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Introduction

The highlight of this issue may be the report of the meeting on 21 June, which after all was initiated by Gilles Borrie, one of our original Friends. His tremendous involvement in the Partij van de Arbeid (PvdA, the Social Democratic Party of the Netherlands) politics, combined with his scholarly-historical interest in this subject, led him to suggest the history of local social democracy as the subject for this day. It has been elaborated here for the Netherlands and for Amsterdam in particular, although the Dutch experiences undoubtedly have a far broader validity. We hope that our foreign friends and readers will identify with the stories of prominent PvdA officials, such as Gilles Borrie (who served as mayor of Eindhoven, in addition to other offices) and Ed van Thijn (who was mayor of Amsterdam and later a minister in the Dutch government). The items from Borrie’s personal collection, intended for the iish collections, as well as the presence of many PvdA members, added a special touch to the meeting. Perhaps we will even welcome some of them as new Friends of the iish.

Members of the Friends of the iish pay annual dues of one or five hundred euros or join with a lifetime donation of one thousand five hundred euro or more. In return, members are invited to semi-annual sessions featuring presentations of iish acquisitions and guest speakers. These guest speakers deliver lectures on their field of research, which does not necessarily concern the iish collection. The presentation and lecture are followed by a reception. In addition to these semi-annual gatherings, all Friends receive a forty-percent discount on iish publications. Friends paying dues of five hundred euros or more are also entitled to choose Institute publications from a broad selection offered at no charge. The board consults the Friends about allocation of the revenues from the dues and delivers an annual financial report in conjunction with the iish administration. The iish was founded by master collector Nicolaas Posthumus (1880-1966) in the 1930s. For the past two decades, two of the institutes established by this “history entrepreneur” have operated from the same premises: the NED (Netherlands Economic History Archive) since 1914 and the International Institute of Social History (iish), which is now 72 years old. Both institutes are still collecting, although the “subsidiary” iish has grown far larger than the “parent” NED. (Detailed information about the iish appears in: Maria Hunink De papieren van de revolutie. Het Internationaal Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis 1935-1947 (Amsterdam 1986) and in: Jan Lucassen Tracing the past. Collections and research in social and economic history; The International Institute of Social History, The Netherlands Economic History Archive and related institutions (Amsterdam 1989). For all information concerning the Friends, contact Mieke IJzermans at the iish (mij@iisg).
From all nooks and corners

In addition to reading this periodical, several people appear to scrutinize the spelling as well. What more can the editors hope for, after apologizing for the errors? Two reactions are particularly noteworthy, as they address incorrect information provided in previous newsletters. Ferdinand Mertens (author of Otto Neurath en de maakbaarheid van de betere samenleving, published by Aksant a few weeks ago) has observed some errors in our description of the Gerd Arntz Collection (On the Waterfront 13, 2006, pp. 7-8). Otto Neurath was not a minister under the Bavarian Council Republic but was a civil servant in charge of the Wirtschaftsamt. Had he held political responsibility, he would not have escaped execution. Arntz was less a colleague than a subordinate of Neurath (as was the equally important Marie Reidemeister). Nor did Arntz – an ordinary German – need to flee occupied Austria. Rather, he accepted Neurath’s invitation to come to The Hague. Mertens has substantiated his assumption that Posthumus and Neurath became acquainted at the World Social Economic Congress held at the Koloniaal Instituut in Amsterdam in 1931, organized under the auspices of the Industrial Relations Association (I.R.I.).

Another reaction is from Annemarie Cottaar, responsible for the Historisch Beeldarchief Migrant en (HBMI), who correctly has noted that the title page sketch for Patrides by Dimitra Sideris (On the Waterfront 14, 2007, p. 14) originates from the Sideris Collection, rather than from the Aridjis Collection.

Presentation of the acquisitions

During the previous year the Institute once again added many new items to its collection, and we expect to register 250 new acquisitions (slightly less than half) and accessions (slightly over half) in 2007 as well. The NEHA collections are once again growing as well, albeit at a far more modest rate. The Institut Iranien collections previously brought together in France are among the highlights of the new collections acquired, as well as a very special private book collection on the same subject. Below the editors have featured their personal favourites from among these lovely items.

Martin Emanuel Philippson (1846-1916) in the Franco-Prussian War, 1870-1871

While clearing out his office, our colleague Götz Langkau made a dozen smaller archives that had been here for a while available for consultation in the reading room. As we will also discuss two of them this afternoon, we will undoubtedly fail to do justice to others, such as Erich Pechmann, who after having been imprisoned in a concentration camp fled to the Netherlands in 1936, where he worked with the communist radio station “29, 8; Der deutsche Freiheitsender,” obviously focusing on Germany. We would like to go back further in time, however, to the Franco-Prussian War. A typescript from around 1900 entitled “Martin’s Kriegsbriefe 1870/71” caught our eyes. In the fall of 1870 the 24 year-old Jewish historian volunteered for the attack on France. He had enlisted in the armed forces without permission from his parents (his father Ludwig had been a rabbi in Magdeburg and edited the Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums). His reason was simple. After all, he believed in “Deutschland, Deutschland über alles, über alles in der Welt,” as he wrote his parents. He was proud that so many Jews were joining the war on the side of the beloved Fatherland against the unquestionably deceitful French. As had already become a tradition in his family, Jewish and German identities were regarded as synonymous. Nevertheless, Martin already knew France very well. In 1867/68 he had done archival research there for his PhD thesis about Henri IV and Philippe III.

His lively letters about his war experiences convey a medley of German and especially Jewish pride, as well as pity for the French in some parts. On 8 November 1870 he wrote from Gros- lay, north of Paris: “Incredible, how this unfortunate country is suffering from the invasion. I will leave out here the war contributions and compulsory supplies, requisitioning and the like. In the provinces, where the inhabitants have stayed behind, and no fortresses are near, the situation is tolerable. Even there, however, the population has pretty much been picked clean by the onslaught of Germans. But the entire area of Paris is a horrible sight! Since the residents have largely gone,
The silver trowel of Henri van Kol (1852-1925)

Henri van Kol (1852-1925) is probably the best-known Dutch socialist not to have had a biography written about him yet. Nor did he try his hand at an autobiography. Except for a few short articles with self-deprecating titles such as “Uit de oude doos [From the old box] (1870-1872),” Van Kol left no memoirs of which we are aware. But he did leave behind a wonderful collection of papers. When the Institute was established, the Domela Nieuwenhuis Archive already contained 76 letters from him. More arrived with nearly all new Dutch and several foreign socialists. After all, Henri van Kol was a member of the First International from the age of 19 and was thus active in the socialist movement for 54 years altogether. His truly vast circle of acquaintances included many very prominent individuals: from Karl Marx to Multatuli and from Friedrich Engels to Kartini. He travelled all over the world, especially throughout Asia.

Much later, nearly fifty years after his death, a grandson — also named Henri — donated his grandfather’s archive to the IISH. That was not all: various other materials arrived from other family members as well. In 2003, for example, an addition came

...
from his granddaughter (see On the Waterfront 9, 2004, pp. 5-7), and now, four years later, we have received another. Enough material is now available for a serious study of this colourful figure, perhaps even a double portrait of him and his equally interesting wife.

Given the vast range of topics from which we select each time, featuring the same individual for the second time in three years might seem exaggerated. Still, the beautifully carved Javanese wooden box inscribed with Van Kol’s name and bearing the date 20 April 1901, and especially the contents, left us no choice. So here is Henri van Kol revisited. The following is a rather random selection from the contents of the box.

First is a coloured silhouette of Lodewijk Justinus Wilhelminus Beeckman (1812-1831), described in the inscription on the rear as “Great-grandma’s brother,” who together with other students from Leiden University volunteered for the ten-day campaign against the insurgent Belgians, during which he was shot in the head on 5 August 1831. He was only 19. The celebrated Dutch poet J.P. Heijen commemorated this patriot in one of his poems. This makes one think of Henri, a young engineering student forty years later, who in 1871 went to Paris with an armed foot soldier to assist the Communards. Unlike Lodewijk Beeckman, Henri was fortunate to arrive too late on the battlefield, enabling us to hear much more about him.

Next come several traditional Catholic obituary cards for his father, grandfather, and great grandfather. The Van Kol’s were devout Brabant Catholics, and Henri tried to reconcile Catholicism with socialism well into the 1880s. A spiritual eclectic, he took a sincere interest in freemasonry, spiritualism, theosophy, and rhabdomancy at different points in his life. And he was not the only socialist to do so.

Freemasonry probably relates to the most intriguing item in this treasure chest: a small silver trowel inscribed “Ferdi 24-08-1891 Bandjar,” referring to his second son, born exactly four years before. In 1883 Henri van Kol married Nellie Porreij. The next year they had a son, unfortunately stillborn. Their daughter Lily followed in 1886, and on 24 August 1887 the couple’s second son was born, whose names read like a party programme, as the poem his mother published on his first birthday reveals:

Named “Karl” after the thinker
Named “Ferdinand” after the doer
Our lovely little lad once may prove
very similar to both
Lovely little lad who hangs so gaily
at mother’s hand,
would you compensate my cares,
would you reward me for your love?
Become like Karl and Ferdinand.

These amazingly high expectations, which of course referred to Karl Marx and Ferdinand Domela Nieuwenhuis, were never realized. The lovely little lad died six months later. Bandjar (Brebes department, Tegal residence, Indonesia) denotes where Henri van Kol was stationed in 1891 as an Engineer for the Ministry of Public and Civil Works. But myriad questions remain: why was this birth four years earlier solemnly commemorated precisely then? After all, six months before a new son had arrived, Rienzi Ferdinand Cesar Jean. And what did the trowel symbolize?

The last two items in this treasure chest commemorate the two loves of Henri’s life. Cosily wedged against each other are a small wallet crocheted by Nellie (“wallet crocheted by me for Pa, during the early days of our marriage”) and some Japanese cards reminiscent of the Japanese journalist Otawa Tomi, with whom Henri lived in the Belgian town of Aywaille since 1919.

Paul Frölich (1884-1953)
In her history of the Institute, Maria Hunink writes that by the summer of 1935 prominent socialists were asked to write their political memoirs. An early awareness
of the importance of oral history! The Institute even offered to pay: fifty guilders for each 16-page sheet for a maximum of six sheets. Souvarine and Nikolaevski compiled a list of three Frenchmen (Pierre Pascal, André Ferrat, and Alfred Rosmer), three Germans (Paul Frölich, Heinrich Brandler, and Jacob Walcher), two Italians (Angelo Tasca and Ignacio Silone), the Belgian Victor Serge, two Poles (Pawel Minc and Fanny Jezierska), the Yugoslav Ante Ciliga, and the Russian Leo Sedov. “Alas,” she wrote, “this project, too, was doomed.” According to Hunink, only Petr A. Garvij – whose absence from the list suggests that it may later have been expanded – actually wrote down his memoirs. To her intense regret, these memoirs were in fact published not by the iish but by Nikolaevski and Sapir in the United States.

Fortunately, she is not entirely right: the items that Götz Langkau entrusted to the Institute (see above) also include the memoirs of Paul Frölich, who co-founded the German Communist Party KPD in 1919. Having fled to France in 1933, he approved the 1938 proposal that envisaged publishing the memoirs in the International Review of Social History. The memoirs ended up being far too long, spanning 312 pages. Frölich was reminded that the Institute could pay at most 300 guilders for his work. To our knowledge, however, they were never published – probably because they were too long.

Although Paul Frölich authored many publications, of which the Milanese publishing house Panta Rei recently reissued several in translation, the manuscript concerned is indeed unique. Compared with Frölich’s published work, these memoirs are very personal. He writes almost exclusively about his own experiences, about his own conversations, and refers to publications by others and by himself. This apparently sophisticated initiative has resulted in a fine document about the rise of the German communist movement, as well as about German social democracy from the late nineteenth century onward.

After all, the first hundred pages of his memoirs are about the period before World War I. Raised in a Leipzig working-class family with a keen political awareness, Paul helped canvas as a young man. His father was such an experienced and expert fitter that he received special commissions, for example for exhibitions. He did these jobs as a subcontractor. Although he worked extremely long hours, he made a very good living at times – much needed as the father of eleven children! Paul provides a comical and indeed invaluable (a rare and unusually accurate) description of the home where he was raised. In addition, his account exemplifies his lively and meticulous writing style.

“Our home consisted of two rooms that were not large, one small, narrow room, and a kitchen. It was terribly bug-infested, like all homes in the working-class suburb. One room was set aside
as the “parlour” and was used as little as possible. My mother felt that the parlour was dishonoured, since the master bed was ultimately placed here. A veneered table covered with a velvet cloth, father’s library (three volumes of Lassalle’s Reden und Schriften, Internationale Bibliothek, Brockhaus’s Grosses Lexikon, W. Liebknecht’s Robert Blum und seine Zeit, Bisha, Naturheilkunde, a popular book on astronomy, other scientific texts, Die Neue Zeit from 1889 onward, and political leaflets). On the walls were two oil prints of Marx and Lassalle, which looked august to me, a fine Bebel portrait from the eighties, the social-democratic Reichstag faction of 1884, a copperplate engraving of Robert Blum, done by a friend of my father’s. A large mirror and two ornate chairs – and the room was so full that it became impossible to move there. We children slept two or three to a bed, and even the torn couch in the living room served as a place to sleep.”

The memoirs end in the spring of 1921. Frölich appears to have intended to continue them, at least until 1924, but he did not get around to that just before the war and sent this provisional result to Amsterdam in the meantime. Here – better late than never, according to the adage – they are now accessible to everybody.

The Centraal Bond voor Inwendige Zending en Christelijk Maatschappelijk Werk

The archives of some organizations derive their chief merits from the material they contain about other organizations. One such archive is that of the Centraal Bond voor Inwendige Zending en Christelijk Maatschappelijk Werk [Central League for Home Missions and Christian Social Work], toward which the Institute received an accrual this year. Like related organizations abroad (in 1923 an International League for Home Missions was established with the Dutchman J.R. Slotemaker de Bruïne as its chairman), this league aimed to re-Christianize society through...
active social commitment. In addition to spreading the gospel at the workplace, the programme included a temperance movement, efforts to abolish prostitution, white slavery, and trade in children, and running juvenile institutions and sanatoriums.

The variegated small collection of papers from this institution that has reached the ISIH over the years (it covers the period 1926-1974 and can be found in both the archive and in the Image and Sound Department) comprises leaflets, posters, and other propaganda and information materials of related organizations in the Netherlands and abroad. The material from Germany from the late 1920s and early 1930s is especially remarkable. Present-day observers will be struck by the similar metaphors of the different movements, regardless of their political background, from the Red Cross to the Protestant Westdeutsche Jungmännerbund (with a penchant for the “Heil!” salute) or the Reichsmilchausschuss.

Wim de Wit (1897-1938)

In June 2007 Hans Olink published his book Een Siberische Tragedie about the tragic fate of Wim and Augusta de Wit. Olink has based his work largely on the archive that the ISIH recently received via the grandson of Augusta de Wit-Schröder. This small but fascinating archive features tangible memories of these special people and – through photographs and extensive correspondence – of their friends and kindred spirits. During World War I Wim attended the engineering polytechnic in Delft. He was thrown in prison for refusing to serve in the military and finished his studies only after he was released. As a former conscientious objector, he had difficulty finding work and soon moved with his wife Augusta Schröder (but called Guus), ten years his senior, to Aachen where he found a job. He and his wife associated with artists such as Gerd and Agnes Arntz, Frans Seiwert, Laszlo Moholy Nagy, and Oskar Schlemmer and leftist radicals.

Five years later the De Wits moved from Aachen to Berlin, where they immediately felt at home and made friends with Erich and Zenzl Mühsam and others. Although Wim did not condone everything about the Soviet Union, he accepted an offer to work there as an engineer. His German superiors had started to cause problems for him, and he hoped his working conditions would improve. In addition, the financial outlook appeared far better in Russia.

In 1929 they settled in Moscow, where they came to be known as Bim and Juscha. Their home became a centre for Dutch expatriates: communists and anarchists, engineers and bureaucrats, fortune hunters and adventurers. In 1936, however, after a few happy, fascinating years, disaster struck for Wim. In November of that year, De Wit was taken away by the NKVD (the secret police), on suspicion of having contacts with Trotskyist organizations and engaging in espionage. He refused to confess but was ultimately deported to Kolyma in Siberia, where he was executed on 8 March 1938.

Augusta wrote letter after letter. Even when one of her letters was returned stamped adresat umer (addressee deceased), she continued to hope he would return. In late 1937 Augusta moved back to the Netherlands. For sixty long years, until her death in 1997, she waited for Wim, the love of her life.

Sicco Mansholt (1908-1995)

A few years ago Mansholt was described by a leading Dutch social democrat as “a legendary pioneer of the PvdA.” Some contemporaries appear to have had a different view. In 1938, when Sicco Mansholt left the Ministry of Agriculture in The Hague for the European Commission in Brussels, Prime Minister Drees and fellow social democrat said: “We are fortunate to have lost him.”

Mansholt, who had served as a minister continuously since 1945, appeared on the threshold of his career. He more than made good on his reputation as a tenacious, reformist, and socially dedicated politician: against all odds, he achieved a common European agricultural policy. His ultimate objective was the political unification of European integration. He was called “Mister Europe,” and his agricultural policy was regarded as the driver of European integration.

Environmental issues became important for Mansholt in the
second half of the 1960s, the final stage of his tenure with the European Commission in Brussels. The 1971 report *Limits to Growth* by Dennis I. Meadows (born 1942) made him aware of the dangers of unbridled production. Mansholt did his utmost to alert the European Commission, but his ideas fell on deaf ears. The next year, in 1972, he retired.

His personal papers were entrusted to the iish back in 1995 and 1996. A section of the archive from the EEC period is in Florence at the Archivi Storici delle Comunità Europee of the Istituto Universitario Europeo. The addition recently received at the iish comprises many scrapbooks filled with clippings and photo albums, as well as a special correspondence with his parents during World War II.

Ernest Mandel (1923–1995)

Although the Fourth International never had a lot of active members, its name enchanted many, as did that of the individual inextricably associated with it: Ernest Mandel. His widow presented the iish with his personal papers. Mandel was a Belgian economist, a non-dogmatic Marxist thinker, and a radical politician. These papers were the main source for the biography that Jan Willem Stutje recently wrote, entitled *Ernest Mandel, rebel tussen droom en daad*; an English translation, *Ernest Mandel (1923-1995): Rebel Caught Between Dream and Deed*, will appear in 2008 with Verso, London.

Stutje was the first to gain access to this impressive archive, which recently became available for research at the iish. Mandel, who was internationally acclaimed as an author and scholar, associated with student leaders, workers, and trade union officials, with fellow militants Rudi Dutschke, Alain Krivine, and Ernesto Che Guevara, with the philosophers Jean Paul Sartre, his “good friend” Ernst Bloch, and with scholars such as Roman Rosdolsky and Perry Anderson. He wrote extensively, taught, and lectured in many languages, organized secret meetings, congresses, debates, and political meetings. He regarded himself as “a Flemish internationalist of Jewish heritage.”

In 1938, soon after his fifteenth birthday, Mandel was admitted to the Parti Socialiste Révolutionnaire, shortly after the conference establishing the Fourth Inter-
national. A Trotskyist, Mandel took his PhD degree in 1972 and, following a lot of complicated procedures, became a professor of social economics at the Free University of Brussels. During this period Mandel lectured in Berlin as well. Soon, however, German Minister of Home Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher, a liberal, barred Mandel from entering Germany, arguing that “Professor Mandel, in addition to singing the scholarly praises of the doctrine of permanent revolution, endeavours to promote it in practice.” Many, including political adversaries such as Sicco Mansholt, rallied to his support. Only in 1978, six and a half years later, was the ban lifted. He was prohibited from other countries as well: France denied him entry from 1968 until 1981, and he was declared a persona non grata in the United States, Switzerland, and Australia. In the summer of 1989, shortly before the fall of the Berlin Wall, he was also turned back as such at the crossing from West to East Berlin.

Mandel, an internationally acclaimed author and scholar – also among liberal economists – was apparently feared by governments and their secret services in East and West alike. His most important theoretical works included Traité d’économie marxiste (1962), translated in English as Marxist economic Theory (1968) and Der Spätkapitalismus [Late Capitalism] (1972).

As a Marxist, scholar, activist, party leader, journalist, and militant pedagogue, Ernest Mandel believed in the revolution. During the May days of 1968, he looked on, “bleary-eyed from teargas,” from atop a barricade to see the scenes of fire and destruction in the streets of Paris. A reporter for The Observer heard him exclaim: “Ah ! Comme c’est beau ! C’est la révolution !” In the May uprising of young people and workers Mandel figured both as a theorist and political analyst and as a direct participant (as previously in Berlin with the student leader Rudi Dutschke), as an agitator in the debate, and in the fighting during “la nuit des barricades.”

Politics and scholarship, however, were not his only passion. Ernest Mandel was an avid reader of thrillers as well. In 1984 he published Delightful Murder: A Social History of Crime Novels. The British publisher Pluto Press prepared a series about Marxists and their hobbies. Mandel refused to write about postage stamps, although he was a keen philatelist and owned a vast collection – “Jewish life insurance” – that had belonged to his father. He did write about a different passion: crime stories. Delightful Murder was the first of its kind.

Letter from S.L. Mansholt to Ernest Mandel, Brussels, 28 January 1973, in which the well-known socialist politician (he had resigned as Chairman of the EEC four weeks previously) writes to the Trotskyist professor: “I will be happy to sign the petition. I regard the refusal of the German government to allow you to enter Germany as an infringement on the ordinary freedoms in a democratic country. I fondly remember the debate with University students in Brussels.” (IISH, Ernest Mandel Archive)
Presentations about
“Local Social Democracy”

Gilles Borrie is one of the original Friends of the 1911. In addition to having served as mayor of several communities, including Eindhoven, this leading social democrat has become known as a competent scholar. His thesis advisor was Fris de Jong Edza, a former director of the 1911, and he specialized – of course – in scholarly biographies of local pioneers among local Dutch social democrats. His fine collection on this subject, which he has donated to the 1911, has motivated the theme for this Friends’ Day. Two lectures were delivered, followed by a discussion. Summaries of these lectures appear below. Friends and others were invited to partake in refreshments and to view the exhibition about a Century of Social-democratic City Politics in the Netherlands (1907-2007), organized by Frank de Jong and Michel Jizersmans, as well as of course Gilles Borrie. Most specimens came from Borrie’s collection now donated to the 1911. Much of the material consisted of items that Borrie had gathered in the course of his research on Wibaut, Rodrigues de Miranda, and P.L. Tak.

A CENTURY OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CITY POLITICS (1907-2007)

Lecture by Gilles Borrie

Soon after the SDAP was established in 1894, it became clear that the party’s members intended to be active on city councils. Set up as parliamentary campaigns, the city council elections offered the new party a wonderful publicity opportunity and a chance to maximize its influence on city councils to realize its ideals.

Two individuals drove the establishment and rise of social-democratic municipal politics: Pieter Lodewijk Tak (1848-1907) and Florentinus Marinus Wibaut (1859-1936). The Fabian Society in England propagated the idea that municipal authorities could be important in organizing collective services, while in the Netherlands people counted on the actions of progressive radical-liberals on the Amsterdam city council.

Under the aegis of Tak and Wibaut a system was soon devised that for years formed the backbone of socialist municipal politics. In 1899, for example, the first municipal program was formulated, a principle and programmatic municipal policy. Two years later the Vereeniging van Sociaal-democratische Gemeenteraadsleden [Association of social-democratic city council members] was formed, with an information desk to advise council members, and in 1907 the monthly De Gemeente [The municipality] was launched. These activities did much to inform and help crystallize socialist municipal politics.

While the first time that SDAP members stood for the city council, 11 were elected, their number increased to 100 in 1907, and the periodical De Gemeente [The municipality] had 325 subscribers. Thanks to programmed and carefully organized actions, the SDAP managed to propagate a single line throughout the different city councils, and party politics became firmly enshrined in these bodies for the first time. Social-democratic city council members thus developed into a force in municipal politics that became a major factor behind the success of the SDAP in its endeavours. Over the years the other political parties became increasingly interested in municipal politics as well. Especially during the interbellum, political interest in municipal entities grew, and social efforts became more prominent, with municipalities progressively being regarded as responsible for regulating socioeconomic and cultural activities.

During the interbellum SDAP municipal politics often commanded far greater esteem than the party’s actions in national politics, although this was of course attributable in part to its status as an opposition party. Highly respected SDAP politicians were remarkably prominent in municipal politics, although of course they served in parliament as well.

This was the case in the early years of the party, as well as in the 1920s and 30s: such individuals included De Miranda, Drees, Albarda, Boekman, Reinalda, and others. The SDAP achieved its greatest victories in municipal politics.

In the aftermath of World War II, social-democratic achievements in municipalities continued, elaborating on the pre-war successes in public administration. The first municipal programme of the Partij van de Arbeid [social-democratic party], entitled De Grote Inzet [The big commitment] highlighted two objectives: rebuilding the devastated cities and villages and introducing a thorough change in mindset by pursuing community spirit. In ’t Veld was especially influential in the programme. In 1946, as minister of restoration and housing, both nationally and in conjunction with the municipalities, he was responsible for new types of housing and spatial planning. Housing once again received special consideration within the party, as it had in the early years under Wibaut and De Miranda. Schaefer in Amsterdam, for example, is reminiscent of these leaders.

I will not dwell on this period but rather conclude by reviewing recent decades and focusing on the 1980s and 90s. While the 1980s were a heyday for social democracy in city politics, they were followed by “the party’s flight to national politics”, i.e. the “purple coalition” [comprising major parties from left and right alike] This idea
was driven by the diehard illusion that “true politics” could be practised only at the national level,” as the prominent party member Joop van den Berg, who served in the Dutch Senate and was the chairman of the board of the VNG (association of Dutch communities) and the director of the Wiardi Beckmanstichting (WBS) research foundation, stated in his ninth Wibaut lecture in 2004. Van den Berg continued: “did you ever notice how few of the stated … aldermen and delegates made it into parliament in The Hague, let alone became ministers or state secretaries? This even though the course of history has made clear that the strength of social democracy … rises and falls according to its position in city councils.”

In summary, the PvdA invested too little in local politics – the national government in The Hague was its main concern – local officials were treated as inferiors; these words were spoken at the Wibaut lecture, delivered three years ago at the centre for local government in Utrecht. Several of those here this afternoon attended that gathering as well and will have stood behind these words.

Some of this gloom has lifted in recent years. In the current PvdA parliamentary party, two former aldermen of a major city serve on the council of ministers, one as a minister and the other as state secretary of Home Affairs, and augur a powerful progressive voice.

A gathering such as this one, which revolves around the periodical De Gemeente and Wibaut and Tak, is an appropriate occasion to speak out in support of the great significance of social-democratic city politics. As far as the WBS centre for local government and the editorial board of the periodical Lokaal Bestuur (the successor to the periodical De Gemeente which was introduced a century ago) are concerned, municipalities will receive ample consideration during the years ahead, also in national politics.

Should ministers and state secretaries talk at greater length with municipal officials throughout the country, rather than only with the VNG? It need not take 100 days… And since we are on the premises of the IISH anyway: politicians would benefit from a visit to the IISH to enrich their knowledge of the history of social democracy. Recently, René Couperus of the WBS mentioned a PvdA member of the Dutch House of Representatives who mistakenly thought that P.J. Troelstra was a cough syrup brand!

I will now give the floor to Ed van Thijn. I am delighted that he has agreed to speak about social-democratic city politics this afternoon. He is man of the municipality, with several years of experience in the national government, and knows a great deal about politics in general and the PvdA in particular.

Lecture by Ed van Thijn (former parliamentary leader of the PvdA, former mayor of Amsterdam, and former minister of home affairs)

Wibaut, Tak, De Miranda, Den Uyl, Schaefer. Leading citizens of Amsterdam abounded in the history of local social democracy. They believed that they could shape society and endeavoured to improve the lives of ordinary people. Their initial successes in Amsterdam have informed my own experiences in this field.

PIONEERS

The SDAP pioneers were visionaries. Theirs was not by nature a governing party, and members eschewed the power of capitalist society – in 1914 Troelstra was reprimanded by the Zwolle congress for being invited to serve on a “bourgeois” cabinet. The same hesitation existed toward city politics. The election of the first SDAP alderman in Amsterdam was preceded by a meeting at the Plancius building: an overwhelming majority ultimately adopted a resolution stating that if a fifth alderman were to be entrusted with public housing, “the interest of social-democratic city politics (required) accepting such an appointment.” Amsterdam was not the first city where an SDAP member became an alderman: in 1912 Duys had already accepted this office in Zaandam.

Public housing was an uncharted field. Here, the need was greatest, and the interests of the working class could be served best at municipal levels. Tak indicated that the city council was to be used not only as a propaganda forum but also as a place for achieving specific reforms and improvements for workers. And so it came to pass. Building, living, affordable, and good quality (think of the architect H.P. Berlage), amid pleasant surroundings and responsible urban design. All this figured in Amsterdam’s 1935 General City Expansion Plan. Social engineering was the driving force and main contribution of social democracy. And a red thread in the history of the movement, from Wibaut and De Miranda to Den Uyl and Schaefer.

The first socialist city officials had very little latitude and encountered mistrust and resistance everywhere, even among their own supporters (“I would love to unseat them,” Troelstra once said about the aldermen). They regarded municipal circles as a new frontier for social-democratic politics, without harbouring any illusions that they might win the class struggle locally. They viewed municipal facilities as leverage (material, spiritual, and cultural) for the great masses of the working class. Later, E. Boekman focused on this cultural dimension: Art and People should converge through what Den Uyl later described as the small steps of democratic politics. They were a preliminary version of “the sinful race of reformists,” although – and this is indeed remarkable – Wibaut was one of the most...
militant Dutch Marxists ever. I could spend the rest of my lecture discussing the ups and downs from that era, including food supply and efforts (among others from De Miranda) to eliminate unemployment. But I will not overlook the pre-war downs that are so characteristic of our movement. They are listed below:

* the potato uprising of 1917 as a consequence of the dismal food situation (ten dead and 113 wounded);
* conflicting views within the party about reductions to the salaries of civil servants, mandated by the Dutch government in 1932. The party line was to support it, although three party members opposed it and were forced to resign. This gave rise to Bonger’s book Problemen der Democratie, in which he vigorously defended the basic principle of representative democracy, without any hassle or consultation. “Democracy shall be selectionist or shall not be at all”;
* the defeat in the 1927 Amsterdam local elections, which led to a council without the SDAP (people had “tired of the arrogance”);
* Problems with the uprising in the Jordaan neighbourhood, which spread to all working-class districts (July 1934) and harsh reprisals by the army and the police (leaving six dead and many wounded). The SDAP was caught between a rock and a hard place during this massive police intervention and would be again on several subsequent occasions;
* The anti-Semitic campaign against De Miranda in the daily De Telegraaf, following what was known as the ground lease issue in 1939, the indolence of the mayor and ultimately that of De Miranda’s own party, which did not allow him to publish his self-defence Pro Domo. A dark moment in our party history;
* The same holds true for the silence when Jewish city council members were dismissed by the Nazis (Boekman had committed suicide by then – no compassion whatsoever from their colleagues).

**AFTER THE WAR**

Following World War II a new generation of firm but somewhat less colourful officials emerged. They put education on the agenda, although housing remained the first spearhead. Amsterdam became the Mecca of urban development. Parliamentary party chairman Den Uyl and his cohorts soon published Mens en Stad. Amsterdam vandaag en morgen, unveiling ambitious plans, especially for urban development. The analysis is intriguing: society atomizes, giving rise to mass civilization. This needs to be related once again to community spirit. Good housing is the first requirement. Eliminate the housing shortage and build, build, build. Everything else had to make way, even old neighbourhoods as such. The redevelopment plans levelled entire city districts to provide space for homes and public buildings that served current needs. This was the generation of the powerful Public Works Department, a state within a city. Suburbanization — clustered de-concentration — was a typical response to motorized society and ushered in construction of satellite towns.

Whether the PvdA should participate in the government ceased to be an issue after World War II: the PvdA was the government and became a true governing party. In 1962 I encountered in the Amsterdam city council a top-heavy PvdA faction of seventeen settled citizens, who included a housing association director, an NVV district manager, a notary, a chartered accountant, a general practitioner, the director of Humanitas, a labour inspector, the director of Nature Monuments, a well-known graphic designer, an executive editor of the daily Het Vrije Volk, a former editor-in-chief of the daily Het Parool, and, last but not least, the chancellor of the University of Amsterdam as the party chairman.

That very day Den Uyl became an alderman. He gathered up nearly all relevant portfolios (including Public Property, Public Works, Economic Affairs, and the port from Van Hall) and embarked on an almost megalomaniacal policy. He was literally a groundbreaking socialist, intended to make way for traffic, attracted petrochemical companies, poured “the sand of Joop”, and introduced unprecedented dynamics. That lasted only a year and a half. Then he went to The Hague to join the Cals-Vondeling cabinet. His departure restored the – dull – respectability of the establishment and ushered in several darker events:

* the tumultuous year 1966, when police used excessive force against happenings and Vietnamese demonstrations, the riots connected with The Royal Wedding of Beatrix, and, to top it all, the grim construction workers’ uprising, including the fire near the building of De Telegraaf; when the mayor and police commissioner were unavailable because they were in meetings;
* an unprecedented defeat, first during the Provincial and then during the local elections, resulting in part from the transition, on a national level, from the opposition to the Cals-Vondeling cabinet, without interim elections in between;
* the fall of Mayor Van Hall – his successor Samkalden was the first mayor to be in principal elected by the city council. The PvdA was regarded as a high-handed party that was out of touch with society and was overtaken on both the left and the right by new movements: D’66, the Boerenpartij, Provo, and Nieuw Links within the party itself.

**A NEW TURNDOWN IN THE 1960S**

Large-scale versus small-scale was a major subject of dispute in those days. Should the clustered de-concentration, satellite towns, and major infrastructural projects continue? The first teach-ins were held. Small was beautiful. The new generation had other
ideas: renovation rather than demolition, monument preservation, retention the human scale, input, power for the districts (32 sub-district councils), trams instead of a metro.

Then came the change of generations in 1970. Clashes erupted immediately: not between old and new but within the new. Even in Amsterdam, nothing emerged from this period unscathed: DS’70, a right-wing social democratic split-off party, was established, in part because the communists had joined the college of aldermen:

- the occupation of the Magdenhuis, in which I mediated. Fellow party members were ubiquitous, both among those maintaining order and among those occupying the premises. For Den Uyl this was an inspiration to his “The narrow margins of democratic politics” in which he set the limits to extra-parliamentary action in a democratic rule of law;
- During this period a leftist programme college of aldermen materialized as well. It disintegrated during the Nieuwmarkt riots against the construction of the metro, when Samkalden, Lammers (both PvdA), and Verhey (CIPN) stood their ground;
- The PvdA was deeply divided;
- The rise of the increasingly violent squatters’ movement, with which PvdA supporters sympathized for far too long.

**Introducing Jan Schaefer (1978)**

When Jan Schaefer entered office as alderman, the Etty/Van der Vlis generation had already proved its merits. Their major achievement was the compact urban philosophy. The city had been restored to its former glory, and the division between working and living had been eliminated. Districts and neighbourhoods had become paramount. Construction was focused on neighbourhoods and on decentralization inside the city limits. Then Jan Schaefer (as a reincarnation of Wibaut?) transcended this with his zealous urban renewal efforts as a long-standing and popular state secretary for urban renewal. A major turning point: the city was once again imbued with social democracy. Wim Polak restructured the finances, first from Amsterdam, then from the national government in The Hague, and then once again from the city.

But nothing is ever perfect. On the one hand, construction was focused on neighbourhoods, the compact city, more extensive distribution of authority, decentralization, and power to the newly organized city districts (with decentralization within the city as the new doctrine), but on the other hand the new school of aldermen also comprised builders, doers, and eventually a new style of regents. The term aldermen’s socialism came into use. While it had been an honorary designation in Wibaut’s day, it now denoted aversion. Etty was referred to as Brezhnev on the Amstel in the NRC newspaper. The consequence was an unprecedented electoral defeat, followed by a wave of socialist-democratic modesty.

**Late 1980s: The PvdA is Obliterated**

Even amid the modesty, the enthusiasm persisted, especially in construction. Louis Genet, the new alderman for construction, wielded little authority as the local PvdA captain. Nevertheless, his urban development legacy is formidable: Amsterdam New East is impressive and reflects the spirit of illustrious predecessors. He is the most underestimated in the series of aldermen, with Duco Stadig as a worthy successor. But there was a catch to this generation as well: the importance of spatial planning as a steering instrument. The old conflict of Spatial Planning versus Economic Affairs was back: socialist aldermen fighting a turf war over portfolio interests. And Economic Affairs was the victor. This would probably not have happened under Wibaut, although it would under Den Uyl, as he was an Economic Affairs man par excellence.

**New Generations: Social Democracy Back in Town**

Asscher and Aboutaleb (already gone as this goes to press) have replaced the old guard. As victors in the 2006 elections (in all districts), they are a response to turbulent times and debates about the multi-cultural society. Morocco-born Aboutaleb in particular did extremely well following the cowardly murder of Theo van Gogh, when calm miraculously prevailed in Amsterdam’s neighbourhoods. At the tenth Wibaut lecture he expressed confidence in social democracy and social stability as a symbiotic unit.

I believe that the neighbourhood focus in Amsterdam, including the city district councils, as well as the de-concentrated police with its district teams and neighbourhood managers, was a major factor. In my view, however, decentralization within the city has gone too far, and the central city should be more of a directive democracy and social stability as well. Moroccans are extremely well following the cowards’ example.

Unfortunately, globalization is a strike against them. International violence in the financial sector (the wave of mergers and takeovers) may prevent the Zuidas office development from materializing. A wealth of alderman’s socialism will be needed to perpetuate the belief of our illustrious forebears that they could shape society and defend their legacy consisting of their successful districts. As well as a new awareness that local politics, especially for social democrats, is a precious commodity, both as a breeding ground for outstanding municipal officials such as Drees and Den Uyl and as a source of inspiration for our ideology.

**Two Concluding Observations**

Every generation has its own cycle and undergoes spiritual changes over time, often in fits and starts. As a consequence, officials who are...
The island-like nature of Amsterdam, these jolts often cause unrest and upheaval. Wibaut was caught by surprise by the Jordan uprising. Van Hall and his aldermen by the massive unrest in the 1960s, which started so innocuously with the Provo happenings but culminated in the construction workers’ uprising and the fire near the building of De Telegraaf. Samkalden/Lammers ran into trouble because of the Nieuwmarkt riots. The Schaefer/Polak generation was confronted with violent squatters’ riots, including during the Coronation. Until then, the police force was unpopular among leftists, including the PvdA. This changed in the 1980s, when other problems arose: drugs (the Zeedijk had become a place of ill repute), public disturbances, petty crime, and later organized crime. Neighbourhood residents demanded a police presence. The turning point was the arrival of the first constabulary district team in the Nieuwmarkt neighbourhood of all places, followed by one in the Staatslieden neighbourhood. From that point onward, a stronger police presence became a leftist cause. I believed long before the rest of our party did that safety was automatically a leftist issue. If we want a tolerant society, we will need to work hard to make people feel safe. Frightened people are not tolerant. Nor will frightened people vote for the left. Safety and social stability, to echo Aboutaleb, are cornerstones of social-democratic policy.

This certainly holds true for a society that has undergone so much demographic change since Wibaut’s day. We might as well start from scratch. What has not changed is the quality of our residential surroundings. Past tradition is being continued: many of our neighbourhoods are wonderful sanctuaries of working-class housing. And what about the people? Wibaut and his cohorts regarded social-democratic municipal politics as a vehicle toward social improvement in material, spiritual, and cultural respects. This vehicle needed to be re-invented. We want wonderful people to live in our wonderful neighbourhoods, people who will see and seize the opportunities of the big city. Emancipation, acculturation, integration: if these processes do not work locally, they will not work anywhere else either. Social democracy, once again, as the cradle of social stability without disadvantage or under-privilege of population groups. Our mission is to serve as an emancipation movement, starting at the local level. It has been for about a century.

---

**Report of the General Friends’ Meeting, 21 June 2007**

At the brief general meeting following the presentation of *On the Waterfront* 14 – the financial report in that same issue (p. 15) was addressed, as well as the desire of the Friends to launch a separate ANBI (Algemeen Nut Beogende Instelling, meaning “serving a general purpose”) foundation. Under Dutch law, this would offer major tax benefits for Friends interested in making donations. If all goes as planned, we hope to launch such a foundation in 2008. Although the number of Friends has remained relatively stable, we have received an interesting special donation from the Zuster Marten Nijhuis Stichting in Amsterdam worth 7,000 euros. At the end of the year we will reassess the finances and number of Friends.

As for the major research projects supported by the Friends, the first book has resulted from the Women’s Work in the Dutch Republic project. On 30 March 2007 at the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam Elise van Nederveen Meerkerk defended her PhD thesis *De Draad in eigen handen. Vrouwen en loonarbeid in de Nederlandse textielnijverheid 1581-1810* [Holding the thread in her hands. Women and wage labour in the Dutch textile industry, 1581-1810]. This book (issued by our publisher Aksant) explains changes in women’s participation in the pre-industrial labour market and the gendered division of work by investigating developments in the textile industry of the Dutch Republic, most notably in spinning and weaving of wool and flax. Elise concludes that economic fluctuations and related labour market developments deeply influenced female labour participation and gender divisions of labour. This history shows that female labour participation figures are very dynamic indeed and definitely not static or linear in their development.

The next and sixteenth Friends’ meeting will take place on Thursday, 24 January 2008, when Eef Vermeij, our man in Bangkok, will describe his experiences over the years collecting for the Institute in South and Southeast Asia.
Jelle van Lottum  
**Across the North Sea**  
The impact of the Dutch Republic on international labour migration, c. 1550-1850  
ISBN 978 90 5260 278 3, 253 PAGINA’S, GEBONDEN € 27,50

Daily life in the early modern North Sea region was largely subject to international forces. International developments like wars, trade and changing religion trickled through all layers of society, and almost everyone enjoyed or suffered from the consequences. People, however, also came in direct contact with the outer world: they moved to another country, and did so in great numbers. The centre of attention for most international migrants from the North Sea region was the Dutch Republic. From 1550 to 1800 this small confederation of provinces attracted hundreds of thousands of foreigners to work in its industries, in its households and on board of its ships. This book is about the impact of the Dutch Republic on the geographical mobility of the people in the surrounding countries. Jelle van Lottum deals with the underlying demographic framework of the migrations, with the changes that occurred in the receiving labour market, and will make a comparison with the other labour-attracting core on the other side of the Channel, England. He arrives at the fascinating conclusion that the early modern migrations in North Western Europe shared many similarities to the better studied migrations of the industrial era.

Danielle van den Heuvel  
**Women and entrepreneurship**  
Female traders in the Northern Netherlands c. 1580-1815  
ISBN 978 90 5260 277 6, 334 PAGINA’S, GEBONDEN, GEILLUSTRERD, € 29,90

The many travellers who visited the Dutch Republic praised them: the heroic Dutch tradeswomen. In contrast to women in the surrounding countries, in the early modern period Dutch women were enterprising, independent and capable traders. In Women and entrepreneurship they form the topic of investigation. Danielle van den Heuvel examines the role women played in trade in the Northern Netherlands. She looks at three forms of commercial enterprise in particular: street selling and stallholding, shopkeeping and international commerce. She uses evidence of female entrepreneurship originating from sources in several urban and rural areas of the country, which allows her to portray the various activities tradeswomen undertook, but also to elaborate on the differences between male and female entrepreneurs, and the reasons for the high shares of women involved in the sector. Her conclusions are surprising. Commerce was not always as accessible for women. The institutional framework and the way in which a trade was organised were crucial to its accessibility for women. Moreover, Van den Heuvel’s work shows that it was not the Dutch Golden Age, but rather the subsequent century which provided a favourable climate for female entrepreneurship. With this conclusion, the author also makes a significant contribution to the debates on the effect of economic trends on female labour participation in the past.

Vibeke Kingma & Marco H.D. van Leeuwen (red.)  
**Filantropie in Nederland**  
Voorbeelden uit de periode 1770-2020  
ISBN 978 90 5260 271 4, 219 PAGINA’S, GEBONDEN, GEILLUSTRERD, € 19,90

Open het Dorp, het allereerste Nederlandse museum, Zending in Egypte, de tsunami actie en soepkeukens in Zeeland. Het is slechts een greep uit het brede spectrum van filantropische activiteiten in het moderne Nederland. Waaraan Nederlanders geven en gaven, en waarom; hoe filantropische fondsen werken en wat de bestaansgrond is van de Goede Doelen; waarom bedrijven geven en hoe er in verschillende periodes over filantropie gedacht werd. Het komt in deze bundel allemaal aan bod. De geschiedenis van de filantropie in Nederland in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw staat nog in de kinderschoenen. Dit boek vormt een aanzet tot het schrijven van die geschiedenis. Het geeft inzicht in de kunst van het geven tussen 1770 en 2020.