

# 'As long as they keep away from me': The paradox of antigay violence in a gay-friendly country

**Laurens Buijs, Gert Hekma and Jan Willem Duyvendak**

Amsterdam Research Centre for Gender and Sexuality, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Sexualities  
14(6) 632–652  
© The Author(s) 2011  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1363460711422304  
sex.sagepub.com



## **Abstract**

Considering the tolerant and gay-friendly image of the Netherlands, antigay violence is a remarkably grave problem. By combining a broad survey of Amsterdam youth with in-depth interviews with smaller groups and individual attackers and reviewing recent cases, we conclude that traditional norms of gender and sexuality present in broader society form the breeding ground of the violence. The gay-friendly narrative that dominates discussions on citizenship in the Netherlands – opposing the liberal ‘Dutch’ to the Muslim ‘Other’ – coexists next to traditional norms of gender and sexuality, thereby not challenging the roots of homonegativity. Even perpetrators duplicate the prevailing gay-tolerant rhetoric of Dutch society, but do not refrain from all sorts of violence as soon as they are confronted with aspects of it that collide with traditional norms of gender and sexuality. Peer pressure and the fear of seduction often function as triggers of the violence. However, these situational factors can only be understood in a larger macro-sociological framework, showing the necessity of a multilevel approach in coming towards a comprehensive understanding of antigay violence.

## **Keywords**

antigay violence, heteronormativity, homophobia, Islamophobia, Dutch citizenship

---

### **Corresponding author:**

Laurens Buijs, Kloveniersburgwal 48, 1012 CX Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
Email: [l.j.buijs@uva.nl](mailto:l.j.buijs@uva.nl)

## Introduction

The Netherlands is known around the world for its liberal position on homosexuality. The capital city, Amsterdam, in particular is often associated with gay emancipation, as it provided the setting for the world's first legally recognized 'gay marriage' in 2001, and hosts the famous gay parade with festively decorated boats floating through the city's picturesque canals each year.

In cross-national survey research, the Dutch indeed indicate to accept homosexuality more than most other European peoples. The Dutch almost invariably show the most support for non-discrimination of, and equal rights for homosexuals (Gerhards, 2010; Keuzenkamp and Bos, 2007). Moreover, Dutch surveys show that general tolerance of homosexuality increased dramatically between 1970 and 1980, and has been steady since or even still slightly growing in recent surveys (Keuzenkamp, 2010; Keuzenkamp et al., 2006).

With seemingly large support of gay rights among the Dutch population, it is surprising that violence against homosexuals is a severe problem in Amsterdam. An analysis of police files, intended to provide quantified data on the occurrence, times, and locations of the violence in the city, showed that gay men fall victim to violence on a very regular basis. Suspects are mostly young men between 15 and 25 years old (Buijs et al., 2009: 51). In 2007, 201 cases were recorded, of which 67 were cases of physical violence, and 38 of serious threat (Buijs et al., 2009: 41).<sup>1</sup> The actual number of violent attacks is probably much higher, as police estimates say that between 75 per cent and 95 per cent of the incidents go unreported (Buijs et al., 2009: 38). The number of reported lesbian victims of anti-homosexual violence is comparatively very low – only 4 per cent of the reported cases – and will not be discussed in this article.

Recently, several scholars have analysed how acceptance of homosexuality is used in the construction of national identity in the Netherlands, positioning a 'we' (the native, 'progressive' Dutch) versus a 'them' (the Others who are 'backward') (Butler, 2008; Ceuppens and Geschiere, 2005; Duyvendak et al., 2009; Geschiere, 2009; Hekma, 2002; Hurenkamp et al., 2011; Keuzenkamp, 2010; Mepschen et al., 2010; Schinkel, 2008). In line with their anti-immigration agenda, right-wing political parties, until 2000 generally opposed to gay rights, now declare the immigrants' relatively negative attitudes towards homosexuality (Keuzenkamp et al., 2006; see also Keuzenkamp, 2010)<sup>2</sup> as a threat to the 'Dutch tradition of tolerance'. In particular, Muslim migrants and their descendants are accused of being 'backward', for example by reference to homophobic statements of imams (Hekma, 2002) and violent conflicts between sexual and other minorities in urban areas. Emancipation of homosexuals is now no longer exclusively a left-wing issue. Almost all political parties in the Netherlands explicitly claim to support gay rights, regardless of their position on the political spectrum (Duyvendak et al., 2009).

The increasing popular support for the claim that acceptance of homosexuality is something 'typically Dutch' that should be protected, indicates that the acceptance of homosexuality has become a touchstone of belonging in the Netherlands.

Some scholars see this as a result of the ‘culturalization of citizenship’ in western European societies that claim to base citizenship rights on juridical and social status. This term denotes the recent, increasing importance attached to culture and morality – and in particular sexuality and gender – in shaping citizenship and integration policy (Geschiere, 2009; Hurenkamp et al., 2011; Mepschen et al., 2010; Schinkel, 2008).

The populist right-wing party PVV declared in the Dutch parliament in 2008 that ‘The perpetrators of antigay violence in the big cities are almost always Muslims, almost always Moroccans.’<sup>3</sup> The study of police files however shows that suspects of physical violence in Amsterdam are as often native (‘autochthonous’) Dutch as Dutch-Moroccan (both 36%), although the latter are overrepresented as suspects considering the fact 16 per cent of all Amsterdam male youth under 25 years of age is Dutch-Moroccan, while 39 per cent is native Dutch (Buijs et al., 2009: 50). Still we can conclude that neither do all perpetrators share the same religious ideals, nor do the widely supported gay-friendly values in Dutch society prevent native Dutch from committing violence against gays.

In order to disentangle the paradox of structural violent incidents against homosexuals in a country with a dominant gay-friendly discourse, this study intends to determine the motives of the perpetrators.

## **A multilevel methodology**

Forty-five recent incidents of violence were carefully reconstructed by means of in-depth interviews (coded as IN) with 17 perpetrators (involved in 14 incidents), and analysis of extensive files from law courts of the Public Prosecutor (coded as PP) and the Dutch resettlement association (coded as RN) of 35 perpetrators (involved in 31 incidents).<sup>4</sup> The interviewed perpetrators have been questioned extensively about their attitudes towards homosexuality. This way, the influence of beliefs and motivations can be distinguished from more random, ‘situational’ factors leading to the violence (Collins, 2008).

If such analysis reveals an influence of beliefs and motivations, their ‘breeding ground’ remains unclear: they may be nothing more than the personal perspective of the perpetrators, but they may also flow from belief systems existing in their narrow social sphere, or even from broader societal norms. To be able to distinguish between influences on those three ontological levels, a multilevel methodology was opted for. The in-depth interviews with perpetrators shed light on their personal beliefs and attitudes, focus groups (coded as FG) with young men from ‘risk groups’ (with individuals who meet the profile of potential perpetrators, but who have probably not actually committed violence) provide the dominant discourse on homosexuality in different social groupings, and surveys in secondary schools offer the perspective of Amsterdam youth in general.

Each focus group consisted of at least five male participants. Seven social groupings have been interviewed by means of eight focus group meetings. Five of the eight focus groups concern street urchins belonging to four of the main ethnic

minorities in the Netherlands, that is, with a Turkish (coded as TU), Moroccan (coded as MO), Surinam (coded as SU) and Antillean (coded as AN) background. The average age of participants of each focus group varied between 17 and 20. Furthermore, a group of supporters of Amsterdam's main soccer club Ajax (coded as AJ), members of the Marine Corps (coded as MA), and gay fraternity students (coded as ST) were included. Two separate focus group meetings were held with Dutch-Moroccan street urchins.<sup>5</sup>

A total of 517 pupils from eight different schools completed the survey. The sample consists of 223 boys (43.1%) and 294 girls (56.9%) in their first, second or third year of secondary education. The average age is 14 years.<sup>6</sup>

## **A qualified acceptance**

Despite the liberal reputation of the Netherlands, the data of this study show that some aspects of male homosexuality are widely considered undesired deviations in all researched groups. Four aspects in particular invoke resentment: anal sex, feminine behaviour, public displays and attempts to seduce.

### *Anal sex*

No questions regarding anal sex were included in the survey amongst Amsterdam youth, but the topic is explicitly mentioned in almost all focus groups and interviews. For many, it seems to be inextricably bound up with homosexuality. 'Anus' (FG/MO2), 'filthiness' (FG/MO2), and 'A man who fucks a guy in the ass' (FG/MO1) are words already mentioned during association rounds in the focus groups. The respondents indicate almost without exception to feel an aversion to images in which two men are kissing or having sex. The participants of the Dutch-Moroccan focus groups even agree on the fact that sex between men is 'the main reason why homosexuality is so repulsive' (FG/MO1). One of them exclaims: 'An exit remains an exit, you know, right? It's filthy and unsightly' (FG/MO2).<sup>7</sup>

In one case, a soldier and some of his colleagues seriously injured several homosexuals on a gay cruising area in the east of the Netherlands. During the interview, it becomes clear that the aversion to male sex plays an important role. He first associates homosexuality with 'ass bumping' and during the interview, he describes his feelings of total disbelief and indignation when he saw two men having anal intercourse, right before he proceeded to assault them. He was asked to describe what crossed his mind when he saw this:

Well, you think, 'This is not real'. That is what crosses your mind at that moment. You think, 'This is not actually happening. This is not right, this is wrong—This is—' Fuck! You are standing next to it, you know what I mean? I saw it in a flash, I turned around and started to walk away from it because I thought, 'I have no business being here, I have to leave!' Well, and my mate had exactly the same thoughts, he eh— [inaudible] I am leaving. Yeah, that's what crossed my mind, unreal! That men

are doing this with each other, you know what I mean? That is unreal. But okay, no hard feelings. (IN/15)

One of the Dutch-Moroccan perpetrators declared:

You see gays and you immediately start to think about the sex, you know, right? That is wrong, really, because when you think it through, you realize that it is not all about sex. Probably they—they care for each other. Or they even love each other, you know, right? I think the biggest problem with gays who get beaten is that many boys immediately start to think about the sexual side of it. (IN/13)

### *Feminine behaviour*

Amsterdam pupils generally consider gender deviant behaviour a bigger problem than homosexuality in itself.<sup>8</sup> A majority of secondary school boys (53.5%) indicate to accept a masculine gay boy as a classmate, but only 40.3 per cent would accept a feminine gay boy. Interestingly, a feminine straight boy is not accepted much more: barely 41.5 per cent of the boys would accept him.<sup>9</sup>

Young men of the risk groups and perpetrators say they also mainly object to feminine behaviour of gay men, which they generally consider 'unnecessary', 'annoying', and 'exaggerated'. 'I'm fine with people being gay, but they should at least behave in a normal way' (FG/AJ). 'When they behave as a normal man there's no problem at all, you know? But if they behave as a woman ...' (IN/11). 'I'm perfectly fine with people being gay, right? But you are and you stay a man. So act like it, you still have a dick' (FG/AN). 'It's fine when you're a homo, but you should behave like a real man. You should be able to give a proper hand' (IN/14). Sometimes it is explicitly mentioned that gays who adapt to the gender norms gain more respect: 'If a gay behaves like a man, the fact that he is homosexual is of course still wrong, you know? But it is not as bad, because you can tell that he tries to adapt' (FG/SU).

Many interviewees associate male homosexuality with feminine behaviour, and conceive this as a major source of irritation. Opinions differ on whether all or only some gays are feminine. A Dutch-Antillean respondent recalls an anecdote of someone he knows who appeared to be gay, 'while you couldn't tell it at all' (FG/AN). Since then, he realizes that 'fags come in two kinds: the fags are the sluts, but this guy was just gay'. One Dutch-Surinamese youngster reasons that it must be half of them, 'because in every homosexual relationship, one is masculine and one is feminine' (FG/SU).

The marines indicate to have professional objections to homosexuals in the corps, as they are considered 'weaker' and 'more feminine': 'You can wait for the moment one breaks a nail. Gays are just weaker and cannot deal well with injuries. You don't want that in the group' (FG/MA).

The stories from the homosexual fraternity students make clear just how significant heteronormative pressure might get. Feminine behaviour is generally not appreciated at fraternities: 'When you behave in very feminine ways, you are an easy target of hassling' (FG/ST). Most of the interviewees indicate that because of this, they are consciously behaving in masculine ways at the fraternity: 'I actively tried to be one of the boys, with girlfriends and stuff' (FG/ST). The following quotation illustrates that this can have far-reaching consequences:

I constantly tried to get across as a straight guy and eventually lost control over myself. Sometimes I just didn't know who I actually was and how I should behave. I decided to stay in the fraternity, just to have 'something straight'. (FG/ST)

The students find an outlet in Amsterdam's gay clubs: 'Gays who are members of a student fraternity express themselves in gay bars. At the fraternity, you act as normal as possible' (FG/ST).

Although there is widespread consensus over the fact that feminine behaviour of gay men is wrong, some indicate to have problems with gays who act 'normally' as well: 'I'm being honest here, do you know who are even more annoying? Those guys of whom you can't see it. Why? Imagine you hang out with him and he suddenly says he's gay ... Then people might have seen me walking around with him!' (FG/MO2).<sup>10</sup>

Feminine behaviour potentially feeds aggression. 'Faggots can bump into you and instead of saying sorry, they say 'What?' in this queer manner. That can easily result in a conflict' (FG/SU). One Dutch-Antillean recalls a conflict with a 'probably gay' guy because he was complaining 'in a homosexual tone' about the slow service in a fast food restaurant (FG/AN).

Several perpetrators indicate they were irritated by their victim's 'feminine' behaviour. One of the perpetrators who threatened a group of homosexuals in a gym and spat them in the face, is asked what he thinks about his victims: 'They are a little bit effeminate. That's okay, but then they shouldn't go to a place where you are expected to be a real man' (IN/08). Another perpetrator, who threatened his homosexual neighbour and vandalized his bike, tells that his victim is well known for his feminine behaviour: 'I can't stand that at all, just be yourself ... I don't respect that kind of men. What would your parents say about that?' (IN/17). A Dutch-Moroccan youngster was arrested in Amsterdam because of a serious assault on a transsexual woman. He called her a 'fag' and 'transvestite' before hitting her several times with a steel pipe, inflicting serious injury (PP/28).

### *Public displays*

A third aspect of homosexuality that conflicts with the heterosexual system in all examined groups is public displays of homosexuality. Many consider it as something that should be largely restricted to the private sphere. Public expressions of

homosexuality, either an 'extravagant' gay pride, 'feminine' clothes or same-sex couples showing affection in public, are widely frowned upon.

The survey results reveal that Amsterdam youngsters are rather intolerant towards public expressions of homosexuality, especially when it concerns males: 24.4 per cent think it is 'filthy' when two women are kissing in public, while this is 46.2 per cent when two men are kissing. Only 7.8 per cent think it is filthy when a mixed couple are publicly kissing.

Almost all interviewed risk-group youngsters express their displeasure with the fact that homosexuality is often displayed in public areas. The data make clear that rejection of public displays is often connected to or even overlaps with disapproval of feminine behaviour; this is generally seen as artificial and unnecessary, used by men to 'profile themselves as homosexual' (FG/AJ). Many state that feminine gays attract most attention: 'Those feminine queers are always sensation-seeking and want to attract attention. They should not be surprised to get ... negative reactions' (FG/AJ). Most find that 'gays should know their bounds' (FG/AN): 'It is unacceptable to kiss another man on the streets' (FG/SU). The yearly Gay Pride is often mentioned as the ultimate wrong example when it comes to public displays: 'The Gay Pride is completely unacceptable. Homosexuality is something people should keep to themselves' (FG/MA).

Youngsters from the risk groups with an immigrant background generally regard the openness of homosexuality as something 'typically Dutch': 'In Morocco, everybody should do as he likes and people know who's gay, but they are not supposed to kiss in public. If people keep it privately, there's no problem at all ... But in Holland, everything has to be labelled' (FG/MO2).<sup>11</sup> They believe that others might be 'contaminated' by the visibility of homosexuality: the Netherlands 'set off a chain reaction over the whole world' (FG/SU). Many worry about the negative consequences the public displays may have for children: 'Little kids experiment a lot. When they see queers, they might copy their behaviour. This is also the reason why parents don't want their children to see them' (FG/MO1). Youngsters from ethnic minorities often prefer social over biological explanations, which feeds their fear of becoming homosexual by interacting with them (see also Crocker, 2005; Crocker et al., 1998; Whitley, 1990).<sup>12</sup>

Most perpetrators sharply condemn public visibility of homosexuality as well. One perpetrator who assaulted a gay man and threatened him with a knife says his aggression was triggered when he saw his victim kissing with a man in a park:

How he was kissing him there publicly ... Maybe I'm not allowed to reject that, but I think it's a major issue, you know? They should just eh—they should make a rule stating that it is not allowed in public anymore. You know—just do it at home. (IN/01)

One of the interviewees who threw his homosexual neighbour down a staircase explains how his irritation 'was built up over years': 'It all starts on the streets, when he shows his visitors to the door and ardently says goodbye to them.

Then I say to myself: “Just do that inside your own living room and keep the rest of the neighbourhood out of this” (IN/05). Another one harassed a group of homosexuals who were dressed up as angels during the Gay Pride weekend, persistently insulting them and asking why they would ‘put so much emphasis’ on their homosexuality; two coincidentally passing police officers were able to prevent an attack by arresting him (PP/36). One Dutch-Turkish perpetrator blames the motive for his attack on an overtly kissing man in one of Amsterdam’s parks by saying that ‘little kids were watching’ (IN/01).

### *Attempts to seduce*

The fourth contentious aspect of homosexuality is the fear it provokes of becoming a sex object of a homosexual man. The interviewees do not want to be forced into a role that they perceive as feminine. They are subjects, not objects of desire.

The fear of being seduced by a homosexual is a possible explanation for the Amsterdam pupils’ poor acceptance of homosexuality at close quarters.<sup>13</sup> Mainly boys have problems with a homosexual peer: 29 per cent ruled out the option of becoming friends (while this is 15.8% with girls), 39.4 per cent do not want to do homework together (22.6% with girls), and 38.1 per cent do not want to spend time with a homosexual during breaks (17.9% with girls). Moreover, 61.8 per cent would make clear to him that he should keep his hands off (38.6% with girls) and 54.2 per cent would not share a room with him (36.2% with girls).

The fear of seduction demands an important role in almost all focus groups and perpetrator interviews and appears to be of major influence on the way homosexuality is perceived. The interviewees are undividedly afraid of being attractive to gay men and of being seduced by them:

The first thing I have to think of [when thinking about homosexuality] is that I don’t want to have anything to do with it. If one of my friends would turn out to be gay, I swear I would not want to have anything to do with him. Imagine that he would find me attractive, that’s disgusting. (FG/MO1)

This fear is one of the reasons why most interviewed risk boys rule out the option of becoming friends with a homosexual. The Ajax supporters argue that it is hypothetically possible to become friends with a homosexual, but only after making clear to him ‘that he does not stand a chance’ (FG/AJ). A Dutch-Antillean states that he knows a guy who is ‘the dopest queer’ he ever ‘chilled’ with, after which he quickly adds: ‘I’m not saying that I chill with queers or anything’ (FG/AN). According to the marines, homosexuality conflicts with the culture of the corps:

That’s very hard, for everyone but especially for the homosexual. When we’re on a mission, we sometimes have to share a tent. You have to share everything together.



If I share a tent with a fag and everyone knows about it, I will be the one frowned upon' (FG/MA).

The risk-group youngsters often indicate that they could get violent when they feel they are being seduced by a gay man: 'In that situation I would think: "So you want to take me in the ass? If you don't piss off quickly you will regret it"' (FG/MO1). 'If they touch me physically, for example here near my bottom, I will hit' (FG/MO1). 'If a fag comes to me and asks me to do something I don't want, then that queer is history' (FG/MO2). 'I don't have problems with it as long as they don't touch me, but if they start to flirt, something bad could happen' (FG/AN). 'If a fag tries to fix me, I would get angry. It could lead to a fight' (FG/SU).

Remarkably, most risk youngsters consider the option of being seduced by a gay man to be exceptionally realistic. They see homosexual men as unreliable and sexually obsessed, who make 'feints' all the time 'to fix you' (FG/AN). They often attribute a strong urge to seduce to homosexual men: 'Gays weigh the pro and cons each time they see a guy they fancy: "Either I approach him and risk a blue eye but then at least I can jack off tonight thinking about him, or I just walk past him"' (FG/AN).

Perpetrators express themselves in similar wordings: 'I'm willing to understand that they're gay, but they shouldn't get too close to me. I don't want that. If I can't make that clear in a decent way, I am forced to use other means' (IN/05). Many versions of this sentence are recorded, such as 'As long as he leaves me alone' (IN/04), 'As long as they keep away from me' (PP/26) and 'As long as they don't touch me' (IN/06).

Some perpetrators explicitly express their difficulties fitting homosexuality into the traditional gender framework: 'I don't know what he wanted when he was trying to seduce me—I don't know, I just don't know what he— Listen, I sometimes think fags are just like women, you know? They act like them, you know? Just look at the way they act. They're just like women, I don't know—hard to explain.' (IN/01). 'I feel threatened when a man is hitting on me. No, I don't want a man to rub my nipples or touch my bottom. Maybe in 500 years, then it might be normal' (IN/04).

Although some perpetrators legitimized their violent acts by claiming that they were assaulted or touched first, the data show that this is rather unlikely in most incidents. All victims deny those allegations, and are often backed by eye-witnesses (e.g. in PP/26 and PP/31). It seems that many perpetrators stereotype homosexuals as hypersexual 'predators' that can strike at any moment, leading to a highly unrealistic fear of being seduced by homosexuals.

## Group dynamics

The data show that heteronormative ideas are further enhanced in groups. Antigay attitudes are known to serve as a social expression by which individuals emphasize, strengthen, or create their membership to a masculine group (Herek, 1992: 153).

A 'fag discourse' (with 'fag'-related remarks and jokes) serves to discipline boys and young men to gender norms (Pascoe, 2007). Results from the survey show that similar discourses are common among Amsterdam youth: 53.7 per cent of the surveyed boys indicated to have been called 'gay', 'faggot', or 'queer' in the last six months.<sup>14</sup>

The qualitative data shed light on the precise mechanisms of the 'fag discourse'. The marines explain: 'Colleagues, but also executives, regularly ask: 'What are you, a fag?' This is meant as a belittling remark, to make clear that you shouldn't behave like a pussy but like a real man. You hear the word 'fag' a lot around here. It's a word that's often first in your dictionary' (FG/MA). The Ajax supporters say that the word 'homo' is 'mutually the most often-used term of abuse, just because it sounds right' (FG/AJ). The homosexual fraternity students claim that the word 'is often used for jokes, especially during the selection procedures'. The participants of this focus group agree that it is best to deny your sexual preference during these selection weeks with the start of each academic year: 'Most fraternities do not want to be associated with homosexuality. We had one group with two homosexuals in our fraternity and this group was not taken seriously at all. And of course most of us want to get in the higher groups' (FG/ST).

In 63.5 per cent of the researched violent incidents, there is more than one perpetrator involved. When asked, the perpetrators say that they use words like 'gay' or 'fag' so often in their group of friends, that, according to one, they have 'no meaning anymore by now' (IN/15). One perpetrator said he often disparages homosexuals when he is hanging out with his friends in order to prevent him from being 'rejected' by the group (IN/02). One of the perpetrators declares: 'I think that people who bash gays are being bullied by their friends and accused of being queer themselves. Their way of showing that they're straight is by attacking one' (IN/07). Another incident proves how strong the need can be to distance themselves from a gay identity. A 20-year-old man stormed into a sex shop and put a television set displaying a gay porn movie on fire. The probation officer notes: 'The client states that he did this because he was constantly called a homosexual by his friends, because he was never seen with a girl ... The client wanted to make a statement: "I am not gay!"' (RN/44).

Interestingly, although the risk-group youngsters and perpetrators feel resentment towards homosexuality, many seem to be fascinated by it as well. The dominance of gay-related discourses might have contributed to the development of curiosity for the topic. This curiosity even drove some to pay visits to gay cruising areas. Five young men were interviewed who were involved in three different incidents on gay cruising areas. All declared independently from each other that a hidden-camera documentary on cruising areas for homosexuals, broadcasted on a major Dutch television network in 2005, whetted their idea of paying a visit themselves: 'We were watching this documentary, and one of the others said, "Let's have a look there man! Let's go! Let's go!" And well, I thought that would be interesting as well, just to bring some terror there, you know? So we googled it and found a place to go to' (IN/11).

Most of those who visited gay cruising areas declare not to have gone there with the intention to commit violence, but rather out of curiosity. This curiosity even drives them to get involved in confusing games, seemingly meant to provoke their future victims:

One of my friends was working on a school project and he wanted to film the cruising area for this. We arrived there, and he parks his car right next to the passenger's seat of some of the visitors. And he starts to stroke them and that kind of stuff, you know? And then he asked one of those men, like, 'Hey, are you horny and do you want to walk with me a little through the forest?' Then this man, I mean this fag, started to pull down his pants and stuff. Then my friend quickly filmed this and ran away. (IN/11)

A group of soldiers who visited a cruising site also engaged in games before the situation escalated into violence:

And there was this guy following us all the time. We called him the Frenchman, because he had a French accent ... At one moment, he walked straight at us and asked 'Hey do you want me to suck you?' I thought: 'Well!' so I said, yeah I had to stay in character you know, so I said, 'No I first want to get horny a bit more', you know what I mean? So we continued walking, but this guy was still constantly following us ... When we stopped, he stopped. When we started walking, he started walking. It seemed like a rabbit game, completely weird ... Then later this guy asked one of my friends: 'Are you gay?' And my friend said: 'No.' 'So what are you, bisexual?' And my friend said: 'No.' 'So you must be straight then', this guy said. And my friend responded again: 'No.' 'Then what are you?' that guy asked. And my friend turned around and said: 'I'm aggressive!' and he hit him in the mug real hard, really bizarre. So this guy collapsed. (IN/15)

### **The gay-friendly discourse**

The analysis thus far has shown that even in 'liberal' Holland, homosexuality remains in conflict with traditional views on gender and sexuality, which were found in all researched groups. Although survey research shows that acceptance of homosexuality amongst Dutch-Turks, Dutch-Moroccans and Dutch-Antilleans is below the national average (Keuzenkamp et al., 2006), risk youngsters and perpetrators with a religious background generally reject homosexuality with exactly the same arguments as others. Violation of traditional gender codes is their main reason for condemnation, and the most important source for their disgust and resentment. The Dutch-Moroccan overrepresentation in police statistics of antigay violence is more likely the result of their low social-economic position, combined with the fact that their family networks are less tight, and their upbringing less

strict, than for example those of Dutch-Turks. This draws the Dutch-Moroccans, more often than youngsters from other groups, away from their homes and schools to public spaces, where they learn to live according to the tough and hyper-masculine codes of the culture of the street (see also de Jong, 2007).

At the same time, we have seen that a narrative framing Dutch modernity versus Muslim tradition is dominating discussions on Dutch culture and citizenship, in which acceptance of homosexuality functions as a symbol of Dutch tolerance and sexual freedom. Interestingly, this narrative appears to be able to coexist with traditional ideas on gender and sexuality, thereby leaving the roots of homonegativity intact. The survey set out amongst Amsterdam youth for example shows high acceptance of homosexuality in general terms,<sup>15</sup> but poor acceptance in other dimensions, that is, of gender deviant behaviour, of public displays of homosexuality, and at close quarters.

Even risk-group youngsters and perpetrators explicitly express sympathy towards the alleged Dutch tolerant values. None of the perpetrators that were interviewed for example indicated to have committed the violence just because he dislikes homosexuals. On the contrary, in most cases perpetrators indicated to be 'completely fine' with homosexuality. They even share the opinion that they live in a gay-friendly nation in which it is 'old-fashioned' (IN/15) or 'not done' (IN/17) to speak out negatively about homosexuality. When entering the interview room, one of the interviewees immediately stressed that he thought 'there's nothing wrong with homosexuals' (IN/01). He said this even before introducing himself, with his coat still on.

However, this sentence is generally followed by the word 'but', after which an account is given of the conditions that homosexuals should meet before a gay man finds favour in their eyes. Homosexuals are fine as long as they do not indulge in anal sex, do not behave in feminine ways, do not publicly display their preference, and do not make any attempts to seduce. The formulated conditions for 'acceptable homosexuality' are strongly related to traditional norms of gender and sexuality, proving that the gay-friendly discourse dominant in Dutch society does not seriously challenge the true causes of homonegativity.

Many interviewees say they are even proud at the Dutch leading role in the world when it comes to liberal ideas. The marines agree on their motivation for joining the armed forces: 'You stand for the Netherlands, and tolerance *is* the Netherlands' (FG/MA). The Ajax supporters say that tolerance is something they explicitly carry out in the stadium, because 'that's something that belongs to Amsterdam and something every supporter is proud of'. They also regard homosexuality as something that belongs to Amsterdam, 'but you don't want to have gays standing next to you in the stadium' (FG/AJ).

The soldier who was part of the group who attacked gay men on a cruising area in the east of the Netherlands also indicates to be proud of the Dutch (gay) tolerance. His greatest wish is to serve the country in Afghanistan, a dream that was shattered when he was dismissed from the Dutch Armed Forces after the violence he committed. 'So they kicked me out. Then I think, "Well hello, that's absolutely

not necessary”. I am motivated, I am against injustice. And I’m against everything that threatens what we managed to build up here in this country. And the Taliban is a threat to this’ (IN/15). He is asked what he meant by the things ‘we managed to build up’.

What I mean by that? Our society, and—eh well, it’s funny that I’m the one who says this—the rights and stuff that we build up together. Then I think—Then I touch upon the topic of homosexuality. That’s a bit ironic, isn’t it? We all have our rights which we defend and stuff, such as freedom of speech and much more, no racism and stuff—And then I beat up a couple of fags! I mean—. (IN/15)

### Triggers of antigay violence

Antigay violence is often explained by referring to heterosexual norms (Comstock, 1991; Herek, 1992; van der Meer, 1993). Randall Collins criticizes mainstream sociological studies that explain violence by referring to macro structures such as ‘religious or machismo cultures’, as it is ‘not at all clear’ that violence represents ‘long-held beliefs and deep-seated motivations for action’ (Collins, 2008: 23). Macro-sociological interpretations ‘suffer from failing to look closely at the dynamics of micro-situations’ (Collins, 2008: 23).

Collins argues that it is wrongly assumed that violence is ‘easy’ to carry out for individuals, which causes sociologists to ‘skip the micro-level as unproblematic and turn to conditions in the meso background or the macro organization or overarching structure’ (Collins, 2008: 34). Only by examining violent situations up close as they actually happen may we unfold how the confrontational tension and fear, present in ‘human psychological hardware’, is overcome and why people make the ‘hard’ step to violence (Collins, 2008: 20). Therefore, he argues that the best thing sociologists interested in explaining violence can do, is to ‘push as far as possible with a situational approach’ (Collins, 2008: 21).

The importance of situational factors is supported by the fact that in most studied cases, the violence arises unplanned and on the spot. The image of ‘gay bashers’ as organized groups who search the town to beat up homosexuals, often sketched by the media, is, at least in present-day Holland, largely inaccurate: ‘I don’t wake up from my bed and think: ‘Hey, let’s bash some queers today.’ I have nothing against homosexuality’ (IN/01). Even those who went to gay cruising areas declared that they did not go there with a planned intention to beat up homosexuals, but instead went there ‘out of curiosity’ (IN/15), because they were ‘bored to death for over two weeks’ (IN16/10), or ‘just to have a laugh’ (IN/06).

Careful reconstruction of the violent incidents revealed two triggers for antigay violence. Firstly, peer pressure is a factor that causes specific situations to escalate into violence. In almost half of the researched cases (22 out of 45), peer pressure seems to have played a role. Many perpetrators seem particularly sensitive to

pressure by their friends. One of the boys from a group who threatened homosexuals on a parking lot, says: 'I felt I had to go with them. It's hard to resist that whole group' (IN/07). The testimony of his friend makes clear that he had similar reasons to participate: 'Once we arrived, I got out of the car. I actually was afraid to get out, but I still did it, because everybody did it' (IN/06). Many probation officers also note the importance of peer pressure: 'The fact that the client participates in serious criminal offences, seems to be less important than the pressure of his friends' (RN/48). Another one was sentenced for threatening and assaulting homosexual men on a cruising area: 'The client says he has nothing against homosexuals, and denies an active role in the crime. He feels that his friends took a ride with him, they knew he could not resist' (RN/39).

The interview with the soldier reveals how peer pressure may lead to an escalation of violence. His friends assaulted homosexuals, but initially he did not participate. After a while, the soldiers left to have something to eat. The soldier says that he tried to convince the group to go again:

It sounds really wrong, I know. But exactly the fact that I hadn't done anything yet while the rest had, was bothering me. You don't want to be a letdown to the group, you know, that's also a military thing. There you learn to do everything together, you know, so you're not going to let down on each other. (IN/15)

And off they went a second time.

Secondly, the fear of being seduced is a demonstrable trigger in 10 out of 26 incidents from the dataset in which the cause of the violence was clear. One Dutch-Moroccan perpetrator attacked a man who tried to seduce him, remarkably in a gay bar. He explains that his anger was a result of fear: 'I fear them more than I hate them, to be honest. They might throw something into your glass, and then you wake up the next morning with your pants down and a condom in your ass. Just to give an example. Well, that would be a nightmare, believe me. And that's why I felt I had to defend myself.' (IN/04). A Dutch-Turk perpetrator also used violence in reaction to what he conceived to be seduction:

Look, I got angry because he was kissing another man in broad daylight. But I would not have hit him if he—you know, would only have done that. The fact that he winked at me and showed his tongue to me, that made me go crazy ... I felt a rage coming up and I couldn't stop myself. (IN/01)

Another perpetrator testifies: 'Well, I felt threatened when that guy hit on me. It made me feel like a rat in a trap. And trapped rats bite' (IN/05).

This second trigger somewhat resembles Collins' concept of the 'forward panic'; a prolonged state of tension and fear striving toward a climax, which eventually carries people on to violent actions that they would normally not approve of in calm, reflective moments (Collins, 2008: 85). But contrary to Collins' beliefs, this 'seduction' trigger shows that a purely situational explanation of the violence is

insufficient, as the tension and fear experienced by the perpetrators before the attack cannot be understood without macro-sociological regimes of gender and sexuality.

The story of the soldier is an illustration of the incapability of handling deviations from norms of gender and sexuality. Another reason for them to go back was because they were disappointed with what they had 'seen' thus far, and they were curious to see sex. The soldiers decided to go back and were surprised to find a full parking lot:

Suddenly it was packed with cars: SUV's, Jeeps, BMW's, Volkswagens, trucks, vans, it was completely full over there. So I said: 'Look guys, we hit the jackpot! Now you're going to see stuff, guys! You wanted to see stuff, well, you'll see stuff!' (IN/15)

When entering the cruising area, they were indeed confronted with plenty of gay sex, and this confrontation fuelled their aggression:

Well, my friends mugged him well I can say. But hey, this guy was standing there with his pecker out of his pants. Well, I didn't see it but my friends said he had a big one hanging there. So yeah, it scares the hell out of you when you see a guy swinging his dick towards you. So that's probably why they knocked him down. (IN/11)

From that moment, he was 'possessed by a demon' as he expressed it. What followed were humiliations, robberies, and assaults of the cruising gay men. Realizing they were in danger, the men present started to panic and run toward their cars. But one of them stumbled and fell down with his head near the exit gate. He sustained serious head injuries after one of the soldiers slammed the gate with a 'flying kick' (IN/15).

## **Back to the macro-level**

A socio-historical perspective on sexuality and gender helps to understand better why the fear of being seduced, as well as the widespread disapproval of anal sex and feminine behaviour, as mentioned before, encounter widespread rejection amongst Dutch youth. We have to go back as far as to the 18th and 19th centuries, when attitudes towards sex and gender radically changed in western societies. The 'inclusive' idea of women and men representing two different forms of the same sex made way for an 'exclusive' perspective on sexual anatomy, in which the male and female sexes were seen as 'biological' opposites (Laqueur, 1990). In line with this new view, sex and gender were increasingly considered as coinciding, resulting in a gender binary of masculine and feminine (Butler, 1990; Kessler and McKenna, 1978; Mosse, 1985). This formed the foundation of the heterosexual regime.

When homosexuality became an object of study in the 19th century, homosexuals were seen as having a female soul in a male body and desiring 'real' (heterosexual) men as sex partners. Doctors started to look for female signs in male

homosexual bodies and turned the femininity of homosexuals into the core of their pathological theories (Hekma, 2007). Homosexual men looking for social recognition started to oppose this image in the 1960s. Since that time, they instead started to consider themselves to be 'normal men' and said to prefer relationships with other 'normal men' (Hekma, 2007; Keuzenkamp et al., 2006). Now gays who come closest to mimicking societal standards of the male gender are generally more appreciated and deemed most worthy of receiving rights. Even homosexuals themselves widely adopt this viewpoint (Buijs and Hospers, 2010; Hekma, 2007; Keuzenkamp et al., 2006), a phenomenon denoted as homonormativity (Duggan, 2003).

But despite gay men's growing claim at masculine identity, they are not fully regarded as masculine in broader society. As homosexuals do not engage in a 'normal' relationship between a man and a woman, they deviate from heterosexual norms. This leads to the view that a man who is attracted to a man cannot be a 'real' man, nor can a woman who is attracted to a woman be a 'real' woman (Connell, 1995; Drummond, 2005; Hekma, 2007). As long as gender and sexuality are intertwined, gays and lesbians remain an anomaly. The historical process that has led to the heterosexual regime explains why exactly those aspects of homosexuality that fit uneasily in the gender binary incur disapproval.

## Conclusions

This study shows that norms of gender and sexuality are key in understanding antigay violence in Amsterdam. These norms affect attitudes towards homosexuality in all researched groups (secondary school pupils, risk individuals and perpetrators), and form the 'breeding ground' of antigay violence. They pave the way for widespread rejection of four aspects that many consider to be inextricably bound up with homosexuality: anal sex, feminine behaviour, public displays, and attempts to seduce.

At the same time, a gay-friendly narrative is dominating discussions on citizenship in the Netherlands, in which Dutch culture, framed as 'enlightened' and 'modern', is contrasted to the Muslim culture, depicted as 'traditional' and 'irrational'. While homosexuality is indeed widely accepted in general terms, the narrative coexists with traditional, restrictive norms of gender and sexuality, thereby not challenging the roots of homonegativity.

The prevalent tolerant rhetoric of Dutch society is widely reproduced, but the ongoing dominance of the heteronormative regime prevents deep-rooted acceptance. Even the perpetrators of antigay violence stress they have nothing against homosexuality and express their pride of Dutch sexual tolerance and diversity, but do not refrain from all sorts of violence as soon as they are confronted with aspects of it that collide with what they see as 'normal' gendered and sexual practices. This fits in more general findings indicating that the Dutch are less progressive than the gay-friendly narrative of citizenship and cultural identity suggests (see e.g. Keuzenkamp, 2010; Keuzenkamp et al., 2006; van der Klein et al., 2009).



Despite previous criticism of research explaining violence merely by reference to macro structures and thereby neglecting the dynamics of micro-situations, the data show that the distinction between factors on different levels is not always clear-cut. Peer pressure and the fear of seduction have been identified as situational factors often triggering actual violence, but the tension and fear experienced by the perpetrators of antigay violence before the attack cannot be understood without macro-sociological regimes of gender and sexuality. A multilevel approach is necessary in coming towards a more comprehensive understanding of antigay violence. Such an approach can explain why in a nation that considers itself as tolerant of homosexuals, antigay violence nonetheless persists.

### Notes

1. The definition of antigay violence used includes verbal violence (cursing and discriminatory language), threat, robbery and physical violence, in which the (alleged) homosexuality of the victim played an important role according to the victims, perpetrators, witnesses and/or police.
2. Dutch-Turks, Dutch-Moroccans and Dutch-Antilleans are less accepting towards homosexuality, also when controlled for gender, age, level of education and religiosity.
3. See Anti-homogeweld zijn geen incidenten. Inbreng PVV debat homo-emancipatie. URL [www.pvv.nl/index.php?option=com\\_contentandtask=view&id=906](http://www.pvv.nl/index.php?option=com_contentandtask=view&id=906), downloaded 22 July 2011.
4. Incidents that took place before 2004 have been excluded from this study, while most of the studied incidents occurred in 2007 or 2008. The content of each law court file differed. It always contained a police file with a summary, record of findings, interrogations of suspect(s), informant(s), and witness(es), and a summation for the Public Prosecutor containing the charge. Some files contained an additional wealth of information, such as summaries of judicial institutions, a record of the law court, a screening of institutions for youth criminals and recidivists, a medical certificate, pictures of, for example, injuries, a document of the Foundation for the Aid of Victims, a personal letter of the victim, or an analysis of the resettlement association. The files of the resettlement association all consisted of one or more so-called risk analysis. These are comprehensive reports aiming to map the factors that lie at the bottom of criminal behaviour of the clients, and assessing the risk of recidivism.
5. Street urchins were selected because previous research shows that perpetrators often operate in groups of loitering boys (van der Meer, 1993). Surinamese and Antillean youngsters were included in this study because research shows that these ethnic groups have a significantly more negative stance towards homosexuality than native youth. The same goes for Turkish and Moroccan youngsters, who repudiate homosexuality even more strongly (Keuzenkamp et al., 2006: 51). Moreover, the boys in this latter group are often mentioned as suspects of antigay violence in media reports and have dominated youth crime statistics for years (de Jong, 2007: 14). The decision to include soccer supporters in this study was based on the fact that the sometimes aggressive and discriminatory choruses make stadiums a particularly gay-unfriendly place (Buijs et al., 2009: 72). Marines were selected because the culture in the Dutch armed forces is notoriously masculine and intolerant towards homosexuality (Keuzenkamp et al., 2006: 217). In June 2007, two incidents were reported in the Netherlands in which soldiers attacked

homosexuals (Buijs et al., 2009: 72). The masculine cultures of some student fraternities are strongly intolerant towards homosexuality. This final focus group differs from the other groups, in that respondents were not themselves heterosexual. As overt rejection of homosexuality is generally considered taboo in these circles and socially desirable answers are to be expected in interviews, it was assumed that more reliable insights on gay acceptance in fraternities would be obtained by interviewing non-heterosexual members.

6. The eight selected schools show a wide variety in location, level, and ethnic background of the pupils. However, the sample is not fully representative for the population of pupils in Amsterdam. Dutch secondary education is divided into three levels, and pupils from the two higher levels are overrepresented (61.9% of the sample versus 38.6% of the total population of pupils in Amsterdam). Furthermore, native Dutch youngsters are overrepresented (55.3% in the sample versus 39% of all Amsterdam youth up to the age of 24), and youth from Moroccan descent underrepresented (8.5% in the sample versus 16% of all Amsterdam youth until 24 years). In contrast, the share of youth from other ethnic minorities reflects the Amsterdam population well. Pupils from the low level of secondary education have a more negative stance towards homosexuality than pupils from the higher levels, and all major ethnic minorities in the Netherlands, except the Surinamese, are less tolerant towards homosexuality than the native population (Keuzenkamp, 2010; Keuzenkamp et al., 2006). Therefore, the results of the survey are likely to be positively biased.
7. Interestingly, anal sexual intercourse is often said to be common amongst men in Arab countries who do not identify as homosexual. Their masculine gender role is not at stake as long as they take up the active role (Vuylsteke, 2008). The resentment expressed by the Moroccan participants towards anal sex might be explained by the fact that they find it hard to deal with sexual ideas in western societies, in which men who take the active sexual role are generally considered as homo- or bisexuals as well.
8. To measure acceptance of gender deviant behaviour of the pupils, they were confronted with four cases. In each case, a fictional new male classmate was introduced to boys, and a female classmate to girls. Some basic characteristics of this new classmate were described: whether she or he behaves and dresses masculine or feminine, whether she or he does stereotypically masculine or feminine sports, and whether she or he is attracted to boys or girls. Then the pupils were asked to which extent they would accept this person on a five-point scale.
9. Girls also prefer a feminine over a masculine lesbian (77.1% versus 66.1%), but the aversion to only cross-gender behaviour is not as large as among boys: the girls prefer a masculine straight girl over a masculine lesbian girl (76% versus 66.1%).
10. Generally, the Dutch-Moroccans take a distinct position when it comes to feminine behaviour. The survey results show that where most pupils indicate to have more problems with deviating gender roles than with a homosexual preference in itself, Dutch-Moroccan pupils are the only ones who prefer a masculine lesbian and a feminine gay boy over a feminine lesbian and masculine gay boy. Hence it seems that Dutch-Moroccan pupils prefer 'stereotypical' homosexuals over homosexuals 'in disguise'.
11. In Arab cultures, it is uncommon for men who have sex with other men to name themselves 'homosexuals' (Massad, 2007; Schmitt, 1992: 11; Steinberger, 1999: 644; Vuylsteke, 2008). This might explain why they are more likely to condemn men who explicitly claim a homosexual identity.

12. This corresponds with findings from the survey amongst Amsterdam youth. When asked what they consider as the 'cause' of homosexuality, native Dutch pupils think significantly more often than Dutch-Turks, Dutch-Moroccans and Dutch-Surinams that homosexuality is innate. Dutch-Moroccan pupils think significantly more often than their native Dutch peers that one becomes gay by interacting with homosexuals.
13. To measure acceptance of homosexuality at close quarters, the girls were asked what they should do when one of their female classmates turned out to be lesbian, and boys when one of their male classmates turned out to be gay.
14. Only 18.1 per cent of the girls were called comparable words for 'lesbian', suggesting that homophobic discourses are mainly used in boy cultures.
15. General acceptance was measured by statements such as 'Lesbian women are free to live their lives as they wish' (79.9% agree, 12.2% disagree), 'Homosexual men are free to live their lives as they wish' (73.6% agree, 18.1% disagree), 'When a girl finds out that she is lesbian, she should try to fight those feelings' (11.3% agree, 78.6% disagree), and 'When a boy finds out that he is gay, he should try to fight those feelings' (16.8% agree, 73% disagree).

## References

- Anti-homogeweld zijn geen incidenten. Inbreng PVV debat homo-emancipatie (n.d.) URL: [www.pvv.nl/index.php?option=com\\_contentandtask=view&id=906](http://www.pvv.nl/index.php?option=com_contentandtask=view&id=906).
- Buijs L and Hospers H (2010) *Hoewel ik het zelf soms ook wel doe. Een onderzoek naar onveilige seks en coming out bij homojongens*. Maastricht: Aids Fonds.
- Buijs L, Hekma G and Duyvendak JW (2009) *Als ze maar van me afblijven. Een onderzoek naar antihomoseksueel geweld in Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Butler J (1990) *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler J (2008) Sexual politics, torture, and secular time. *British Journal of Sociology* 59(1): 1–23.
- Ceuppens B and Geschiere P (2005) Autochthons or indigenous? New models in the struggle over citizenship in Africa and Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 385–407.
- Collins RC (2008) *Violence. A Micro-Sociological Theory*. Princeton, NJ and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Comstock GD (1991) *Violence against Lesbians and Gay Men*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Connell RW (1995) *Masculinities*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Crocker J (2005) De sociale psychologie van stigmatisering. *Tijdschrift voor Seksuologie* 29: 4–10.
- Crocker J, Major B and Steel C (1998) Social stigma. In: Gilbert S and Lindzey G (eds) *The Handbook of Social Psychology, Volume Two*, 4th edn. New York: McGraw-Hill, 504–554.
- De Jong JDA (2007) *Kapot Moeilijk. Een Ethnografisch Onderzoek naar Opvallend Delinquent Groepsgedrag van Marokkaanse Jongens*. Amsterdam: Aksant.
- Drummond M (2005) Listening to the voices of young gay men. *Men and Masculinities* 7(3): 270–290.
- Duggan L (2003) *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

- Duyvendak JW, Tonkens E and Hurenkamp M (2008) Culturalization of citizenship in the Netherlands. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the APSA 2008 Annual Meeting*, Hynes Convention Center, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Duyvendak JW, Pels T and Rijkschroeff R (2009) A multicultural paradise? The cultural factor in dutch integration policy. In: Hochschild JL and Mollenkopf JH (eds) *Bringing Outsiders In. Transatlantic Perspectives on Immigrant Political Incorporation*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 129–139.
- Gerhards J (2010) Non-discrimination towards homosexuality. The European Union's policy and citizens' attitudes towards homosexuality in 27 European countries. *International Sociology* 25(1): 5–28.
- Geschiere P (2009) *The Perils of Belonging. Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hekma G (2002) Imams and homosexuality. A Post-gay debate in the Netherlands. *Sexualities* 5(2): 269–280.
- Hekma G (2007) De benen wijd, de stem naar beneden. Houdingen tegenover 'nichterigheid' bij homoseksuele mannen. *Sociologie* 3(1): 81–94.
- Herek GM (1992) The social context of hate crimes. Notes on cultural heterosexism. In: Herek GM and Berrill KT (eds) *Hate Crimes. Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE, 89–104.
- Kessler SJ and McKenna W (1978) *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach*. New York: Wiley.
- Keuzenkamp S (ed.) (2010) *Steeds gewoner, nooit gewoon*. Den Haag: SCP.
- Keuzenkamp S and Bos D (2007) *Out in the Netherlands*. Den Haag: SCP.
- Keuzenkamp S, Bos D, Duyvendak JW and Hekma G (eds) (2006) *Gewoon Doen*. Den Haag: SCP.
- Laqueur T (1990) *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Massad JA (2007) *Desiring Arabs*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mepschen P, Duyvendak JW and Tonkens E (2010) Sexual politics, orientalism and multicultural citizenship in the Netherlands. *Sociology* 44(5): 962–979.
- Mosse GL (1985) *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe*. New York: Howard Fertig.
- Pascoe CJ (2007) 'Dude, You're a Fag'. *Adolescent Masculinity and the Fag Discourse*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Schinkel W (2008) The moralisation of citizenship in Dutch integration discourse. *Amsterdam Law Forum* 1(1): 15–26.
- Schmitt A (1992) Different approaches to male–male sexuality. Eroticism from Morocco to Uzbekistan. In: Schmitt A and Sofer J (eds) *Sexuality and Eroticism among Males in Moslem Societies*. New York: Haworth Press, 1–24.
- Steinberger R (1999) Homoseksualiteit onder mannen uit islamitische landen. Naar homo-vriendelijke en transculturele dienstverlening. *Maandblad Geestelijke Gezondheid* 54(6): 641–653.
- Van der Klein M, Tan S, de Groot I and Duyvendak JW (2009) *Discriminatie is het woord niet. Lesbische vrouwen en homoseksuele mannen op de werkvloer: Bejegening en beleid*. Utrecht: Verweij-Jonker Instituut.
- Van der Meer T (1993) Gay bashing – a rite of passage? *Culture, Health and Sexuality* 5(2): 153–165.

- Vuylsteke C (2008) *Onder mannen. Het verzwegen leven van Marokkaanse homo's*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Whitley BE (1990) The relationship of heterosexuals' attributions for the causes of homosexuality to attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 16(2): 369–377.

**Laurens Buijs** is a PhD candidate at the Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Labour Studies (AIAS) at the University of Amsterdam. He currently participates in the interdisciplinary research project 'Solidarity in the 21st Century' about the societal impacts of modernity. His research interests vary from gender and sexuality to multiculturalism and populism, and their intersections.

**Gert Hekma** teaches Gay & Lesbian and Sexuality and Gender Studies within the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Amsterdam. He has published widely on gay and sexual history and sociology. He is the co-editor of *The Pursuit of Sodomy* (1989) and *Sexual Cultures in Europe* (2 volumes, 2000), the author of *Homoseksualiteit in Nederland van 1730 tot de moderne tijd* (2004) and *ABC van Perversies* (2009) as well as the editor of *A Cultural History of Sexuality in the Modern Age* (Berg/Palgrave 2011).

**Jan Willem Duyvendak** has held the position of Professor of Sociology at the University of Amsterdam since 2003. Previously he studied sociology and philosophy in Groningen and Paris. His publications cover a broad range of topics: from new social movements in France to problems of social cohesion and multiculturalism. In 1999 he edited with Barry Adam and André Krouwel *The Global Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics: National Imprints of a Worldwide Movement* (Temple University Press), and he recently published *The Politics of Home. Belonging and Nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States* (Palgrave Macmillan).