

The Shadows of (Public) Recognition

Transatlantic Slavery and Indian Ocean Slavery in
Dutch Historiography and Public Culture

Guno Jones

Introduction¹

Some eight years ago, I was in Amsterdam with my partner on Open Monuments Day (*Open Monumentendag*). On this day historic buildings classified as heritage sites are open to the general public. One stately Amsterdam canal house—which housed exhibits spanning art, interior design, decorations and the books of the family that once lived there—was of particular interest to us. We walked round the building, looked at the exhibited art and strolled through the beautiful garden. Our tour, however, was brutally disrupted by a certain advertisement (see Figure 1). It offered for sale “castrated, firm Madurese or East-Java [sic] pull-cattle” and “beautiful Madurese bulls” next to “firm, young and healthy East Javanese workers, men and women for agricultural work and mining”, the latter for “60 Florin per adult”, by “H. Leeksma” in “Soerabaia”. The poster was hanging on a wall, showcased as part of the exhibition. Was I *really* seeing this? Typically, “postcolonials”, in uncovering colonial violence, habitually read “Dutch heritage” against the grain, but the violence in this advertisement was hidden in plain sight.

As I was more familiar with representations of transatlantic slavery, it took me a while to realize that the advertisement *might* have been referring to slavery in “the Dutch East Indies”, as colonial Indonesia was known in the Netherlands. While the advertisement appeared in the *Sumatra Post* in 1902—in the formally post-abolition era, when those “on sale” would legally have been contract workers and Leeksma would have received a broker’s fee—its objectification and dehumanization of colonized people bears similarities with actual advertisements of slavery from a few decades earlier. Such continuities are testimony to the afterlives of slavery in colonial Indonesia.²



**H.H. Hoofd-Administrateurs en
Administrateurs, zoomede Slagers
en Ondernemers van Mijnbouw!**

LEVERING tegen de LAAGSTE PRIJZEN:
Gecastreerd, degelijk Madureesch of Oost-Java Trek-vee
van 300—375 K.G., voorzien van certificaat van den Veearts.

Prachtige Madureesche Slachtstieren.

Flink, jong en gezond Oost-Java Werkvolk,
MANNEN of VROUWEN voor LAND- en MIJNBOUW, tegen
f 60.— per volwassen persoon, franco BELAWAN.

Belast zich met het KOOPEN en VERZENDEN van:
Savoeneesche en Rottineesche Rij- en Wagenpaarden,
uitstekend geschikt voor BERGTERREIN.

Minzaam aanbevelend,
H. LEEKSMA Kzn., Soerabaia.

Figure 11.1. Cattle and Colonized for Sale.

Source: Exhibited image of *Sumatra Post*, 1902 (photograph by author on location).

Since so little is known of the Dutch role in slavery in colonial Indonesia, actual depictions of it are hard to recognize.

In the Netherlands, people do not generally associate “East Java” (Java is one of the main islands in the Indonesian archipelago) with slavery. Representations of the Dutch East Indies often celebrate the great “Dutch entrepreneurial spirit”, but disavow the violence of Dutch colonialism. Paul Bijl has argued that though there are ample traces of systemic colonial violence in “the East” in the Netherlands, its “memorability” has remained limited because there is no proper conceptual apparatus and “dominant discourses do not produce them (the victims of colonial violence) as belonging to national history”.³ There is a conspicuous difference between the discourse on the “East Indies” and “West Indies” in reference to Dutch colonialism. While the dominant Dutch discourse on “the East” has remained nostalgic, discourse on the Dutch Caribbean colonies of Suriname and the former Dutch Antilles (six islands in the Caribbean Sea) have notably dropped nostalgic articulations of the Dutch colonial past.

Decades of scholar-activist interventions have succeeded in reframing Dutch colonialism in the Caribbean as a national shame—as such, the role of the Dutch in transatlantic slavery is the central focus. Despite the backlash against these efforts, the connected politics of memory has had a visible impact in the public sphere, as I will demonstrate in this chapter. However, *visibilising* the Dutch role in transatlantic slavery has rendered the Dutch role in Indian Ocean slavery *invisible*, regardless of the fact that structural and systematic Dutch military violence during the wars of decolonization has recently entered decolonial politics of recognition and some scholarly work.⁴ This bifurcation of Dutch slavery is visible in monuments, debate, practices of memory and commemoration, museum exhibitions, history-education and media representations, and it also characterizes knowledge production. One might even argue that slavery is, culturally and epistemologically, “allowed” in representations of Dutch colonialism in Caribbean history, but not in those of Indonesia. This is striking, since the use of enslaved people was “central to the East India Companies established by various European powers throughout the Indian Ocean world”, as Alicia Schikker and Nira Wickramasinghe point out in the introduction to this volume. While the role of the Dutch (and other European empires) in Indian Ocean slavery concerns geographically dispersed locations (places such as Ceylon, Cochin, Batavia, Cape Town and Mauritius), as Schikker and Wickramasinghe observe in comparing Indian Ocean Slavery with Transatlantic Slavery, I will focus

on the historical narration and public memory of the Dutch role in slavery in 'the Dutch East Indies', as colonial Indonesia was referred to in colonial discourse.

Michel-Rolph Trouillot's conceptualization of the relationship between power and historical knowledge production in his seminal work, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*,⁵ has a particular and perhaps somewhat surprising resonance for the case of Dutch slavery. The epistemological and public afterlives of Dutch slavery in the "East Indies" and "West Indies" show the distinctive impact of silencing on similar histories of oppression. The recent and partial de-silencing of transatlantic slavery in the Netherlands, as an outcome of a politics of citizenship among an engaged part of Caribbean Dutch citizens, has transformed transatlantic slavery from a "non-event" into an event worthy of public debate, monumentalization, public commemoration, exhibitions and research in the Netherlands. Unfortunately, the frames of the politics involved in de-silencing transatlantic slavery (rendering it a meaningful historical event) were not sufficiently broad to do the same for slavery in colonial Indonesia, which is still very much a "non-event" in the Dutch public sphere. This sharply uneven bifurcation of Dutch slavery should alert us to unintended consequences, incompleteness and losses in any politics of recognition. Although this bifurcation is being cautiously addressed in discussions among members of diasporic post-colonial communities with genealogies in different parts of the Dutch empire, there seems to be a political and affective investment in its sustenance. The bifurcation appears to be informed by varied experiences of colonialism and reflects the differential positioning of the colonized and members of post-colonial communities in present-day Dutch society.

This chapter unpacks some of the social and political dynamics in the uneven public and epistemological afterlives of colonial slavery in Indonesia and the Caribbean and argues why it is important to transcend the status quo. Rather than explaining this phenomenon, I hope to sketch its complexity. I will discuss the afterlives of both histories of slavery in the contemporary Dutch public domain and in knowledge production, and the diverse power dynamics and genealogies of (public) engagement involved. I will look at the differential positioning of transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery in knowledge production, public memory and commemoration culture, and media productions and museum exhibitions. I will also examine how inclusion and exclusion from citizenship and nation are negotiated, articulated and contested via public and epistemological engagements with slavery. With

regard to Indian Ocean slavery, I am interested in the nexus between the (constitutionally and ideologically legitimized) Dutch involvement in slavery in colonial Indonesia and the rise of Dutch racial capitalism and, specifically, how this cornerstone of Dutch colonial rule in “the East” is narrated and remembered in post-abolition historiography and public culture in the Netherlands. Therefore, I will not include slavery and bondage in local societies in Indonesia in this piece.

Dutch slavery in knowledge production

Author Reggie Baay, one of the few researchers who works on slavery in the Dutch East Indies, recently made the following observation:

Slavery in the East does not exist in the Netherlands. The Dutch history of slavery is emphatically limited to Suriname and the Antilles. It seems as if a ballotage-commission has weighed the slave-trade and slavery in the Dutch East Indies and deemed it as being too light. Was slavery over there not cruel enough? Was it not extensive enough? Maybe it didn't meet the “definition” of slavery? ... how is it possible for slavery in the one former Dutch colony to be included in Dutch history, while slavery in the other Dutch colony is not included in Dutch history? Why do we think our children should learn about our colonial history of slavery and the involvement of our ancestors with it in Suriname and the Antilles, but not about the former Dutch East Indies? [translation G.J.]⁶

We should take a closer look at some of the conditions that make possible the present status quo in historiography and history education on slavery that Baay captures so effectively. Before I discuss these conditions of possibility, a few words on the epistemological position that informs this chapter. My perspective on historical knowledge-production is based on the constructionist premise that “the facts” do not “speak for themselves” (they cannot be retrieved objectively), but are interpretations of events based on non-neutral archival sources that are turned into historical narration informed by dynamics in the present. From a constructionist point of view, the entire process of historical knowledge production is a reflection of particular power formations between people.⁷ Along this line, I will give central attention to the power dynamics involved in the knowledge production and public culture of

slavery in the Netherlands. As a consequence, this chapter differs somewhat from, for instance, the very empirically rich chapters of Lodewijk Wagenaar and Kate Ekama in this book that approach facts in a different way.

While nowadays transatlantic slavery is certainly more visible than Indian Ocean slavery in knowledge production and educational material, the present-day visibility of the former cannot be taken for granted – it is the result of a long history of engagement and struggle. Sustained engagement by activist-scholars and critical academics has played a major role in furthering the presence of transatlantic slavery in public history, although this recognition is highly contested and not necessarily irreversible. For a long time only a small group of academics conducted research on Dutch transatlantic slavery, and the phenomenon was not included in the canon of Dutch history.⁸ Arguably, this situation was nurtured by the epistemological compartmentalization of “colonial” and “Dutch” history, which excluded slavery from metropolitan Dutch history. In 1995, Ann Stoler observed that “the history of the metropole is structurally set apart from the history of the colonies” in the Netherlands.⁹ Along the same lines, Gloria Wekker recently observed:

... within departments of history, the discipline was centrally structured such that there was a preponderance of majors, courses, and specializations that dealt with national history, while a small, separate minority of the curricular materials was devoted to the expansion in the world, meaning colonial history. ... The metropolitan and colonial parts of Dutch colonial empire are still overwhelmingly treated, both inside and outside academia as separate worlds, the metropolitan and the colonial, that did not impinge upon each other.¹⁰

However, even if we take the epistemological separation of “colonial” and “Dutch” history into account, the relative silence on slavery in accounts of the former “Dutch East Indies” is striking. Transatlantic slavery was primarily studied within the framework of colonial history and its role in the history of the metropole initially received only limited scholarly attention. But its presence was and still is much more prolific (and continually expanding) in knowledge production than slavery in colonial Indonesia.¹¹ Several observations can be made about the Dutch transatlantic slavery knowledge field. First, it has developed from an academic research field to a knowledge field in which history, heritage and memory are deeply interwoven. The fecundity of

research on transatlantic slavery especially, directly or indirectly, draws from the deep engagement with the history of slavery and its afterlives of advocates in Caribbean Dutch communities. Moreover, scholar-activists have utilized the existing body of knowledge on transatlantic slavery in their politics of recognition. This is not to suggest that “traditional Dutch academic” research on slavery is “neutral” (not situated in power dynamics), but that the power dynamics within academia were made invisible by reigning objectivism in Dutch historical knowledge production. Some prominent Dutch historians of slavery have been known to be epistemological gatekeepers, systematically suppressing novel research perspectives on slavery within academia, as Pepijn Brandon has demonstrated. This reflex has also been observed by long-time historian of Dutch colonialism Susan Legêne.¹²

“Traditional” academic knowledge production on transatlantic slavery has arguably been one of the conditions of possibility for the emergence of a politics of public recognition, but the lively public memory and commemoration culture that has emerged in the last twenty years—and the post-colonial/decolonial perspectives in which it is embedded—has also inspired critical assessments of the earlier knowledge production and has facilitated the emergence of new perspectives on the history of slavery. Post-colonial critiques have revealed the politics and non-neutrality inherent in “traditional” scholarship on slavery by deconstructing paradigms, terminologies, interpretations and frames of reference.¹³ Second, knowledge production on slavery is no longer exclusively done to serve the needs of intra-academic debates; there are also “hybrid” knowledge projects that design and engage knowledge production to match the interests of a wider public. For instance, the emergence of publicly accessible databases on the enslaved and manumitted have made genealogical research much easier than it was before. And the knowledge production of the Mapping Slavery team¹⁴ enables heritage tours for those interested in the Dutch history of slavery. Third, the mutual constitution of colony and metropole, as has been advocated by post-colonial/decolonial scholars, has been taken up in some recent knowledge work. Thus, knowledge production in this area is no longer exclusively a historiography of transatlantic slavery in the Caribbean colonies. Instead, the afterlives of slavery are being explored in interesting ways, and the connections between Caribbean slavery and Dutch capitalism and main Dutch institutions presently receive more attention in research. As regards the latter, a pioneering study authored by historians Pepijn Brandon and Ulbe Bosma that quantifies the importance of Trans-Atlantic slavery

for the economy of Holland in the eighteenth century has recently been published.¹⁵ Whether these shifts in research have the potential to change the epistemological compartmentalization of national and colonial history in academic institutions is yet to be seen.

Fourth, it should be mentioned that the notion of the “knowledge field of transatlantic slavery in the Netherlands” is somewhat problematic, since it hides the preponderance of Surinamese plantation slavery in knowledge production and public history. While publications on slavery in Curaçao exist,¹⁶ plantation slavery in Suriname seems to have drawn the most scholarly attention so far. Much less is known about the particularities of slavery as it existed in Curaçao, where there was no large-scale plantation economy and the enslaved often “worked in and around the harbor as construction workers, artisans, sailors, traders, musicians, and military personnel”.¹⁷ From an agonistic perspective on knowledge production, this is not about some inherent significance of “plantation slavery” as compared to “non-plantation slavery,” but, rather, it points to the power dynamics in knowledge agendas in the Netherlands. For a variety of historical reasons, Surinamese Dutch citizens, who initially opposed dominant discourse at the risk of being ridiculed, have been prominent in “de-silencing” the history of transatlantic slavery, in particular, plantation slavery. The relative revelation of the horrors of Surinamese plantation slavery has impacted on knowledge production and public culture—it also reveals how a politics of recognition may unintentionally foster new silences. In what way does the focus on “plantation slavery” in Dutch knowledge production of transatlantic slavery (instead of “harbor and construction slavery”) *pre-structure* the kinds of questions we tend to ask about slavery? Which stories are represented in the knowledge field, knowledge agendas and public initiatives aimed at de-silencing “transatlantic slavery”?

Notwithstanding its contested and “incomplete” nature, knowledge production on transatlantic slavery has grown in recent years. In contrast, the history of Dutch slavery in Indonesia is strikingly absent. The multidimensionality in the transatlantic slavery knowledge field, particularly as it pertains to plantation slavery in colonial Suriname, is absent in the case of “Dutch East Indies” slavery. Only a few authors have published work on slavery in colonial Indonesia. This is not because the slavery in “the Dutch East Indies” was, as compared with transatlantic slavery, “less serious”, as seems to be the general perception. The epistemological divide between slavery in the “East Indies” and “West Indies” is not dictated by some inherent difference between the two—it is a consequence of the distinctive dynamics

involved in the historical narration of both slaveries *after* their respective abolitions. Baay and Van Rossum demonstrate that, keeping in mind some basic features of slavery in colonial Indonesia,¹⁸ there were many similarities between transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery.¹⁹ Both slaveries were dehumanizing tragedies characterized by the commodification of enslaved bodies, which implied an absolute negation of legal personhood. However, as already mentioned, in-depth studies of the different dimensions of Dutch East Indies slavery—let alone its connections with the metropole—are almost non-existent. This absence is not exclusive to knowledge production, but has shaped public debate, understandings of slavery, and the public memory and commemoration culture in the Netherlands. Attempts to narrate and represent more “integrated”, comparative versions of Dutch slavery are scarce. The few exceptions include work done by the Mapping Slavery team. The relative de-silencing of transatlantic slavery has enriched knowledge production of Dutch history. But how would our understanding of Dutch slavery and its impact on Dutch society change if the Dutch involvement in Indian Ocean slavery were systematically included in knowledge practices?

The disavowal of slavery and its afterlives in public Dutch culture

Before 2000 transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery were equally absent from public Dutch memory and commemoration culture. In 2001, historian Alex van Stipriaan referred to this avoidance of Dutch slavery and the slave trade in the Netherlands as a “deafening silence”.²⁰ Van Stipriaan demonstrates that in Dutch educational materials up to 2000 slavery was primarily associated with “America and the negro-cabin of Uncle Tom”.²¹ In other words, Dutch children were versed in the tragedy of slavery in the American South, but Dutch slavery was no part of public consciousness and moral discourse. The outward projection of slavery was reflected in the landscape of public memory and commemoration—official monuments commemorating the abolition of transatlantic slavery existed in the former Dutch Caribbean colonies of Suriname and Curaçao, but not in the motherland that was constitutionally responsible for the phenomenon.²² Slavery had turned into “an accepted part of national history” in independent Suriname, but this was much less the case in the Dutch Antilles,²³ and the history of slavery was entirely absent in metropolitan Dutch consciousness. Glenn Willemsen, the first director of the Nationaal Instituut Nederlands slavernijverleden en erfenis (NiNsee, National

Institute for the history and heritage of Dutch slavery), concluded that “until the end of the 20th century, slavery and its legacies were non-issues in both the public domain and the collective consciousness of Dutch society”.²⁴

The silencing of slavery in Dutch culture was accompanied by complex political subjectivities among Caribbean Dutch diasporic communities. While some Caribbean Dutch citizens openly engaged with slavery, for many others it was not the norm to speak freely about slavery and the slave trade in the Dutch public sphere.²⁵ These were not fashionable subjects of *public* discussion, especially among privileged members of the Caribbean Dutch diaspora. Slavery was privately recognized by many as a significant history of pain (its cruelty is a part of subaltern historical consciousness and cultural repertoire), but it was also regarded as a history of shame. Humphrey Lamur observed a “taboo” associated with publicly discussing slavery until the end of the 1980s.²⁶

These complex subjectivities need a brief explanation. Privately, and within Caribbean Dutch diaspora organizations, slavery was actively commemorated.²⁷ In the case of the Surinamese Dutch, these commemorations were inspired by older anti-colonial thinkers, such as Anton De Kom, who published his seminal work, *Wij Slaven van Suriname* (We Slaves of Suriname), in 1934 and explicitly self-identified as a “descendant of enslaved” therein. This anti-colonial work (part of broader cultural, religious and social critiques developed in response to Dutch hegemony)²⁸ exposes the dehumanizing and exploitative nature of Dutch colonialism, slavery and indentured labour in Suriname and served as inspiration for later generations and their multifold expressions of decolonial thought and practice.

In contrast, in the Dutch public sphere in the Netherlands slavery has long been subjected to hesitant articulation and is surrounded by political ambiguity. Until around the end of the 1990s it would have been uncommon publicly to claim genealogical connections with enslaved people as part of a politics of public recognition, especially if one was relatively well-off socio-economically. Even today, some people are deeply disturbed by cinematographic representations of slavery.²⁹ Contemporary Dutch society may remind Caribbean Dutch citizens that racialized hierarchies (everyday racism, racism on the labour market, racialized traditions and ethnic profiling) are not phenomena of the past, which perhaps accounts for why some are deeply affected by representations of slavery. Degrading events and systemic racism in the present may “ignite” the past as a metaphor for talking about the present. Perhaps the continuation of racialized exclusions

and hierarchies in contemporary Dutch society is what makes Trans-Atlantic slavery a particularly resonant history for Caribbean Dutch citizens.

Whatever the case, the idea of “rising above” slavery and its afterlives through ‘forgetting’ until the end of the 1990s still held currency as a relatively viable ethos and politics (and this is possibly still true for many today).³⁰ Perhaps the attitude could be summed up as: Yes, we know about the Dutch involvement in slavery and its present-day racialized legacies, but we should rise above it, work hard, and only fight when it is absolutely necessary. In any case, demanding public recognition of slavery as Dutch heritage, publicly discussing its racialized afterlives, or openly identifying as a descendant of the enslaved did not occupy a central place in Caribbean Dutch politics of identity and citizenship at the time.³¹ Memories of and critical perspectives on slavery travelled with Caribbean Dutch communities to the metropole and were kept alive among them, but it took a while for commemorators in the diaspora to succeed in “breaking down the taboo on *public discussions* of slavery”.³² Partly in response to majoritarian Dutch politics of citizenship shortly before and after the Independence of Suriname in 1975—in which the relocation of a significant part of the population of the former colony to the Netherlands and their Dutch citizenship status were contested—Surinamese Dutch organizations focused on legal, social and socio-economic dimensions of citizenship in the 1970s and 1980s.³³ The “subaltern” memories of slavery among the Caribbean Dutch were not yet connected with a politics of equal citizenship.

The public absence of the Dutch role in Indian Ocean slavery was even more striking—nobody in the motherland or former colonies seemed openly to take an interest in the trauma of slavery in the “Dutch East Indies”. While Caribbean slavery was practically non-existent in public culture and consciousness in the motherland, it received partial recognition in the Dutch Caribbean and lived on as a “subaltern history” among the Caribbean Dutch diaspora in the Netherlands. In contrast, slavery during the Dutch colonial rule in Indonesia was (and still is) non-existent in public culture and consciousness in the Netherlands *and* is absent from the Indonesian public sphere. This is not to suggest, however, that Indian Ocean slavery (and the Dutch role in it) is generally absent from practices of memory and commemoration in Indian Ocean colonial societies. In South Africa there is a cultural memory of Indian Ocean slavery through songs, as Anne Marieke van der Wal discusses in this book; public commemorations and exhibitionary practices also exist.³⁴ But slavery under Dutch colonial rule in

Indonesia was (and still is) essentially a “non-event”. It is as if slavery never happened there. To date, no monuments commemorating the abolition of slavery exist in the Netherlands or post-colonial Indonesia.³⁵ While many were affected by slavery in Indonesia, there is (to my knowledge) no official engagement with this history, nor are there people identifying as “descendants” of the enslaved. The existence of a subaltern community identifying as “descendants” has been an important condition of possibility for the partial de-silencing of transatlantic slavery. However, technically speaking, people who could trace their lineage back to enslaved ancestors in Indian Ocean slavery exist in Indonesia and the Netherlands. In fact, Reggie Baay’s *De njai* reveals that, through the female ancestral line, slavery (as it intersected with gender-based sexual exploitation and racism previously silenced or even romanticised) was part of the family histories of a considerable number of Dutch citizens of “Eurasian” background (the so-called Indische or Indo-Europese Nederlanders).³⁶ But tracing the lineage back to enslaved ancestors and keeping their memories alive have not been done in connection with slavery in colonial Indonesia. Unlike transatlantic slavery, slavery in colonial Indonesia has *not* been memorialized by people identifying as descendants of the enslaved in Indonesia and the Netherlands. This bifurcation once more illustrates that these politics of memory and identity are not inherently determined by the existence of lineages tracing back to enslaved ancestors (‘the facts of the lineage’), but conditioned by evolving dynamics, questions and politics in the present.

In short, until the 1990s the consensus in the Netherlands was that slavery left no significant mark on Dutch society. Dominant representations of the Netherlands centred on the idea of an entrepreneurial and innocent nation, prone to justice, human rights and the rule of law. Scholars and activists who dared to connect slavery to the systemic racism in Dutch society and culture were often ridiculed, verbally attacked, physically threatened and symbolically excluded from the Dutch nation.

De-silencing transatlantic slavery

The public recognition of slavery in the Netherlands has been a complex and uneven process. In the last two decades (1998–2018), slavery has transformed from a particularized sub-memory among parts of Caribbean Dutch communities to an issue of public debate and national Dutch concern.

Slavery has become an important issue among parts of the Caribbean Dutch diaspora, and a matter of cultural heritage for which people have sought public recognition.³⁷ In conjunction with a reconfigured politics of identity, in which forerunners began to self-identify as “Afro-European Dutch” and other variations with the prefix “Afro” while resolutely rejecting the commonly used “negers” (negroes) because of its colonial connotation, transatlantic slavery has become a part of discussions on equal citizenship and inclusion in the Dutch nation. “We are here to stay. We have a stake in Dutch history too, and slavery and its racialised legacies are a part of it.” Inclusion was no longer simply defined as an improvement in people’s socio-economic and legal status (residence and citizenship status), but also as a public recognition of slavery and its racialized afterlives. This Caribbean Dutch politics of citizenship was often connected with an epistemological orientation in which social inequalities in Dutch society were *not* explained by referring to intra-ethnic particularities (as in dominant Dutch cultures of scholarship). Instead, it emphasized the detrimental impact on Caribbean Dutch citizens of the racialized afterlives of slavery in Dutch society. In other words, the relationship between historic dominance and contemporary racism and exclusion from Dutch society received central attention in these public interventions. Hence, it is no coincidence that forerunners who pleaded for the public recognition of slavery simultaneously criticized the coloniality of certain Dutch traditions (for instance, the Black Pete figure in the Saint Nicholas tradition and colonial representations of the Golden Coach and group slurs (e.g., “neger”, “negerin” or “negerzoeenen”)).

At the end of the 1990s, Caribbean Dutch organizations began to advocate harder for the public recognition of transatlantic slavery in the Netherlands.³⁸ This culminated in eighteen Dutch Caribbean organizations cooperating to form the Foundation National Monument for the history of Dutch slavery, chaired by Barryl Biekman. The foundation’s aim was to erect a national monument and establish an institution (NiNsee). The centre-left government recognized the foundation, and on 1 July 2002 Queen Beatrix unveiled the National Slavery Monument in Amsterdam’s Oosterpark. The monument commemorates the abolition of transatlantic slavery.³⁹ Other monuments in Amsterdam—the Monument of Awareness (2003), Middelburg (2005) and Rotterdam (2013)—soon followed. These monuments primarily commemorate the abolition of transatlantic slavery on 1 July 1863. In addition, the 1795 revolt by 2,000 enslaved people, led by Tula in Curaçao, is commemorated on 17 August in Amsterdam and in the form

of the slavery monument in Rotterdam. The number of municipalities that commemorate the abolition of transatlantic slavery has grown. Apart from those in Amsterdam, Rotterdam and Middelburg, public commemorations are organized in Utrecht, Almere, Tilburg and The Hague.⁴⁰

The events leading up to the monumentalization of transatlantic slavery did not happen in discursive and national isolation. While a subaltern Caribbean Dutch memory of transatlantic slavery has long existed, the politics that accompanied the plea for public recognition of slavery was also inspired by African-American identity politics. Furthermore, forerunners who advocated for the official monumentalization and commemoration of Dutch slavery discursively connected their pleas with the wider Dutch public memory and commemoration culture centred on World War II. They argued that public commemoration of slavery is as important for descendants of the enslaved as public commemoration of World War II victims is for their relatives and offspring.⁴¹

After the establishment of the National Slavery Monument and the creation of a tradition of official annual commemorations, even general Dutch museums—such as The National Maritime Museum (Scheepvaartmuseum) in Amsterdam (2013) and the Amsterdam Museum (2013)—incorporated transatlantic slavery into their (temporary) exhibitions. As of 2017, the Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam has a permanent exhibition on slavery. Even the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, which represents archetypical Dutch mainstream art par excellence, is planning a temporary exhibition on slavery in 2020–2021.

Transatlantic slavery has been made the subject of media productions. In 2011, a fiercely debated five-episode television series, *De Slavernij*, was broadcasted on national Dutch television. In 2013, *Tula: The Revolt*, a film based on similar historic figures and the revolt in Curaçao, was released. Another example is the documentary, *Drie Vrouwen* (Three Women), which portrays Ellen-Rose Kambel, Valika Smeulders and Marian Markelo, and their role in promoting the public recognition of transatlantic slavery and its present-day heritage. Important heritage work has also been done by the Mapping Slavery team, which traces buildings, locations and historical figures in Dutch cities that have connections with slavery and records them on (digital) maps and in books. Heritage tours, in which tourists visit locations that have connections with slavery, are being organized—for instance, by Jennifer Tosch and Valika Smeulders. Publicly claiming a genealogical link with slavery is now accepted among the Caribbean Dutch.

Advocating for public recognition of slavery is about demanding inclusion in national history and the nation, but its “economics”, broadly speaking, are undeterminable. Engaging with public recognition of transatlantic slavery has not been an easy process and people sometimes pay a substantial price for it. As Markus Balkenhol demonstrates, there is an affective politics of engagement and disengagement with slavery—one aimed at public recognition and the other at repression.⁴² While the former strives for emancipation and inclusion in the Dutch nation, the latter defends the status quo and dominant constructions of Dutchness. Furthermore, the de-silencing of slavery in the public sphere over the last two decades is not necessarily irreversible. The public recognition of transatlantic slavery has been highly contested—the visibility of slavery is fragile and contingent upon power dynamics in the Netherlands. While the centre-left Dutch Government that was in power at the beginning of the new millennium granted funding for the erection of the National Slavery Monument and the establishment of the associated institution (NiNsee), the right-wing Dutch government that was ruling in 2013 stopped supporting NiNsee.⁴³ While “austerity” was the “neutral” justification given for the retraction of the subsidy, the move aligned with the wishes of the far-right PVV (Party for Freedom), which provided parliamentary support to the government at the time. Ethno-nationalist populist parties like the PVV and the Forum for Democracy, which tend to describe transatlantic slavery and Caribbean Dutch citizens as non-Dutch, have gained increasing support from the electorate and there are no signs of this changing. The monument and annual commemoration at Oosterpark are ostensibly “national”, but their official status in the Dutch heritage landscape is conditional.⁴⁴ The recently developed public heritage of slavery may be undone, even obliterated, if the powers that be deem those parts of the citizenry that strongly identify with it (or are strongly identified with it) as not belonging to the nation. In this regard, the electoral rise of far-right parties like the Forum for Democracy, which explicitly articulate nativist and racist ideologies, is an ominous sign.

Dutch slavery reveals multiple modalities of “silencing”, in which the “unconscious” influence of dominant paradigms and intentional exclusion operate in unison. To be sure, silences on slavery and its racialized afterlives have been produced by the compartmentalization of colonial and national history. But, in addition, the violent responses to those who have advocated for the public recognition of slavery and its racialized afterlives also show a conscious investment in maintaining the status quo. The history of transatlantic slavery has been instrumental in demands for equal citizenship, but

the backlash against its public acceptance has revealed the hierarchies of racialized belonging in the Netherlands. Advocating the public recognition of Dutch slavery is an expression of “active citizenship”—it is about occupying symbolic and social space, but it also exposes advocates of recognition to the wrath of those who self-identify as “real” members of the Dutch nation. Souls may be freed and minds liberated in public engagements with slavery, but the impact of the backlash against these engagements on those who identify with transatlantic slavery should not be overlooked. Given the cost of such critical public engagements with slavery and its afterlives, a politics of assimilation is understandable and perhaps beneficial to some, but such a politics does not solve the problem of hierarchical citizenship.

Public recognition of transatlantic slavery has been politically and symbolically significant, even when its outcomes in terms of substantive equality are uncertain; however, slavery in colonial Indonesia has not been incorporated into these dynamics. Strikingly, the slavery monuments that were erected in the last two decades, whether they commemorate the abolition of slavery or the revolt of the enslaved people, are all dedicated to transatlantic slavery, not Dutch slavery in colonial Indonesia. Even the National Slavery Monument in Amsterdam’s Oosterpark commemorates the 1863 abolition of transatlantic slavery, but not the 1860 abolition of slavery in colonial Indonesia. The politics of recognition of slavery—anchored as it was in Caribbean Dutch activism—and the proliferation of monuments dedicated to transatlantic slavery in the last two decades have all unintentionally rendered Dutch involvement in slavery in colonial Indonesia even less visible in public memory and culture. The deeply uneven representation of transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery is reflected in the entire Dutch cultural and epistemological landscape,⁴⁵ and the heritage dynamics in the last six years (manifesting itself in new monuments, exhibitions and documentaries) have made this bifurcation even more prominent.

Genealogies of slavery

As I write in February 2019, some younger members of post-colonial diasporic communities with family links to colonial Indonesia—while recognizing the longstanding struggle of Dutch Caribbean communities in de-silencing transatlantic slavery—have started positioning post-colonial communities “from the East” (Dutch citizens of Moluccan, “Indische”, Papuan

and Indonesian background) as descendants of enslaved people. Contrary to what the silencing of slavery in colonial Indonesia in public culture and politics of memory suggests, they express the view that the racialized afterlives of slavery have deeply impacted on later generations. They aim to raise awareness of the Dutch role in Indian Ocean slavery to ensure its inclusion in public histories of the nation, and advocate for solidarity among different post-colonial diasporas as a key element of decolonization. These young commemorators of slavery in “the East”, who have not yet entered the public sphere,⁴⁶ express a novel political subjectivity that involves establishing a genealogical link with Indian Ocean slavery, and are actively working towards propagating Indian Ocean slavery (and its afterlives) in public culture.

Political engagements and practices of memory and commemoration by members of earlier generations with genealogical links to colonial Indonesia were primarily informed by experiences during World War II (especially when Japan took control over the Indonesian archipelago between 1942–1945) and the decolonization wars between the Dutch colonial army and the forces of the emerging Republic of Indonesia.⁴⁷ As earlier generations were assigned and occupied an intermediary position in the Dutch colonial hierarchy, they were deeply impacted upon by these developments, which is evident in the politics of recognition and practices of memory and commemoration in the Netherlands. Post-war generations of colour from the East (of Eurasian, Moluccan and Papuan background) were represented as “loyal” to the Netherlands in dominant discourse, but in the years immediately after their relocation to the Netherlands majoritarian politicians symbolically excluded them from the Dutch nation.⁴⁸ Notwithstanding, no essential political subject from the East exists. A multitude of orientations, ranging from apologizing for Dutch colonialism to manifold critiques of colonialism and its afterlives, are being articulated. While recently the structural and systematic nature of Dutch war crimes during the decolonization wars in Indonesia have become part of public and historiographical scrutiny, the violence of Indian Ocean slavery has not (yet) become a part of the politics of recognition.

The different epistemological and public genealogies of Indian Ocean and transatlantic slavery in the Netherlands demonstrate the dynamic relationships between events, historiography and heritage. How can we make sense of the differentiated genealogies? While no easy answers exist, certain possibilities come to the fore. First, those identifying as descendants of the enslaved have always kept memories and histories of transatlantic slavery alive, which has been one of the conditions that made possible a politics of public recognition

of transatlantic slavery in the Netherlands in the past two decades. More importantly, these politics of memory have become closely intertwined with combatting racism and claiming equal citizenship and belonging in the Dutch nation. Second, Dutch involvement in the formation of colonial Suriname and the Dutch Antilles centred around slavery, which perhaps made its memory harder to repress following decolonization. Third, there seems to be a mutually constitutive relationship between knowledge production, memorial practices and the politics of recognition of transatlantic slavery which may also have contributed to its public visibility and political efficacy.

In contrast, the Dutch role in Indian Ocean slavery has not seen similar involvement of commemorators and descendants in the post-slavery period. Awareness of genealogical links with enslaved individuals has not been culturally nurtured by a living memory of slavery among earlier generations with links to colonial Indonesia. Politics of memory and articulations of equal citizenship were deeply informed by the violent and often traumatic decolonization processes in which post-colonial communities from “the East” were complicatedly entangled. For older generations, the direct impact of these “recent histories” has not been conducive to claiming genealogical links with the “earlier history” of slavery. This is not a necessity, however; some members of the younger generation, self-identifying as “descendants” and inspired by decolonial thinking, are making genealogical connections with the “earlier history” of slavery in colonial Indonesia. Simultaneously, they are pleading for the inclusion of Indian Ocean slavery in public Dutch culture, while critically tracing its racialized afterlives in Dutch society.

‘Inclusion’ and loss

The emerging heritage of transatlantic slavery in Dutch society is not a sign of widespread acceptance of this history (and the people who are identified with it) as integral to Dutch history. It is highly contested and constantly at risk of being obliterated. Broadening the public heritage field of slavery in the Netherlands to include both transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery would further testify to the centrality of slavery to Dutch history; it could also enable the expansion of the political community of commemorators needed to contest the multiplicity of racialized exclusion in Dutch society. From this perspective, recognizing that diasporas with genealogical links to colonial Indonesia and the Caribbean are differentially racialized subjects is not an

argument against broadening the framework of the knowledge production and public memory of slavery, but one in favour of it. A more inclusive public culture of slavery could create the space to discuss the similarities and differences among racialized oppressions in the past and present, and to explore how post-colonial communities with genealogical links to different parts of the Dutch empire are differentially impacted upon by the afterlives of Dutch colonialism in the present. Heritage is dynamic and the public (material and symbolic) culture of slavery can easily be made more inclusive and encompassing. New institutions, such as the as yet to be established National Slavery Museum, should use the novel opportunity to include transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery in their exhibitions.

There are a few benefits of ensuring a more integrated history of Dutch slavery. Comparative historiographical analyses would provide a deeper understanding of the different modalities of Dutch slavery in colonial Indonesia and the Caribbean. Second, new light would be shed on the premise that slavery has been crucial to the rise of capitalist wealth in the metropolises. Recently, as mentioned, a pioneering study authored by Pepijn Brandon and Ulbe Bosma has quantified the importance of Transatlantic slavery for the economy of Holland in the eighteenth century, thereby invalidating earlier claims of its insignificance. What would it mean for our understanding of the genesis of Dutch capitalism and wealth if both the profits (direct and indirect) of transatlantic *and* Indian Ocean slavery were carefully traced and researched? Furthermore, including transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery could help to develop a more elaborate framework within which to analyse the varied nature of historical racism and the racialized afterlives of slavery in the Netherlands. If we include transatlantic and Indian Ocean slavery in trying to make sense of how the cultural archive of Dutch colonialism informs hierarchies and inequalities within Dutch society, this archive may suddenly become much more multisided.

But we should not be blinded by hope. We should also critically reflect upon the impact of knowledge production and heritage dynamics concerning (the afterlives of) slavery for those groups which cannot, in a narrow sense, trace a colonial connection with the Netherlands. If slavery and its racialized afterlives are (contested) vessels for claiming equal citizenship and inclusion in the nation, where would those residents whose memories and colonial histories that do not easily fit into this framework be left? Perhaps we should consider redefining existing slavery monuments as “monuments for the victims of slavery and colonial and capitalist exploitation”? Moreover,

we should keep in mind that “recognition” always produces shadows and losses. As Lisa Lowe puts it:

I try to interpret, from the slave trader’s disinterest in the slave’s pain, those social conditions within which there was no possible political resolution to that pain. I try to imagine what could have been. The *past conditional temporality* of the “what could have been”, symbolizes aptly the space of a different kind of thinking, a space of productive attention to the scene of loss, a thinking with twofold attention that seeks to encompass at once the positive objects and methods of history and social sciences, and also the matters absent, entangled, and unavailable by its methods.⁴⁹

Lowe’s words are wonderfully insightful. I recognize “the positive objects and methods”, but I am particularly drawn to “the scene of loss”. Impactful, horrific stories of many millions have disappeared into black holes of epistemological nothingness, and there is no way to retrieve them. Perhaps “recognition” from this perspective is also about epistemological and political humility—realizing that the stories of millions are lost forever, regardless of the paradigm or “method” we apply.

Notes

1. I am grateful to Nira Wickramasinghe and Alicia Schrikker for the insightful comments and suggestions on the draft versions of this chapter.
2. I thank Alicia Schrikker and Nira Wickramasinghe for pinpointing the actual date and newspaper of the advertisement and for making the point about the continuities with the history of slavery. Here is the advertisement: “De Sumatra Post,” Delpher, accessed 6 April 2019, <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?coll=ddd&query=%28Leeksma+soerabaja+slagers%29&facets%5Bspatial%5D%5B%5D=Nederlands-Indi%C3%AB+%7C+Indonesi%C3%AB&identifier=ddd%3A010320873%3Ampg21%3Aa0015&resultsidentifier=ddd%3A010320873%3Ampg21%3Aa0015>. For advertisements on slavery see, for instance, “Slavernij in de Oost: Een Beetje Vergeten,” Arkhamarchivaris, accessed 6 April 2019, <http://arkhamarchivaris.blogspot.com/2014/02/slavernij-in-de-oost-een-beetje-vergeten.html>.
3. Paul Bijl, “Colonial Memory and Forgetting in the Netherlands and Indonesia,” *Journal of Genocide Research* 14, nos. 3–4 (2012): 441.

4. See for an interesting analysis of the recent epistemological shifts in the study of Dutch colonialism Matthijs Kuipers, "De Strijd om Het Koloniale Verleden. Trauma, Herinnering, en de 'Imperial History Wars' in Nederland," *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 131, no. 4 (2018): 657-676.
5. Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston MA: Beacon Press, 1995.
6. Reggie Baay, *Daar Werd Wat Gruwelijks Verricht. Slavernij in Nederlands-Indië*, 255. Amsterdam: Athenaeum-Polak & Van Genneep, 2015, quotation translated by the author.
7. See Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*.
8. Guno Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet). Over de Discursieve Strijd om de Betekenis van de NTR-Televisie-Serie De Slavernij," *BMGN Low Countries Historical Review* 127, no. 4 (2012): 56-82.
9. Ann Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire*. Durham NC: Duke University Press, 1995, cited in Gloria Wekker, *White Innocence. Paradoxes of Colonialism and Race*, 25. Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2016.
10. Wekker, *White Innocence*, 25.
11. See, for instance, Karwan Fatah-Black, *Eigendomsstrijd: De Geschiedenis Van Slavernij en Emancipatie in Suriname*. Amsterdam: Ambo|Anthos, 2018; Ellen Neslo, *Een Ongekende Elite. De Opkomst van Een Gekleurde Elite in Koloniaal Suriname 1800-1863*. De Bilt: Haes Producties, 2017; Markus Balkenhol, *Tracing Slavery. An Ethnography of Diaspora, Affect and Cultural Heritage in Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: Ridderprint, 2014; Valika Smeulders, *Slavernij in Perspectief. Mondialisering en Erfgoed in Suriname, Ghana, Zuid-Afrika en Curaçao*. Enschede: Ipskamp Drukkers BV, 2012; Lucia Nankoe and Jules Rijssen, *De Slaaf Vliegt Weg. Beeldvorming Over Slavernij in de Kunsten*. Arnhem: LM Publishers, 2013; Aspha Bijnaar, *Kind Aan de Ketting. Opgroeien in Slavernij Toen en nu*. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 2010; Leo Balai, *Het Slavenschip Leusden. Slavenschepen en de West-Indische Compagnie, 1720-1738*. Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2011; Alex van Stipriaan, "De Achterkant van Vrijheid, Gelijkheid, Broederschap," *Tijdschrift over Cultuur & Criminaliteit* 4, no. 3 (2014): 68; Alex van Stipriaan, *Surinaams Contrast. Roofbouw en Overleven in Een Caraïbische Plantagekolonie, 1750-1863*. Amsterdam: KITLV, 1993; Alex van Stipriaan, Waldo Heilbron, Aspha Bijnaar and Valika Smeulders, *Op Zoek Naar de Stille. Sporen van Het Slavernijverleden in Nederland*. Amsterdam: KITLV, 2007; Glenn Willemsen, *Dagen van Gejuich en Gejubel. Viering en Herdenking van de Afschaffing van de Slavernij in Nederland, Suriname en de Nederlandse Antillen*. The Hague/Amsterdam: Amrit, 2006; Rosemary Allen, "In Search for Identity: An Analysis of the Commemoration of the Slave-revolt of 17th of August 1795

in Curaçao. Paper presented at the Conference of Culture". Jamaica, 1996; Rosemary Allen, *Di Ki Manera? A Social History of Afro-Curaçaoans*, 1863-1917. Amsterdam: SWP Publishers, 2007; Kwame Nimako and Glenn Willemsen, *The Dutch Atlantic: Slavery, Abolition and Emancipation*. London: Pluto Press, 2011; Patricia Gomes, *Over "Natuurgenooten" en "Onwillige Honden". Beeldvorming Als Instrument Voor Uitbuiting en Onderdrukking in Suriname 1842-1862*. Amsterdam: Spinhuis, 2003; Humphrey Lamur, *Familiënaam & Verwantschap van Geëmancipeerde Slaven in Suriname*. Amsterdam: LM Publishers, 2004; Humphrey Lamur, "The Evolution of Afro-Surinamese National Movements (1955-1995)," *Transforming Anthropology* 10, no. 1 (2001): 17-27; Humphrey Lamur, "The Slave Family in Colonial 19th-Century Suriname," *Journal of Black Studies* 23, no. 3 (1993): 371-318; Humphrey Lamur, "The Production of Sugar and the Reproduction of Slaves at Vossenburg, Suriname, 1705-1863." Amsterdam: Centre for Caribbean Studies, 1987; Humphrey Lamur, *De Kerstening van de Slaven van de Surinaamse Plantage Vossenburg: 1847-1878*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Antropologisch-Sociologisch Centrum, 1985; Humphrey Lamur, "Demographic Performance of Two Slave Populations of the Dutch Speaking Caribbean," *Boletín de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe* 30 (1981): 87-102; Frank Dragtenstein, *De Ondraaglijke Stoutheid Der Wegloopers: Marronage en Koloniaal Beleid in Suriname, 1667-1768*. Utrecht: CLACS, 2002; Frank Dragtenstein, *Van Elmina Naar Paramaribo*. Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2017; Okke Ten Hove and Frank Dragtenstein, *Manumissies in Suriname 1832-1863*. Utrecht: CLACS & IBS, 1997; Wim Hoogbergen, *"De Bosnegers Zijn Gekomen!" Slavernij en Rebelle in Suriname*. Amsterdam: Prometheus, 1992; Gert Oostindie (ed.), *Het Verleden Onder Ogen. Herdenking van de Slavernij*. Amsterdam: Arena, 2001; Gert Oostindie, Aspha Bijnaar, Alex Van Stipriaan and Valika Smeulders, *Nederland & de Slavernij*, performed by Gert Oostindie, Aspha Bijnaar, Alex Van Stipriaan and Valika Smeulders. Utrecht: VBKMedia, 2013; Esther Captain (m.m.v. Hans Visser), *Wandelgids Sporen van Slavernij in Utrecht*. Utrecht: Centre for the Humanities, 2012; Dienke Hondius, Nancy Jouwe, Dineke Stam and Jennifer Tosch, *Dutch New York Histories. Connecting African, Native American and Slavery Heritage/Geschiedenissen van Nederlands New York*. Volendam: LM Publishers, 2017; Dienke Hondius, Nancy Jouwe, Annemarie de Wildt, Jennifer Tosch and Dineke Stam, *Gids Slavernijverleden Amsterdam/Slavery Heritage Guide*. Volendam: LM Publishers, 2014; Sandew Hira, *Van Priary Tot en Met De Kom: De Geschiedenis van Verzet in Suriname, 1630-1940*. Rotterdam: Futile, 1982; Waldo Heilbron, *Colonial Transformation and the Decomposition of Dutch Plantation Slavery in Suriname (Caribbean Cultural Studies)* (Goldsmiths' College,

Caribbean Centre, 1993); Rudolf van Lier, *Samenleving in Een Grensgebied. Een Sociaal-Historische Studie van Suriname*. Amsterdam: Emmering, 1977; Anton de Kom, *Wij Slaven van Suriname*. Bussum: Het Wereldvenster (first published in 1934, by Uitgeverij Contact), 1982.

Some two decades ago, the knowledge field on plantation slavery in Suriname was already substantial, as Ramsodh demonstrates: see Hans Ramsodh, "Surinamistiek 1975-2000," *OSO, tijdschrift voor Surinaamse taalkunde, letterkunde, cultuur en geschiedenis* 20 (2001), 137-139.

12. See Pepijn Brandon, "Slavernijgeschiedenis zonder polderen: observaties over een debat vol contrast," *Beleid en Maatschappij*, 46, no. 2 (2019): 258-264.
13. See Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet)," 56-82.
14. The Mapping Slavery team currently consists of Dienke Hondius, Nancy Jouwe, Wim Manuhutu, Jennifer Tosch and Dineke Stam.
15. Pepijn Brandon and Ulbe Bosma, "De betekenis van de Atlantische slavernij voor de Nederlandse economie in de tweede helft van de achttiende eeuw," *Tijdschrift voor Sociale en Economische Geschiedenis*, 16, no. 2 (2019): 5-45. The research team that gathered the data for this publication consisted of Pepijn Brandon, Tamira Combrink, Gerhard de Kok and Karin Lurvink.
16. See, for instance, Harry Hoetink, *Het Patroon van de Oude Curaçaose Samenleving: een Sociologische Studie*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1958; Wim Klooster, "Subordinate but Proud: Curaçao's Free Blacks and Mulattoes in the Eighteenth Century," *New West Indian Guide*, 68, nos. 304 (1994): 283-300; Nolda Kenepa-Römer, "Curaçaose Vrouwen in de Slavenmaatschappij," in *Womanhood in Curaçau*, edited by Richenel Ansano, Joceline Clemencia, Jeanette Cook and Eithel Martis, 21-42. Willemstad; Fundashon Publikashon Curaçao, 1992; Rosemary Allen, "In Search for Identity: An Analysis of the Commemoration of the Slave-revolt of 17th of August 1795 in Curaçao. Paper presented at the Conference of Culture". Jamaica, 1996; Rosemary Allen, *Di Ki Manera? A Social History of Afro-Curaçaoans, 1863-1917*. Amsterdam: SWP Publishers, 2007.
17. Angela Roe, *The Sound of Silence: Ideology of National Identity and Racial Inequality in Contemporary Curaçao* (PhD thesis, Florida International University, 2016), 61.
18. Such as duration, extent of slave trade, conditions on slave ships, number of enslaved people, racist ideologies, ferocity of the regime, and involvement of Dutch law and of state-sanctioned Dutch companies.
19. Baay, *Daar Werd Wat Gruwelijks Verricht*, 255; Matthias van Rossum, *Kleurrijke Tragiek. De Geschiedenis van Slavernij in Azië Onder de VOC*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2015.

20. Alex van Stipriaan, "Slavernijonderzoek en Debat in Nederland: Een Stand van Zaken" (public lecture 2011).
21. Ibid., 2011.
22. Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet)," 56–82; Nimako and Willemssen, *The Dutch Atlantic*, 158.
23. Smeulders, *Slavernij in Perspectief*, 53.
24. Willemssen, *Dagen van Gejuich en Gejubel*, 143–153 and back cover.
25. Lamur, "The Evolution of Afro-Surinamese National Movements," 17–27; Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet)," 56–82.
26. Lamur, "The Evolution of Afro-Surinamese National Movements," 17–27. Humphrey Lamur is an emeritus professor at the University of Amsterdam. He conducted extensive research on Dutch Caribbean slavery long before the subject became fashionable.
27. Nimako and Willemssen, *The Dutch Atlantic*, 158–62. See Balkenhol, *Tracing Slavery*.
28. See Johan F. Jones, *Kwakoe en Christus. Een Beschouwing Over de Ontmoeting van de Afro-Amerikaanse Cultuur en Religie Met de Hernhutter Zending in Suriname*. Brussels: Universitaire Protestantse Faculteit te Brussel, 1981.
29. Personal observation.
30. See Lamur, "The Evolution of Afro-Surinamese National Movements," 17–27; Nimako and Willemssen, *The Dutch Atlantic*, 157.
31. Lamur, "The Evolution of Afro-Surinamese National Movements," 17–27; Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet)," 56–82.
32. Lamur, "The Evolution of Afro-Surinamese National Movements," 17, italics added by the author; Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet)," 65; Balkenhol, *Tracing Slavery*.
33. Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet)," 56–82; Guno Jones, *Tussen Onderdanen, Rijksgenoten en Nederlanders: Nederlandse Politici Over Burgers Uit Oost en West en Nederland, 1945–2005*. Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers, 2007.
34. See Smeulders, *Slavernij in Perspectief*.
35. Baay, *Daar Werd Wat Gruwelijks Verricht*, 255.
36. Reggie Baay, *De Njai. Het Concubinaat in Nederlands-Indië*. Amsterdam: Athenaeum-Polak & Van Gennep, 2008.
37. Balkenhol, *Tracing Slavery*; Jones, "De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet)," 56–82.
38. Ibid., 56–82; Guno Jones, "Het Belang van Een Gedenkteken. De Discussie Over Het Nationaal Monument Nederlands Slavernijverleden," *Kleio* 42, no. 5

- (2001): 9–13; Nimako and Willemsen, *The Dutch Atlantic*, 158–164; Balkenhol, *Tracing Slavery*.
39. The ways in which the monument is referred to in the media have shifted. While the platform set out to erect the *Nationaal Monument Nederlands Slavernijverleden* (National Slavery Monument of the Netherlands), it is now mostly referred to in the media as the *Nationaal Monument Slavernijverleden*.
 40. Natasja Gibbs, “Steeds meer gemeenten organiseren een officiële slavernijherdenking,” *Caribisch Network* (Nederland), 26 June 2018, <https://caribischnetwork.ntr.nl/2018/06/26/steeds-meer-gemeenten-organiseren-een-officie-slavernijherdenking/>.
 41. Jones, “De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet),” 66.
 42. Balkenhol, *Tracing Slavery*.
 43. The NiNsee was responsible for organizing the annual commemoration at the national monument, conducting research on slavery and its afterlives, and providing educational materials to schools. It had almost become defunct after the withdrawal of a government subsidy (almost all employees lost their jobs), but luckily the municipality of Amsterdam provided financial support for the commemoration.
 44. In 2018, the majority of the parliament voted in favour of a motion that called upon the Dutch Government to enquire into providing a structural subsidy for the annual commemoration of slavery at the National Slavery Monument. The far-right ethno-nationalists (consisting of PVV and Forum For Democracy), the orthodox Christians and the liberals (VVD) (the biggest party in the government coalition that provides the prime minister) voted against the motion.
 45. Jones, “De Slavernij is Onze Geschiedenis (Niet),” 56–82.
 46. I received an interesting draft of an open letter from a network of members of the younger generation of diasporic communities from “the East”. Unfortunately, it was retracted and is, thus, officially non-existent.
 47. See Esther Captain, *Achter Het Kawat Was Nederland. Indische Oorlogservaringen en Herinneringen 1942–1945*. Kampen: Kok Kampen, 2002, and Esther Captain, “Geen Spoorje Indisch, Geen Bamboe, Geen Prikkeldraad. Het Tweesporenbeleid van Indische Zelforganisaties (1946–2000),” in *Binnenskamers. Terugkeer en Opvang na de Tweede Wereldoorlog*, edited by Conny Kristel, 325–355. Bakker: Amsterdam, 2002b.
 48. Jones, *Tussen Onderdanen*.
 49. Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham NC and London: Duke University Press, 2015), 40–41.

