Gaining resources and having the ability to influence the development of policy is, thus, always contextualised by the arena in which policy is made and the influence of the other actors at play.

Notes

1. This study will primarily refer to the 'Gay and Lesbian Social Movement' or the GL SM. The formulation and ordering are intentional. The movement was primarily focused on and coordinated by gay men, which is the reason for listing 'gay' before 'lesbian'. While the movement is often referred to as the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) movement, bisexual and trans issues have played a very marginal role throughout the movement's history, and bisexual and trans issues have only formed the basis for political objectives in the very recent past. Some authors include the 'B' and the 'T' driven by a politics of inclusion that emphasises solidarity. I exclude those letters, as the issues they represent have been excluded from much of the movement. That choice is not motivated by a rejection of the politics of inclusion but was made to avoid making false claims to an inclusivity that was overwhelmingly historically absent during the period of analysis.
2. 'pacificatie-democratie'
3. The organisation is the Nederlandse Vereniging tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit, COC in Dutch, or The Federation of Dutch Associations for Integration of Homosexuality COC in English. In this article, it will be referred to as the 'COC'.
4. Formalised as the National Consultation Structure for Minorities (LOM) in 1997.
5. The documents in the second policy phase have their own parliamentary number (27017) and are entitled *Homosexual Emancipation Policy (Homo-emancipatiebeleid)*.
6. *Overheidsbeleid & Homoseksualiteit*
7. 'nota's'
8. *Homoseksualiteit in het overheidsbeleid*
9. *Homo & lesbische organisaties aan het woord*
10. HIV/AIDS policy has only been included to the extent that it was a component of government policy on homosexuality. HIV/AIDS policy was temporarily tied to homosexual policy but the two were separated from the parliamentary year 1987-1988. While gay and lesbian organisations were partially incorporated through HIV/AIDS policy, they were ultimately far more incorporated through policy specifically on homosexuality.
11. Algemene Wet Gelijke Behandeling (AWGB)

12. Regering
13. Landelijk Coördinatie-Punt Groepen Kerk en Homoseksualiteit
14. Stichting Boerderij de Heksenketel
15. Stichting Orpheus
16. Stichting Homoseksualiteit en Krijgsmacht
17. Stichting Politie en Homoseksualiteit
18. Regering
19. 'enkele-feitconstructie'
20. 'bijzondere omstandigheden'

Bibliography

- Andeweg, R. B., & Irwin, G. A. (2005). *Governance and politics of the Netherlands*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aronoff, M. J. (2001). Political culture. In N. J. Smelser & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (pp. 11640-11644). Oxford: Elsevier.
- De Rooy, P. (2014). *Ons stipje op de wereldkaart. De politieke cultuur van modern Nederland*. Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek.
- Duyvendak, J. W., Koopmans, R., van der Heijden, H. A., & Wijmans, I. (Eds.), (1992). *Tussen verbeelding en macht: 25 jaar nieuwe sociale bewegingen in Nederland*. Amsterdam: SUA.
- Duyvendak, J. W. (1995). *The power of politics: New social movements in France*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Duyvendak, J. W. (1996). The depoliticization of the Dutch gay identity, or Why Dutch gays aren't queer. In S. Seidman (Ed.), *Queer theory/sociology* (pp. 421-38). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hekma, G. (2004). *Homoseksualiteit in Nederland van 1730 tot de Moderne Tijd*. Amsterdam: J. M. Meulenhoff bv.
- Hekma, G., & Duyvendak, J. W. (2011). The Netherlands: Depoliticization of homosexuality and homosexualization of politics. In M. Tremblay, D. Paternotte & C. Johnson (Eds.), *The lesbian and gay movement and the state. Comparative insights into a transformed relationship* (pp. 103-118). Surrey: Ashgate.
- Inglehart, R. (1981). Post-materialism in an environment of insecurity. *The American political science review* 75(4), 880-900.
- Kennedy, J. C. (1995). *Nieuw Babylon in aanbouw. Nederland in de Jaren 60*. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Kickert, W. J. M. (2003). Beneath consensual corporatism: Traditions of governance in the Netherlands. *Public administration* 81(1), 119-140.
- Kriesi, J., Koopmans, R., Duyvendak, J. W., & Giugni, M. G. (1995). *New social movements in Western Europe. A comparative analysis*. London: UCL Press Limited.
- Lijphart, A. (1968). *The politics of accommodation: Pluralism and democracy in the Netherlands*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lijphart, A. (1969). Consociational democracy. *World politics* 21(2), 207-225.
- Nederlandse Vereniging tot Integratie van Homoseksualiteit, COC (1983) *Homoseksualiteit in het Overheidsbeleid*. Amsterdam: N.V.I.H.-COC/Magazijn.
- Ministerie van WVC (1988). *Homo & lesbische organisaties aan het woord*. Amsterdam: Drukkerij Spinhex bv.
- Musch, E. (2009). Interactive governance in immigrant integration policies: A comparison of

- Germany and the Netherlands. Paper presented at the 5th ECPR General Conference, 10-12 September, 2009, Potsdam.
- Oldersma, G. J. (1996). *De vrouw die vanzelf spreekt. Gender en representatie in het Nederlandse adviesradenstelsel*. Proefschrift: Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.
- Schmitter, P. C. (1974). Still the century of corporatism? *Review of politics* 36, 85-131.
- Schuyf, J., & Krouwel, A. (1999). The Dutch lesbian and gay movement: The politics of accommodation. In B. D. Adam, J. W. Duyvendak & A. Krouwel (Eds.), *The global emergence of gay and lesbian politics. National imprints of worldwide movement* (pp. 158-183). Philadelphia: Temple University press.
- Swiebel, J. (2011). Van gedogen naar 'gewoon homo zijn'; homoseksualiteit als thema in de Nederlandse politiek. Politicologenetmaal Nederlandse Kring voor de Wetenschap der Politiek. Workshop Diversiteit in de Politiek. Amsterdam: June 9-10.
- Tielman, R. (1982). *Homoseksualiteit in Nederland*. Dissertation: Social Sciences, Utrecht University. Amsterdam: Boom.
- Tweede Kamer (1984-1985). "Motie van het Lid Rempt-Halmmans de Jongh." 18600 hoofdstuk XV no. 23.
- Tweede Kamer (1985-1986). *Overheidsbeleid en homoseksualiteit*. 19504 no. 2.
- Tweede Kamer (1986-1987a). *Overheidsbeleid en homoseksualiteit*. 19504 no. 7.
- Tweede Kamer (1986-1987b). *Overheidsbeleid en homoseksualiteit*. 19504 no. 10.
- Tweede Kamer (1987-1988). *Overheidsbeleid en homoseksualiteit*. 19504 no. 11.
- Tweede Kamer (1991-1992a). *Overheidsbeleid en homoseksualiteit*. 19504 no. 19.
- Tweede Kamer (1991-1992b). *Overheidsbeleid en homoseksualiteit*. 19504 no. 22.
- UCV (17-11-1986). Vaste commissie voor Justitie.
- Visser, J., & Hemerijck, A. (1997). *A Dutch miracle. Job growth, welfare reform, and corporatism in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Wansink, H. (1985). Verzuiling en homo-emancipatie. In J. Schuyf & J. Veenker (Eds.), *Homojaarboek 3. Artikelen over emancipatie en homoseksualiteit* (pp. 176-193). Amsterdam: Van Gennep.
- Warmerdam, H., & Coenders, P. (1987). *Cultuur en ontspanning. Het COC 1946-1966*. Utrecht: Interfacultaire Werkgroep Homostudies.

About the author

Robert (Robby) J. Davidson is a PhD candidate at the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR) of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) and is a member of the program group 'Political Sociology'. Davidson's research examines the changing relationship between the Dutch state and the gay and lesbian social movement. Davidson is the programme manager of the Amsterdam Research Center for Gender and Sexuality (ARC-GS), has taught courses at the UvA in the disciplines of political science and sociology, and has previously published articles on intersex social movement organisations and queer theory.

E-mail: R.J.Davidson@uva.nl