1. The multifaceted experience of the “Dutch” in the Indies underscores Bhabha’s discussion of the production of mutable and mutual identities through performance within the colonial sphere.

2. The intimate relationship between body and environment, and the subconscious self-formation that occurs through interaction with place, ensured that children born in Indonesia diverged from their European parents in terms of self/ethnic identity.

3. Even when immigrants consciously reject their natal land, constructing it as negative foil for all the things that are good about “here,” they are unable to refuse totally the intimacy of the early, formative, bond with their countries of birth.

4. Dutch Indonesians were not “Dutch,” but descendents of deep maternal Indonesian and Indo lines in which women married white men. Cultural patterns, ethnic affiliation, and kin ties may be largely Indonesian, very few knew details of their father’s line or history. In short, they were an alternate ethnicity whose cultural heritage was not simply a sum of Dutch and Indonesian ‘parts,’ but a syncretized, fluid structure that produced wholly new cultural forms and a divergent world view.

5. Many Dutch Indonesians speak of, and envision, the departure from Indonesia as enforced, refugees from a racial policy that threatened violence to self and children. They did not “repatriate” since you cannot repatriate to a country you have never seen. The Netherlands evacuated them and they experienced their tenure status in the Netherlands as refugees. The Dutch-Indonesian identity is misidentified in the literature on Dutch Colonialism.

6. Self-determination may be a right but it does not necessarily facilitate justice; ethnic government does not automatically create ethical government. While one group may claim the right to self-determination or freedom, other peoples, at the hands of those same ‘freedom fighters,’ may lose that right.

7. Canadian and American ideologies offer interviewees not only a language, but also validation for their conceptualization of relations with the Indies.

8. Rather than an acknowledgement of the difficulty experienced by exiled Dutch and Indische people who had to alter “naturally given personal attributes” deriving from bonds to Indonesian place, academics prescribe what colonial behavior and responses should have been. Those prescriptions are rooted in colonial guilt.

9. Interviews with Indonesians who left their country for North America suggest that the relationship between power and ‘subjection’ sat relatively lightly on the shoulders of the average citizen during the late colonial period, leading to the wielding of agency and conscious formulation of self that did not include the notion of subalternity in terms of a ‘lesser’ humanity. Furthermore, self-identification was always already in conversation with the Indonesian social fabric and hierarchical (or not) understandings at specific Indonesian locales; the ancestral customs of specific Indonesian societies wielded definitive perceptual power vis a vis Dutch-self definitions.

10. The mythology of the Dutch man who casts his Netherlands morality to the winds in South East Asia rears its head in the early days of the VOC and it forms part of the Netherlands’ interpretative schemata about the colony. In other words, the myth is ‘made in Holland,’ not in Indonesia.