

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE

Racist violence

A comparison of Germany and the Netherlands

Remke Rozemarijne Palsma

Examination Committee

Prof. Dr. Sawitri Saharso

Dr. Ann Morissens

Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction..... 2
 - 1.1 Aim..... 2
 - 1.2 Research Question 4
 - 1.3 Relevance 5
- 2. Theory..... 5
 - 2.1 Racist violence 5
 - 2.2 Grievance Theory 10
 - 2.3 Political opportunity theory 13
- 3. Methodology 16
 - 3.1 Research Design 16
 - 3.2 Case selection and sampling..... 17
- 4. Data Analysis 18
 - 4.1 What is the Amount of racist violence in Germany as well as the Netherlands? 18
 - 4.2 What is the unemployment rate of Germany and the Netherlands? 20
 - 4.3 What is the proportion of migrants in the Netherlands and Germany? 21
 - 4.4 What is the immigration rate in Germany and the Netherlands? 22
 - 4.5 Overview grievance theory 23
 - 4.6 What are, were the views of the LPF, PVV and the NPD on immigrants? 24
 - 4.7 How many votes did the LPF, PVV and the NPD get in National elections? 26
 - 4.8 Overview opportunity theory..... 27
- 5. Conclusion and discussion..... 28
- References..... 30

1. Introduction

1.1 Aim

From the year 2000 till 2006 in Germany nine owners of small businesses were murdered. Eight Turkish and one Greek person were murdered by a group called the NSU (the National Socialist Underground) which is a group of Neo- Nazis. The Bosphorus serial murders, also known as the Döner murders, were murders based on the hate against foreigners. The Döner murders show that violence against migrants occurs within Europe.

Racist violent incidents not only occurred in Germany, elsewhere in Europe racist incidents have also occurred. In the Netherlands in the year of 2001 a feeble-minded Somali man got into a dispute with youngsters out of his neighborhood (AnneFrankHouse, 2007). The man got abused. He entrenched in his house. The house got set on fire by which the man got killed. On the gate to the garden the youngsters wrote 'kut mohamed' which translates to stupid Mohamed. On the walls of the house they had written 'white power', thereby it showed that the incident was based on the fact that the victim was a migrant. Another example of a racist violence incident which took place in Greece is the murder of a Pakistani who was on his way to work. The perpetrators two Greek men accused him of blocking their way by which they killed him (Halikiopoulou, 2013).

The examples show that racist violence is a big problem throughout Europe. The examples show a time frame of 13 years in which murders based on racism occurred, which illustrates that it is an ongoing problem. Racist violent incidents have been reported for a long period of time in Europe. This shows that racist violence is not only a phenomenon from the past or a present day phenomenon, it will not disappear all of a sudden. It is an ongoing structural problem.

The Döner murders were despised by the general public which was brought forward in the media. Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor, said that "the cold-blooded murders of nine immigrant shopkeepers by neo-Nazis is an inconceivable crime for Germany and a national disgrace" (Kuzmany, 2011). The reactions towards the Döner murders were mostly negative, however the trio that killed the immigrants saw the foreigners as a problem. To them the immigrants formed a problem to society. There is a conception in a part of the German society that immigrants are a problem. Does this mean that immigrants in Germany face racism more

often compared to immigrants in the neighbor country the Netherlands? Do people use racist violence as a reaction towards the migrants more in one country as opposed to the other country? This is not clear, that is why in this paper I want to answer this, furthermore if it is the case that in Germany or in the Netherlands there is more racist violence as opposed to the other country what is the reason for that. In this paper I will also try to find an explanation on why there is more racist violence in one country as opposed to the other country.

It has been suggested in the media that there is a connection between the living conditions of the perpetrators and the racist violent incident. The perpetrators are from the eastern part of Germany, which is characterized by unemployment and a 'hopeless' existence, which these perpetrators faced. These factors indicate that a possible explanation for racist violence could be social and economic deprivation. However everywhere in Europe there are disadvantaged people, maybe social and economic deprivations is not the only explanation to racist violence or maybe it does not explain racist violence at all. There are probably more explanations for racist violence. The eastern part of Germany did not know a democratic tradition, that is why people maybe use violence to show their feelings of being unsatisfied through violence because they do not see another option to express their feelings.

I want to understand how differences in racist violence between countries can be explained, that is why in this research two countries will be compared in order to understand the differences in racist violence. These countries will be Germany and the Netherlands . The reason for choosing these two countries is the proximity of the two and them both being Western- European countries. This is important because they are similar countries however in certain parts which might lead to racist violence the countries are expected to differ like for example the proportion of migrants, which will be discussed in more detail later. Furthermore the most important factor for deciding that these countries suit for the research is the expectation of more racist violence in Germany than in the Netherlands.

In order to understand why there is more racist violence in one country compared to the other I will use two theories. On the one hand the grievance theory and on the other hand the political opportunity theory. The grievance theory, which will be explained in depth in the theory part, predicts that the amount of racist violence is related to the proportion of migrant living in a country, the immigration rate and the unemployment rate. The predictions are clarified in 3 hypotheses.

Hypotheses 1: The higher the unemployment rate, the higher the amount of racist violence.

Hypotheses 2: The higher the proportion of migrants, the higher the amount of racist violence.

Hypotheses 3: The higher the immigration rate, the higher the amount of racist violence.

The political opportunity theory considers the three indicators of the grievance theory to be insufficient to explain racist violence. The political opportunity theory, which will be explained in depth in the theory part, predicts that the amount of racist violence is depended on the political representation of their feeling of discontent. This means that if people do not feel that their opinion is represented in politics, meaning that their voices are not heard, they will use racist violence to make themselves heard. There needs to be a party in politics which represents and anti- immigrant view in order for the people to feel represented. The parties that are analyzed for this research are the LPF, the PVV and the NPD. The choice of these parties will be elaborated on later in the article. The expectations of the political opportunity theory are expressed in two hypotheses.

Hypotheses 4: The more a party takes on an anti- immigrant views the lower the amount of racist violence.

Hypotheses 5: The lower the amount of votes for an extreme right wing party the higher the amount of racist violence.

1.2 Research Question

The aim of this study is to explain possible differences in racist violence between Germany and the Netherlands. First the number of racist violence incidents in both countries needs to be explained and put in perspective to each other. In order to understand the topic the conceptualization part constitutes of the concept racist violence and race itself. The study then focusses on why there are more racist violence acts in one country compared to the other country, therefore the grievance and the political opportunity theory will be tested. This part will make up the explanatory part of the research. At the end the study will show if there is a relationship between racist violence and the indicator of the grievance and political opportunity theory.

Therefore the question that is central to this study is: *How can we explain differences in racist violence between Germany and the Netherlands from 2001-2008?*

The main research question is subdivided into six sub questions:

1. What is the amount of racist violence in Germany as well as the Netherlands?
2. What is the unemployment rate of Germany and the Netherlands?
3. What is the proportion of migrants in Germany and in the Netherlands?
4. What is the immigration rate in Germany and the Netherlands?
5. What are, were the views of the LPF, PVV and the NPD on immigrants?
6. How many votes did the LPF, PVV and the NPD get in National elections?

1.3 Relevance

The goal of the study is to find out what explains racist violence. The social relevance is that it is of interest to show what causes for racist violence in order to understand it and find a way to maybe counteract and prevent racist violence for governments. There have been a lot of policy initiatives EU-wide, like for example the EU policy on racism and xenophobia, however if the results will show that each country has different reasons for racist violence then the approach towards racist violence should differ per country. The scientific relevance for this research is the testing of the grievance and opportunity theory. The usage of a case study to test the theories shows if the theories are right in their assumption in claiming what leads to racist violence.

2. Theory

2.1 Racist violence

As concluded earlier, racism against immigrants is a problem throughout the whole of Europe. The racism often comes with violence, making it racist violence. Racist violence will be the key concept in this research paper. The concept needs further elaboration in order to give a clear conceptualization of racist violence that fits the actual research purpose.

Racism is a negatively loaded concept by which it is politically and morally unaccepted (Miles & Brown, 2003). Knowing that racism is negative concept the actual meaning is not clear. Conceptualizing racism brings different considerations with it because a definition that is too broad makes every person saying something about a foreigner be a racist however a definition that is too narrow makes racism a meaningless concept (Miles & Brown, 2003). In order to understand racist violence I will look at the development of the concept.

Europe in the 16th century was fully embedded in colonialism. European countries as for example Great-Britain, Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands expended their power to other parts of the world, which were then seen as their colonies. The Europeans settled in for Asia, America and parts of Africa gain control over these areas. These colonial countries were then exploited and controlled by the colonial power. The relationship between the colonist and the colonial power was an unequal relationship, because the people in the colony were seen as weaker people. The colonies were also used for slave trade in order to get more profit. The indigenous people were shipped away and sold as slaves elsewhere. The colonial power, which were white people from Europe, justified this for themselves by considering the colored people as inferior to them (Acuña, 2010). The legitimacy behind slave trade was the feeling of superiority over inferior black people who were in some ways considered as animals. What colonialism stands for is the exploitation of the black people by justifying their doing through discriminating black people because they were seen as inferior. This discrimination was based on biological features, racism based on skin color. The victims of discrimination were the colored people. This form of racism, that is based on biological features, is called old racism (Barker, 1981). It was called old racism because over time racism has developed by which racism is based on different features. Old racism is discrimination that differentiates through biological features, based on bodily differences, making one group superior or inferior based on for example skin color or other biological features. These biological differences justify the discrimination for the ones that see themselves as being the superior group. The definition of old racism is not suitable for this research because this research focuses on migrants. Migrants are considered to be different however not specifically because of their biological features, that is why old racism is not suitable for this research.

In the 1970s Europe was faced by an immigrant flow. A wave of anti-immigrant opinion had become vibrant. The French party Front National got 10% of the votes during the European elections (Cole, 1997). 'The success of Front National has served as a model for many anti-

immigrant parties across Europe' (Rafaela, 2010 p.5). This new wave of anti-immigrant opinions and the ideologies behind this was referred to by scholars as new racism (Cole, 1997). This form of racism was based on cultural identity. Immigrants were considered to be a threat because they had a different cultural identity (Barker, 1981). The culture of the migrants is different, that is why they do not belong in the country by which some people want them to leave the country. The concept of new racism is suitable for this research. This research focuses on racist violence against migrants because migrants are considered to be different due to their cultural features, that is why new racism is important for the final conceptualization of racist violence.

Racism is not a rigid concept, it developed over time in Europe. On the one hand old racism which is discrimination based on biological features and on the other hand new racism which is discrimination based on cultural features. With old racism people were considered to be inferior because of their biological features, with new racism people were considered to be different because of their culture.

Based on the development of the concept of racism from the past till present and looking at the current situation it can be assumed that currently discrimination is based on cultural differences. The timeframe this article deals with is between the year of 2000 and 2008. The type of racism is mainly based on cultural differences. Discrimination based on cultural differences is still considered to be racism because of the fact that one culture considers themselves to belong in a certain country rather than another culture. The victims of racism in present Europe are the immigrants. The racism is not merely based on biological features anymore because it somewhat has developed. In present Europe most discrimination is based on cultural differences and not on biological differences which it used to be in colonial times. For this reason the initial concept of this research will be new racism.

Now that it is clear that for this research purpose the concept of new racism is the most suitable because people discriminate due to cultural differences it ought to be known what is meant by racist violence.

The European monitoring center on racism and xenophobia (EUMC) clarifies in its report on racist violence in the fifteen member states of the EU that racist violence is: 'Any behavior by an individual that intentionally threatens, attempts to inflict, or does cause, physical, sexual or psychological harm to others or to themselves. An individual may commit an act of violence or intimidation with the support of a group or even the state. Depending on the circumstances,

violence may be considered acceptable, unacceptable, lawful or unlawful.’ (EUMC, 2005). The EUMC considers violence to be of physical or psychological manner. This means that violence can be assaults, confrontation but violence can also be less visible such as threats. The enforcer of this violence can either be an individual or a group of people. Violence can be interpreted differently which leads to different opinions on the violence being acceptable or unacceptable and lawful and unlawful. This mostly is decided by court. An example for this is Geert Wilders who was accused of criminally insulting religious groups and ethnic groups which should lead to hatred and discrimination. People thought that Wilders was saying something racist however Wilders himself said that he was just telling the truth. It is not always clear when certain statements are considered to be racist and when certain statements are considered to be within the limits of freedom of religion and freedom of speech. A court decides if a certain statement is considered to be racist (Rechtbank Amsterdam, 2011). In the case of Geert Wilders, he was not found guilty. This shows eventhough some people consider statements to be racist, other people just say they are telling the truth and argue by freedom of religion and freedom of speech that they are allowed to say certain things. A court needs to decide in such cases, to decide if something is considered racist violence is difficult because there is a thin line of what can be considered racist violence and what not.

The important part of the definition by the EUMC for the definition of racist violence that suits for this paper is the extensiveness of what is considered to be violence. Violence includes psychological and physical harm. It is very important to include this in the final conceptualization of racist violence because in a lot of ways immigrants are not per se experiencing physical violence but much more the psychological violence of for example threats, confrontation and targeted graffiti. In order to show that violence can be physical and psychological it should be included in the final conceptualization of racist violence. All in all the physical and psychological violent acts that will be focused on in the paper include targeted graffiti, threats, confrontations, destruction, arson abuse, bomb attack and murder.

Racism and violence have been conceptualized as being parts of the concept of racist violence. Racist violence as a whole needs to be defined in order to have a working conceptualization for the purpose of this research.

The Anne Frank foundation uses a definition for racist violence that includes the victims, the perpetrators and the basis on which the targets are chosen, why the act their doing is considered to be racist. The Anne Frank foundation conceptualizes violence as ‘behavior in

which one party wilfully harms another party, or threatens to do such harm, and in which this behavior is mainly directed at physical damage to objects and/or persons' (P. Rodrigues, 2010). What they conceptualize as racist violence is 'that form of violence in which the victims or targets are chosen on the basis of their ethnic, racial, ethnic-religious, cultural or national origin.' (P. Rodrigues, 2010). The definition given by the Anne Frank foundation is very useful because it focuses on the victims and the perpetrator which is useful for this research because this research focuses on the differences based on culture, religion and national origin which need to be included in the final conceptualization however it leaves out the psychological violence which is an important aspect in racist violence.

The European Network Against Racism (ENAR) formulated a conceptualization of racist violence that is very comprehensive. Racist violence can be seen as 'an incident in which the victim or any other person believing that a person or a property has been victimized due to certain aspects of their identity. These identity aspects can be race, ethnicity, national origins, skin color, language or the fact that they belong to a certain group on the basis of their race and cultural, religious, geographical, historical, linguistic and or social affiliation of a person' (Iganski, 2011, p.6). Racist violence comprises of victimization, violence against persons and violence against property. Victimization can be seen as targeting of persons or property because of identity aspects basically incidents that are motivated by bias and prejudice (Iganski, 2011, p.6). Violence against persons can be seen as incidents that can be treated as crime like for example physical attacks, murder and threats and intimidation to individuals or groups. Another aspect is violence against property which can be understood as damage to property such as racist graffiti or broken windows or broken doors in places that are affiliated to ethnic minorities such as mosques or synagogues or acts of desecration in places of worship (Iganski, 2011, p.7). The definition given by the ENAR is very specific, the one important aspect for the final definition that is left out is the psychological violence.

Racist violence is an extensive concept, which people grasp differently. For the purpose of this research, which is to understand racist violence against migrants, the definition that will be used takes elements that are suitable from the other definitions. Racist violence are wilfully harming acts towards groups and individuals based on differences in ethnic, racial, ethnic-religious, cultural or national origin, these acts can be of physical or of psychological manner. The violent acts comprehend of targeted graffiti, threats, confrontations, destruction, arson, abuse, bomb attack and murder.

The focus of the final conceptualization is the act of violence. It is very important to be specific of what racist acts are considered to be violent in order to get rid of confusion. Furthermore it is important to know that the focus is on racist violence towards immigrants with a different culture because it is part of the research to understand this.

2.2 Grievance Theory

How can we understand what causes racist violence in Germany and the Netherlands? By finding out which theory applies to the use of racist violence and thereby the background of racist violence the best, one can look at what to improve in a society in order to get less racist violence however we do not want to jump to conclusions. Starting off, the theories used are two of the major competing theories aiming at giving an explanation for the use of racist violence (Koopmans, 1996). The two theories that will be used in this research are on the one hand the grievance theory and on the other hand the opportunity theory which is also called the political opportunity theory.

There are different theoretical explanations for racist violence. Followed by the example of Koopman et al (2005), these theoretical explanations are incorporated into one model of grievance theory. The focus will be on three indicators, which will be further elaborated on.

The grievance theory says that objective conditions and subjective grievances or discontent that is related to the target group of racists violence leads to rise of racist violence. Generally this theory assumes that racist violence rests on anomie and are a reaction to frustration and deprivation (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005, p.2). This means that being unsatisfied with the society one lives in can lead to racist violence. According to this theory economic downturns brings forward a group that gets hit the most by this downturn, this group mostly consists of the lower skilled workers that are faced by unemployment. This unemployment can lead to social exclusion by which they feel excluded from society (Heitmeyer, 1992). The group of socially excluded people that are unhappy about their situation are a source for racist violence because the socially excluded want to express their dissatisfaction, which can be done via racist violence (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005). The discontent focuses on the migrants because they are seen as the cause for the problems. Basically the more profound the issue is or objective condition is the more

powerful the grievance is which leads to more radical and violent response (Koopmans, 1996). This means the worse the situation for a person gets the more the person will want to express the feeling by using racist violence. The socially excluded use violence based on race because the socially excluded depend most on the social security system of the state however also foreigners are very dependent on the social security system. Competing of the migrants and the socially excluded can be explained by it being a perspective of the ethnic competition theory, which will be explained further on in the text. People are afraid the migrants will take their jobs and their social benefits (Kramer, 2013). This means that the socially excluded feel threatened by the foreigners who basically are facing the same situation as themselves by which they form a way of competition. The foreigners are a competition for access to social service, housing and a workplace (Arzheimer & Carter, 2006). However the threat that is perceived is most of the time a threat that is not actually existent. People feel threatened by foreigners in the job market, though mostly the foreigners apply for jobs that are not wanted by the indigenous people. An example of this is cut asparagus, this is a job mostly done by foreigners because indigenous people do not want to do the job. Therefore the threat felt by the indigenous people does not always apply to the real situation. This means that the grievance theory as Koopmans interpreters it also states that the presence and fast growing foreign population can also lead to perceived problems and deprivation of the indigenous people because especially the 'lower class' people as described before will see them as a threat (Koopmans, 19996). Based on this aspect of grievance, the proportion of migrant origin and the immigration rate are used as indicators in order to find out if the grievance theory applies. However this will be explained in more detail later.

An approach that adds to the topic of social movements and grievance theory is the ethnic competition theory that focuses on immigration by Koopmans & Olzak (2004). This theory claims that racist violence occurs due to a competitive element between the native population and the ethnic groups which is based on scarce resources. The competition theory states that due to scarcity of for example jobs and houses in a modern society there will be a competition around these possessions. This competition will be between all kinds of different groups however it will mainly take place between the native groups and the foreigners of the lower class because the native group considers the group of foreigners as a threat and competition for employment and social security as explained earlier (Coenders, Lubbers, & Scheepers, 2006, p.93). In this context however the native group is the economically marginalized member of society, also known as lower class groups who is easily isolated from society due to lack of work and thereby resources (Olzak, 1990). The competition theory can be looked at

as an addition to the grievance theory because scarce resources can be objective conditions which lead to subjective grievance or discontent. For example scarcity of jobs and thereby a lot of unemployment can lead to deprivation which can lead to racist violence. Therefore one of the indicators for this research which will be looked at is the unemployment level because people who are unemployed see the immigrants as a big threat therefore it will be interesting to find out if there is a correlation between unemployment level and incidents of racist violence.

Another element which leads to grievance is the feeling of injustice specifically towards the way authorities are dealing with a certain social problem (Jenkins, 1983). For example there is a shortage in jobs and the unemployed were promised more jobs. However the unemployed see some immigrants that are having a job which leads to a feeling of injustice. This feeling of injustice can translate into racist violence. Therefore again it is important to look at the level of unemployment.

In order to find out if the grievance theory applies to the fact that people use racist violence, three indicators that were established in Ruud Koopmans' research (1996) and used for the grievance theory will be tested to give a possible explanation for the use of racist. These indicators are assumed to create perceived frustrations and deprivation amongst the native population in a country and thereby are assumed to lead to racist violence. The indicators used are the proportion of migrant origin, the immigration rate and the unemployment rate (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005, p.3). The immigration rate will be measured by looking at what is the percentage of total migrants coming into the Netherlands and Germany every year. This number will be related to the amount of racist incidents happening. This indicator is important in order to find out if people feel threatened by a lot of immigrants, for any kind of reason, will there be more racist violence. This means the higher the percentage of migrants coming into the Germany/ the Netherlands, the higher the number of acts based on racist violence. Racist violent incidents are expected to occur more often if there are a lot of migrants coming into Germany and the Netherlands because of a perceived threat which these immigrant are considered to be.

The second indicator will be the unemployment rate. In order to find this out one needs to know what does unemployment mean when is someone unemployed. The international definition, which came into being at the International labor organization (ILO), states that all person who during a specific reference period were without work currently available for work

and seeking for work can be seen as unemployed (CBS, 2013). Germany and the Netherlands practice a similar definition which does not substantially differ from the international definition. The unemployment rate will be measured by looking at the percentage of the society that is able to work but does not work. As stated in the explanation of the theory part people will perceive grievance and social exclusion if they are unemployed and will use racist violence to make themselves heard. This means that the higher the unemployment rate in Germany/ the Netherlands the more people will use racist violence.

The third indicator is the proportion of migrant origin in a country. To proportion of migrant origin living in Germany and the Netherlands will be measured by looking at the percentage of people living in the country with a different nationality. Not only the people that are coming into a country with a migrant origin but also people who are already in Germany and the Netherlands with a migrant origin are influencing the use of racist violence that is why it is important to know the proportion of migrant origin in a country. How many migrants do actually live in Germany and the Netherlands. This will influence the perceived threat the 'lower' part of the society will feel and thereby their grievance. Thereby the bigger the proportion of migrant origin in Germany/ the Netherlands the higher the amount of acts based on racist violence.

Looking at these indicators the aim is to find out if there is a correlation between the indicators and racist violence in order to test which theory is giving the most sufficient answer on why people use racist violence.

In sum these are the Hypotheses that will be tested for the grievance theory:

Hypotheses 1: The higher the unemployment rate, the higher the amount of racist violence.

Hypotheses 2: The higher the proportion of migrants, the higher the amount of racist violence.

Hypotheses 3: The higher the immigration rate, the higher the amount of racist violence.

2.3 Political opportunity theory

A contrasting theory to the grievance theory is the opportunity theory also known in this case as the political opportunity theory. This theory says that racist violence depends not only on ethnic grievance but on the political opportunities that are available or the lack of political opportunities, by which people do not have a channel to express their grievance(Koopmans,

Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005, p.3). The political opportunity theory focuses on the openness or closure of the political system (McAdam, Tarrow, & Tilly, 2003). Political opportunities consist of a certain political environment which gives an incentive to act (Jenkins, 1983). The structure of political opportunities influences the shape and extent of racist violence (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005, p.3). This means that if people do not feel represented in their grievance against immigrants or taken into account when a government decision is made certain parts of society will use racist violence as a way of getting attention by the government. Meaning that government decisions and government compositions can also determine the extent of racist violence use. The theory eventually looks at the relation between the strength of extreme right and racist parties in relation to the extent of extreme right and racist violence (Koopmans, 1996). This theory argues that if there is a possibility in the institutional context that enables opportunities for the rise of extreme right political behavior, socially excluded people are less likely to become engaged in xenophobic activities (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005p, 3). The political structure of representation influences the opportunities perceived (Jenkins, 1983). In a strong one party system minorities will not feel as represented as compared to a multiparty system because people have an alternative to vote for. Furthermore also the electoral system can influence opportunity observed. Hence people will see more opportunities in a large number of smaller parties that will form a coalition then few large parties like in the US and Great- Britain because the lower class of society will rather be represented in a multiparty system then in a single party government in which their interests are not reflected and respresented (Jenkins, 1983).

What the opportunity theory assumes is that if there are no alternative political options available to put forward requests reflecting what the some part of society wants then violence will increase (Meyer & Minkoff, 2004). The people use violence as a way of expressing their despair. This shows that as well as protest, violence is also a mean for the socially excluded powerless population to put forward their demands (Jenkins & Perrow, 1977). If people cannot express their demands via any other channel it will lead to violence as a way of expressing their demand. This means that if there is a party which represents an anti-immigration view, people that share the same view can use this party as an outlet of their views. By having a party that reflects the views of the people that have an anti- immigrant view people will not use racist violence to express their viewpoint. By putting issues on the political agenda like for example anti- immigration the opportunity theory says that people will feel like the issue at their heart is taken seriously and thereby they do not need other ways

like violence to express their views. Alternative options are thus very important in the political opportunity theory.

To test this kind of explanation I will calculate the average percentage of votes received by extreme right parties to find out what the electoral strength of the right wing is. Furthermore the paper will focus on the party programs of extreme right wing parties (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005, p.4). However in order to find this out one needs to know how one can consider a party being extreme right. The common denominator of extreme right parties is their opinion on ethno- cultural stance. This means that a party that has an opinion that is more ethno- cultural of national identity with the focus on cultural differences as being a barrier to societal cohesion are viewed as right wing extremist parties (Stratham, 2003).

To find out which theory explains the use of racist violence as an expression the focus will be on two indicators for the opportunity theory. On the one hand by looking at party programs of extreme right wing parties focusing on what is their opinion towards migrants and foreigners. By looking at the party programs of extreme right wing parties the aim is to see if there are anti- immigrant views represented in their party program because as elaborated before if people see their views are being represented they feel like they are being heard. This would mean that representation of anti- immigrant views by parties leads to less racist violence.

The parties chosen for this research are on the one hand the Dutch parties LPF and PVV and the German party NPD. Two dutch parties are analyzed because the LPF was an anti-immigrant party which started in 2002. The founder of the LPF and the leader of the party Pim Fortuijn was murdered 9 days before the elections, this gave them a lot of attention and a huge boost in the national elections. After 4 years however the party was not represented in the Dutch government anymore. A different party with an anti- immigrant view gained attention. The PVV was founded in 2005. In the elections of 2006 they got into the national government of the Netherlands and have since then always been represented in the Dutch parliament as well as the European Parliament. The PVV took over the role of the LPF in terms of anti- immigrant views, that is why the focus will be on these two parties. The German party the NPD is a party well- known for its anti- immigrant view, therefore the focus will be on the NPD in this research.

Furthermore as mentioned before, the second indicator will be the amount of votes for extreme right wing parties. The votes will be measured in average percentage of votes for extreme right wing parties. The analysis of the outcome can be compared to the analysis of the party- programs because if people vote for an extreme right wing party they see

themselves and their views represented. This means that the higher the amount of votes for extreme right wing parties the less racist violence acts will occur.

In sum the Hypotheses for the political opportunity theory are:

Hypothesis 4: The more a party takes on anti- immigrant views the less racist violence.

Hypothesis 5: The lower the amount of votes for an extreme right wing party the more racist violence.

By using these two theories and the three indicators for the grievance theory and the two indicators for the political opportunity theory the expectations are that there will be a result on which theory has the most sufficient explanation on why people use racist violence. However the theories might not be mutually exclusive which means that maybe both will explain the use of racist violence. In order to find out the actual case- study of Germany and the Netherlands will give an explanation.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study will use a quantitative approach and a qualitative approach. The qualitative approach will be the analysis of the party- programs. The quantitative approach will be everything but the party programs because the focus is on the population of Germany and the Netherlands for which quantitative research is most adequate in order to get a good result. The study will be an explanatory cross- sectional study covering Germany and the Netherlands. The units of analysis are countries. The goal of this study is to find out which theory and thereby which factors explain the use of racist violence the best either the opportunity or the grievance theory.

First I will focus on the difference between Germany and the Netherlands in racist violence. In which country occurs more racist violence? This will be expressed in the peak violence per 1 million inhabitants. I am going to use data from the European Network Against Racism to clarify the difference. Once I know this difference I will look at factors that lead to more racist violence in one country compared to the other country. I will use quantitative data to find out about which factors influence racist violence. The factors that I will be focusing on for the grievance theory are proportion of migrant origin, immigration rate and unemployment rate (Koopmans, Statham, Giugni, & Passy, 2005, p.5). The data that I will use will be taken from existing databases. The factors of the opportunity theory are party programs of extreme right wing parties and amount of votes for extreme right wing parties. The votes will be measured in average percentage of votes for extreme right wing parties between 2001 and 2008.

I have decided to conduct an explanatory cross-sectional study because in my opinion it is the best option available to find out what the factors are that lead to racist violence. There are also problems when using an explanatory cross-sectional study because the conclusion will be based on observations that were made at only one point in time however an explanatory cross-sectional study typically aims at explaining causal processes that occur over time (Babbie, 2007, p. 106).

A threat to this research could be that there are many more factors that are influencing racist violence which I do not account for because the focus lies on the 5 indicators mentioned before. Thereby the results should be treated with caution.

3.2 Case selection and sampling

In order to find out what factors influence the cause of racist violence the unit of analysis I choose are countries. My sample consists of Germany and the Netherlands over a time period of 8 years between 2001 and 2008. The reason for choosing Germany and the Netherlands as a unit of analysis is because I want to know what causes people to interact in racist violence in two countries that are situated next to each other and which seem to be quite similar yet different in racist violence and the causes for racist violence.

The threats of only choosing two countries is that the sample size is too small and thereby one cannot draw a clear conclusion. However in this research I want to focus on two countries that are both Western- European but are politically not alike therefore Germany and the Netherlands are good cases. Furthermore by measuring over a period of time the results will be clearer because odds get evened out.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 What is the Amount of racist violence in Germany as well as the Netherlands?

Figure 1: Racist violence incidents table in absolute numbers

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Germany	14725	12933	11576	12553	15914	18142	17607	20422
Netherlands	317	264	260	-	291	259	223	216

(Eurostat, 2014)

The data collected is based on racist incidents in Germany and the Netherlands. These racist incidents being targeted graffiti, threats, bomb threats, confrontations, destruction, arson, abuse, bomb attack and murder.

Looking at the numbers it is clear that there are a lot more racist incidents happening in Germany compared to the Netherlands. In Germany there are thousands of incidents and in the Netherlands there are hundreds of racist violent incident. The fact that Germany has generally more racist violent acts compared to the Netherlands can be explained by the size of the country and the higher amount of inhabitants living in Germany. Germany is the bigger country. In order to see what these numbers actually mean they will be put in perspective.

Even though the numbers are not in perspective yet, one can already see that in Germany there has been an increase in racist violent incident from the year of 2001 to 2008. In 2001 there were 14725 incident compared to 20422 incidents in 2008. That is an increase of 39% which is significant high increase. In the Netherlands in 2001 there were 317 racist violent incidents compared to 216 in 2008 which is a decline in racist violent act of 32% which is a significant high decrease. What already can be stated is that in Germany there has been an increase in racist violent incidents as opposed to the Netherlands were there has been a decline in racist violent acts.

However to get a clear comparison the numbers need to be put in perspective. The incidents are put in perspective by calculating how many incidents happen per one million inhabitants. In 2008 Germany had 82.4 million inhabitants. The Netherlands had 16.57 million inhabitants in the year of 2008. Now that the numbers are comparable with each other one can see that in Germany there are more racist violent acts than in the Netherlands. This is the case for all the years from 2001-2008. In 2001 in Germany there are 160 racist incidents more compared to the Netherlands. As stated before in Germany the racist violent incidents had increased between 2001 and 2008 as opposed to the Netherlands where the amount of racist violent incident had decreased meaning that in the year of 2008 in Germany there were 235 more incidents more as opposed to the Netherlands. It can be concluded that in Germany the amount of racist violent incidents is significantly higher compared to the Netherlands.

Figure 2: Racist violent incidents per million inhabitants

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Germany	179	157	140	152	193	220	214	248
Netherlands	19	16	16	-	18	16	13	13

(Eurostat, 2014)

Summing up, the table shows that not only in Germany racist violent incidents not only occur more often in absolute numbers. Per million inhabitants the number of racist violent incidents are still significantly higher than in the Netherlands.

4.2 What is the unemployment rate of Germany and the Netherlands?

Figure 3 shows the percentage of unemployment in Germany and the Netherlands. In this table unemployment is seen as all persons who during a specific reference period were without work, currently available for work and seeking for work (CBS, 2013). In 2001 in Germany the unemployment percentage was at 7.9 % this increased to its peak of 11.3% in 2005 after which it declined to 7.5% in 2008. In the Netherlands the development has been similar. In 2001 The unemployment rate was 2.5 % this increased to its peak in 2005 of 5.3% after which it declined to 3.1%. In both countries the development of unemployment has fairly been the same by it increasing and after the year of 2005 decreasing again. However the percentage of people being unemployed was significantly lower in the Netherlands as opposed to Germany. In Germany in 2001 it was 7.9% and in the Netherlands it was 2.5% which is a difference of 5.4%. The difference between the countries declined to 5% in 2005 and in 2008 the difference was 4.4%. This means that in Germany the unemployment over all has declined from 7.9% in 2001 to 7.5 % in 2008 as opposed to the Netherlands where the unemployment has increased from 2.5% in 2001 to 3.1% in 2008. All in all Germany has the higher unemployment but it declined over the period of 2001 to 2008. The Netherlands has the lower unemployment between 2001 and 2008 but it increased slightly.

Figure 3: % of unemployment in Germany and the Netherlands

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Germany	7.9	8.7	9.8	10.5	11.3	10.3	8.7	7.5
Netherlands	2.5	3.1	4.2	5.1	5.3	4.4	3.6	3.1

(CBS, 2014) (Statista, 2014)

The Hypotheses for the variable unemployment rate expected that the higher the unemployment rate the higher the amount of racist violence. In the first sub-question the conclusion was drawn that in Germany the amount of racist violence was higher as opposed to the Netherlands. The unemployment rate in Germany was also higher compared to the unemployment rate in the Netherlands. Due to the higher unemployment rate in Germany a higher amount of racist violence was expected, which is the case. The hypotheses claiming

the higher the unemployment level the higher the amount of racist violence is thereby confirmed. In Germany however the amount of racist violence has increases while the unemployment rate decreased. I will come back to this in the discussion at the end of the paper.

4.3 What is the proportion of migrants in the Netherlands and Germany?

In order to find out what the proportion of migrants is in Germany and the Netherlands it is important to find out how the countries define migrants. In the Netherlands the CBS introduced a standard definition for a migrant. Someone is considered to be a migrant in the Netherlands if at least one parent is born outside of the Netherlands. This means that being a migrant is primarily based on where your parents are born. People can become a Dutch national if one of their parents is Dutch by operation of law through, the option procedure or through naturalization.

In the article 116 §1 of the German constitution, unless otherwise provided by a law, a German within the meaning of this Basic Law is a person who possesses German citizenship or who has been admitted to the territory of the German Reich within the boundaries of 31 December 1937 as a refugee or expellee of German ethnic origin or as the spouse or descendant of such person. Migrants in Germany are people that are not considered German within the framework of article 116 §1 this also includes stateless persons and persons with undetermined citizenships. Children that are born in Germany with foreign parents may acquire German nationality, they have to decide if they keep the German nationality or the nationality of their parents between the age of 18-23. Another way of getting the German nationality is through naturalization which foreigners have the right to after eight years of habitual residence in Germany if certain conditions are met.

Germany and the Netherlands have the same way of acquiring citizenship since 2000. For this research the focus is on the people that by law, which has been specialized, above, do not have the Dutch or German nationality, and thereby makes them foreigners and migrants. The table below considers migrants to be the people that live in Germany or the Netherlands but who do not have the Dutch or German nationality by law by which they are migrants.

Figure 4: Migrants in the Netherlands

	2000	2004	2008
Amount migrants	2.775.302	3.088.152	3.215.416
Percentage of the total population	17.5	19	19.6

(CBS, 2014)

Figure 5: Migrants in Germany

	2000	2004	2008
Amount migrants	7.296.800	6.717.100	6.727.600
Percentage of the total population	8.9	8.2	8.2

(Statista, 2014)

Figure 4 shows that the amount of migrants in the Netherlands has increased by 2.1% within 8 years. In Germany it has decreased by 0.7. The Dutch population exists of more migrants than the German population. In the year 2000, 17.5% of the population were migrants in the Netherlands, which increased to 19.6%. In Germany in the year 2000, 8.9% of the population were migrants which decreased to 8.2%. This show that in the Netherlands the proportion of migrants is significantly higher compared to Germany.

4.4 What is the immigration rate in Germany and the Netherlands?

As a third variable we use immigration rate. The immigration rate is defined as the ratio of net migration plus adjustment during the year to the average population in that year expressed per 1000 inhabitant (Eurostat, 2014). The net migration plus adjustment constitutes of the total change and the natural change of the population (Eurostat, 2014).

Figure 6: Net migration rate per 1000 inhabitants

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Germany	3.3	2.7	1.7	1.1	1.0	0.3	0.5	-0.7
Netherlands	3.5	1.7	0.4	-0.6	-1.4	-1.6	-0.1	1.9

(Eurostat, 2014)

Figure 6 shows that except for the year 2001 and 2008 the net migration rate is higher in Germany as opposed to the Netherlands. In Germany from 2001 till 2007 the net immigration rate was always positive this means that more people came into the country than went out. Only in 2008 Germany had a negative net immigration rate. From 2001 – 2008 there was a decline in the net immigration rate. This means that more people came in than went out however not as much as the year before. The Netherlands had a positive net immigration rate in the years 2001- 2003 till 2008. From 2004 till 2006 the net immigration rate was negative. From 2001 till 2007 each year there was a decline in the net immigration rate. In 2008 however there was a big change in the net immigration rate by it being 2.0 more than the year before. It can be concluded that the net immigration rate in Germany is higher as opposed to the Netherlands however in both countries there has been a declining trend, in Germany this trend set in later in Germany as opposed to the Netherlands. The Netherlands reached its minimum in the year of 2006, however Germany reached its minimum 2 years later in 2008 when in the Netherlands the migration started to increase again. It is not known though if it is an ongoing growth in the Netherlands because the focus is 2001-2008

4.5 Overview grievance theory

For the grievance theory 3 hypotheses have been stated:

Hypothesis 1: High unemployment leads to high amount of racist violence.

Hypothesis 2: High proportion of migrants leads to high amount of racist violence.

Hypothesis 3: High immigration rate leads to high amount of racist violence.

Saying this the Hypotheses expect there to be more racist violence in Germany due to a high unemployment rate, a high immigration rate and a high portion of migrant origin in a country. Data showed that in Germany there had been more racist violence per million inhabitants than the Netherlands, thereby the hypotheses expect there to be more unemployment, a higher proportion of migrants and a higher immigration rate in Germany as opposed to the Netherlands. The unemployment level of Germany is higher than the one of the Netherlands, as has been shown in the data above, and the amount of racist violence is also higher in Germany. This means that the first hypothesis is proven to be right. The proportion of migrants is higher in the Netherlands compared to Germany, which has been proven in the data above, however the amount of racist violence is higher in Germany. This means that the second hypothesis is proven to be faulty. The immigration rate in Germany is higher compared to the Netherlands, which has been demonstrated in figure 6, the amount of racist violence is higher in Germany. This means that the third hypothesis has been proven to be right.

4.6 What are, were the views of the LPF, PVV and the NPD on immigrants?

The variable party programs focus on the opinions towards migrants by extreme right wing parties. The parties programs that are going to be analyzed are the party programs from the NPD and the LPF and the PVV. For the Netherlands two parties are analyzed because the LPF did not continue as a Party, however the PVV, a party that was also anti- immigrant was established. For the LPF and the PVV the party programs for the national elections of 2002, 2003 and 2006 have been the focus. For the NPD the party program of 2010 was the focus because the data for the 2002 and 2005 were not available.

In the 2002 party program of the LPF it is stated that the Netherlands has turned into a overpopulated country in which migration has escalated. “The Netherlands is not an immigration country and due to social and cultural arrears there is a dichotomy in society” (LPF, 2002). These statements manifest that the LPF wants less migrants to come into the Netherlands. The LPF stated that the massive amount of migrants coming into the Netherlands lead to problems in the Dutch society. These problems manifest themselves in public housing, employment, security, health care, mobility, pounding of the public space and

recreation. The large amount of migrants with a low education without an income, who are looking for economic improvement lead to the problems mentioned before. In order to improve the Dutch society, the country needs to be resistant towards migrants. The LPF wants less migrants and wants less asylum seekers to get in. The cities should not be dominated by non- western culture and the Dutch culture should be preserved. The LPF considers it necessary that there is a limit on non- western migrants.

In the 2003 party program of the LPF, they again state that the densely populated country of the Netherlands is not an immigration country. The migration stream leads to tension in the field of security, residence, employment and health- care. This time the LPF comes with possible solutions as for example a stricter admission policy, furthermore migrants need to actively participate in Dutch society therefore they need to pass an integration course. People that illegally reside in the Netherlands , without exceptions need to be set out of the country with a time ban of entering the Netherlands again. The party program of 2003 of the LPF as opposed to the party program of 2002 focuses more on actions the government can take in order to solve the 'migrant issue'. In both years the LPF clearly considers the migrants as a burden for society by which they want to decrease this burden.

In 2006 the PVV took over as the anti –immigrant party because the LPF did not continue as a party. The PVV states that migration is excessively high, the demographic development is worrisome because the majority of the youth in the big cities is of non- western descent. The PVV sees migrants as a big problem however they do not state why they consider it a big problem, however they pose a lot of solutions for the 'migrant problem'. The solutions are that there should be an immigration stop of non- western migrants, a quota of 5000 asylum seekers per year and a new first article of the constitution should be established stating that the Christian/Jewish/humanistic culture must prevail dominant in the Netherlands. There should be a moratorium of 5 years for the construction of a mosque, radical mosques should be closed and the radical imam should be set out of the country, no headscarves should be allowed in public functions and there should be a prohibition of burqas. These are a few of the actions the PVV wants to undertake in order to control the 'immigrant problem'. What really dominates is the fact that the PVV focuses on Islamic people and everything that evolves around the Islam. They clearly want less migrants but they especially focus on actions against Muslims.

All in all we the Dutch parties want less or even no non- western immigrants coming into the Netherlands. The LPF focuses on the why the migrants are a problem and what could and should be done in order to solve the problem, the PVV however does not focus on why migrants are a problem but just states them as a problem and focuses on solutions for the ‘migrant problem’. The solutions of the PVV mainly focus on the Islam.

The German party the NPD focuses very much on the preservice of Germany and germaneness. A famous quote of the party is ‘Deutschland den Deutschen’ which means Germany for the Germans. The NPD even goes so far as to say integration is genocide. The migrants that come into Germany are bad for the preservice of the Germaneness. The NPD does not really come with clear problems which are posed by the migrants except for the fact that they are not German which is a problem to them. They pose some forms of solutions or changes that should happen. For example constructions and cultural changes which are based on religion should be stopped. The NPD says that islamization poses a threat for the culture and identity of the Germans. People should not be offered asylum in Germany. Another policy the NPD wants to introduce is the fact that Germans and foreigners should not sit in the same class because foreigners lower the level due to their language shortcoming. Criminal foreigners should be kicked out of the country and should not be allowed to get back into Germany. Foreigners should not have a German social insurance but they should have a special insurance for foreigners. Basically the NPD is against everything that is not German. The NPD considers foreigners to be a problem because they are not German enough therefore they do not want migrants coming into their country. In comparison to the LPF and the PVV NPD is more extreme in their anti- immigrant views.

4.7 How many votes did the LPF, PVV and the NPD get in National elections?

Figure 6: Electoral output of national elections in percentages

	2002	2003	2005	2006
LPF, PVV	17	5.6	-	5.9

NPD	0.5	-	1.6	-
-----	-----	---	-----	---

(Kiesraad, 2014) (Wahlrecht,2014)

It is expected that violence is less likely to develop where extreme right and racist parties are a relevant force within the political system (Koopmans, 1996). In the last national election the extreme right wing party the PVV got a lot of votes however the NPD did not get as many votes. There are several explanations for this. As we saw in the party programs the NPD is more extreme in its wishes and its opinions. The NPD also is ignored by the other political party meaning that if you vote for them your voice will still be unheard. For the PVV this is not the case they are fully involved into Dutch politics. The PVV got past the electoral threshold however the NPD did not. Therefore people that do have an anti-immigrant opinion see their opinion reflected in the PVV who actually contribute to decision-making in Dutch politics compared to the NPD who has not a say in German politics and decision-making. In the year of 2003 the German 'Bundestag' which is the House of Representatives together with the 'Bundesrat' which is the federal council wanted to forbid the party because it was a racist and anti-constitutional party. There was a lack in transparency of where the information came from to prove that they were anti-constitutional that is why the German constitutional court decided to not continue the case. The NPD was not wanted in German politics and still is not wanted in German politics, by just ignoring these kind of parties, which German politicians are doing there might be a risk of a rise in racist violence. People that want to express their opinion of being anti-immigrant cannot do so via politics in Germany which makes them look for other ways of making their voice heard, by which they fall back to racist violence.

4.8 Overview opportunity theory

For the opportunity theory 2 hypotheses have been stated:

Hypothesis 4: The more a party takes on anti-immigrant views the less racist violence.

Hypothesis 5: The lower the amount of votes for an extreme right wing party the more racist violence.

The hypotheses of the opportunity theory expect that in Germany there should be less votes for extreme right wing parties and that there is less representation of an anti-immigrant opinion in politics in Germany. The data in figure 6 showed that the amount of votes for extreme right wing parties is higher in the Netherlands as opposed to Germany, however in Germany there is more racist violence. In Germany there are less votes for extreme right wing parties but more racist violence which means that hypothesis 4 is proven to be right. It has been shown that the German party NPD did not want any immigrants in the country by which it was more extreme than the LPF and the PVV, however in Germany there is more racist violence.

5. Conclusion and discussion

The question posed in the beginning of the paper was: *How can we explain differences in racist violence between Germany and the Netherlands from 2001-2008?* The first part, if there is a difference in racist violence can be answered with yes. In Germany there has been significantly more racist violence per million inhabitants as opposed to the Netherlands from 2001-2008. The second part of the question was to try to explain the existing difference in racist violence. I tried to explain this difference by applying the grievance and the opportunity theory. For the grievance theory three hypotheses have been tested in order to see if the variables unemployment, proportion of migrants and migration ratio influence the amount of racist violence. I found out that the unemployment ratio and a higher migration ratio correlates with more racist violence. In Germany there is more racist violence and more unemployment. The odd factor is that the unemployment rate decreased as opposed to the amount of racist violence which has increased. This shows that there might not be a direct relation between the two factors and that a third factor might influence racist violence. Other factors that influence racist violence might weaken the influence of the unemployment factor on racist violence. Another factor could be that there is a delay in the effect of having less unemployment meaning that there is a reaction of less violence however this will happen after 2008. Furthermore even though the unemployment level declines people still need a way to express their despair by which they use racist violence. We cannot be completely sure of the relation between the unemployment rate and racist violence. In the case of Germany and

the Netherlands the proportion of migrants does not explain the amount of racist violence in the country. Even though Germany is faced with more racist violence as opposed to the Netherlands the percentage of migrants living in Germany is lower. Two of the 3 hypotheses based on the grievance theory have been proven to be right in the case of Germany and the Netherlands. This lets us assume that to a certain extent, with certain factors the grievance theory explains difference in racist violence between Germany and the Netherlands. This means that the unemployment level and the migration rate are related to levels of racist violence. There is a strong correlation between racist violence and the unemployment level and the migration rate which is in line with the grievance theory. Furthermore levels of racist violence cannot be explained by the proportion of migrants living in Germany and the Netherlands. Hereby it can be concluded that the level of unemployment and the migration rate explain differences in racist violence.

For the opportunity theory two hypotheses have been tested in order to see if the amount of votes for an extreme right wing party and if the representation of anti- immigrant view by a party influence the amount of racist violence in a country. We stated that the lower the amount of votes for an extreme right wing party the more racist violence because people would not feel represented in politics. This was proven to be right, which means that in Germany there were less votes for the NPD as opposed to the PVV and the LPF however there was more racist violence. It can be concluded that the amount of racist votes for an extreme right wing party explains racist violence and is in line with the opportunity theory. The second factor anti- immigrant view, which expected there to be more racist violence the more anti- immigrant a party is. This hypotheses was proven to be faulty. The NPD is a party that is more anti- immigrant compared to the PVV and LPF. However in Germany there is more racist violence. This means that the extremer the anti- immigrant view as a factor is not in line with the opportunity theory. An explanation could be that the PVV and the LPF are kind of mellow in their anti- immigrant views but still are anti- immigrant. The PVV and the LPF are mellow in their anti- immigrant view therefore the political acceptance is higher which makes people accept them easier as a party and would vote for them, which could be the reason behind them having more votes than the NPD.

In Germany another interesting factor is visible. The regional differences in racist violence are bigger in Germany. More racist violent acts take place in the eastern part of Germany. The eastern part of Germany is also faced by more economic disparity which means

unemployment and poverty than the western part of Germany. This shows the influence of economic factors on racist violence.

All in all it can be concluded that the level of unemployment, migration rate and the amount of votes for a right wing party explain the amount of racist violence in the case of Germany and the Netherlands. Anti-immigrant views and the proportion of migrants do not explain racist violence in the case of Germany and the Netherlands. This shows that choosing which theory is better or best, neither can be concluded, it does not mean either or the other theory explains the use of racist violence it is a combination of both theories that explain the use of racist violence.

This paper leaves some questions open for further research. The focus of the paper was on Germany and the Netherlands, however it would be interesting to see if the outcome would be the same if other European countries would be included, therefore further research is needed.

References

- Acuña, R. (2010). *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*.
- AnneFrankHouse. Why did Hitler hate Jews?
- AnneFrankHouse. (2007). Dodelijke afloop, Geweld tegen moslims. Retrieved from
- Arzheimer, K., & Carter, E. (2006). Political opportunity structures and right-wing extremist party success. *European Journal of Political Research*, 45(3), 419-443.
- Banton, M. (1992). The nature and causes of racism and racial discrimination. *International Sociology*, 7(1), 69-84.
- Banton, M., & Harwood, J. (1975). *The race concept: David & Charles Newton Abbot*.
- Barker, M. (1981). The new racism: conservatives and the ideology of the tribe.
- Bleich, E. (2007). Hate Crime Policy in Western Europe Responding to Racist Violence in Britain, Germany, and France. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(2), 149-165.
- CBS. (2013). Sociaaleconomische trends, Werkloze en werkzame beroepsbevolking: twee afbakeningen. *Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek*.
- Coenders, M., Lubbers, M., & Scheepers, P. (2006). Het tolerante land. *historisch en in landenvergelijkend perspectief ('The tolerant country' in historical and nation comparative perspective)*. In: *Tubergen/Maas (Eds.)*, 89-110.
- Cole, J. (1997). *The new racism in Europe: a Sicilian ethnography*.

- EUMC. (2005). Racist Violence in 15 EU Member States A Comparative Overview of Findings from the RAXEN NFP Reports 2001-2004
- Eurostat. (2014). Crude rate of net migration plus adjustment.
- Goodey, J. (2007). Racist violence in Europe: Challenges for official data collection. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(4), 570-589.
- Halikiopoulou, D. (2013). The rise of the Golden Dawn and extremism in Greece.
- Heitmeyer, W. (1992). *Rechtsextremistische Orientierungen bei Jugendlichen: Empirische Ergebnisse und Erklärungsmuster einer Untersuchung zur politischen Sozialisation*: Beltz Juventa.
- Iganski, P. (2011). Racist Violence in Europe. *ENAR*.
- Jenkins, J. C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 527-553.
- Jenkins, J. C., & Perrow, C. (1977). Insurgency of the powerless: Farm worker movements (1946-1972). *American Sociological Review*, 249-268.
- Koopmans, R. (1996). Explaining the rise of racist and extreme right violence in Western Europe: Grievances or opportunities? *European Journal of Political Research*, 30(2), 185-216.
- Koopmans, R. (1999). Germany and its immigrants: An ambivalent relationship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 25(4), 627-647.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M., & Passy, F. (2005). *Contested citizenship: Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe*: JSTOR.
- Kramer, M. (2013). The Netherlands: From national identity to plural identifications. *Migration Policy Institute*.
- Kuzmany, S. (2011). Neo-Nazi Killings Expose Broad German Xenophobia. *Spiegel*.
- McAdam, D., Tarrow, S., & Tilly, C. (2003). Dynamics of contention. *Social Movement Studies*, 2(1), 99-102.
- Mercier, G. (2010). Europe: The Dangerous Rise of Xenophobia and Racist Violence. *News Junkie Post Global News & In-Depth Analyses*. Retrieved from
- Meyer, D. S., & Minkoff, D. C. (2004). Conceptualizing political opportunity. *Social forces*, 82(4), 1457-1492.
- Miles, R., & Brown, M. (2003). *Racism*: Psychology Press.
- Niddle, N. K. (2014). What is racism? *Race Relations*.
- Oakley, R. (2005). Policing Racist Crime and Violence a comparative analysis. *EUMC*.
- Olzak, S. (1990). The political context of competition: Lynching and urban racial violence, 1882–1914. *Social forces*, 69(2), 395-421.
- P. Rodrigues, J. D. (2010). Racism and Extremism Monitor Ninth Report *Anne Frank Stichting*.
- Rafaela, M. (2010). *Immigration and Conflict in Europe*.

- Rechtbank Amsterdam. (2011). Uitspraak van de rechtbank Amsterdam in de zaak Wilders
- Statista. (2014). Zahl der Ausländer in Deutschland von 1990 bis 2012. *Das Statistik-Portal*.
- Stratham, P. (2003). Understanding Anti-Asylum Rhetoric: Restrictive Politics or Racist Publics? *The Political Quarterly*, 74(s1), 163-177.
- Vertovec, S., & Wessendorf, S. (2010). *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*: Routledge.
- Witte, R. (1996). *Racist violence and the state*: Taylor & Francis Ltd