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Introduction

This is the first issue of On the Waterfront edited by Jaap Kloosterman and Jan Lucassen after the retirement of one of its founders, Mieke IJzermans. We hope to maintain the quality of her contributions and above all that Mieke and our other readers will enjoy this and the following issues as much as the previous ones. For the second time we welcome a contribution by Rena Fuks-Mansfeld (see On the Waterfront 11, 2005, p. 3) for our column “From all nooks and corners”.

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 euros or more. In return, members are invited to semi-annual sessions featuring presentations of IISH acquisitions and by 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 (1880-1960) in the 1930s. For the past two decades, two of the institutes established by this “history entrepreneur” have operated from the same premises: the NEHA (Netherlands Economic History Archive) since 1914 and the International Institute of Social History (IISH), which is now 74 years old. Both institutes continue to collect, although the “subsidiary” IISH has grown far larger than the “parent” NEHA. (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 Tracking 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, see http://www.iisg.nl/friends/ .
Founded in 1905, the Anarchist Red Cross was an international relief organization dedicated to aiding anarchist prisoners in Tsarist Russia. In the United States, branches were opened in New York and Chicago, in 1907 and 1909, respectively. Boris Yelensky (1889-1974), an anarchist refugee from Russia, started working for the Chicago branch in 1913 and became its secretary in 1924. At the time, the organization was called the Russian Political Relief Committee, but it was soon renamed the Chicago Relief Fund. In 1936, after the death of the well-known anarchist leader Alexander Berkman, the name of the organization was changed again, this time to the Alexander Berkman Aid Fund. The Fund helped anarchists in need all over the world but focused on Spanish refugees during and after the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939).

During World War II, as contact with the comrades in Europe was lost, the Fund aided comrades in Central and South America. In 1944, after France and Italy were liberated, the Fund tried to contact old comrades and send money and food parcels. After Germany capitulated in 1945, this aid was extended to Germany, where survivors of the Nazi death camps and fugitives from Eastern Europe (Displaced Persons, as they were then called) waited in camps until they found a new country where they could rebuild their lives.

After Japan capitulated in 1945, contacts were established with a small group of Japanese anarchists in Osaka that had survived the war and tried to organize. This group received help from the Alexander Berkman Aid Fund, and the Japanese secretary of the new group drew Yelensky’s attention to the plight of the thousands of Korean labourers forced to keep Japan’s war industry going during World War II. Most were unable to return to their homeland because of the war in progress there and the ensuing division into two separate states, in which anarchists had no place.

The Fund sent money and food parcels to several Korean anarchists in Japan and received a very moving letter of thanks, written in English and signed by two of the recipients. The long letter relates the history of the Korean movement, from the Japanese occupation in 1910 until 1945, a moving account of a hitherto virtually unknown branch of international anarchism.

The letter can be found in the vast archives of the Alexander Berkman Aid Fund, part of the Boris Yelensky papers, entrusted to the NEHA in 1973 and currently in the process of being inventoried.

Contributions about new acquisitions

Craft guilds

One of the larger NEHA databases is about Dutch craft guilds. For over 13 years Piet Lourens and Jan Lucassen have been building a file on all craft guilds that ever existed on the territory of what is now the Netherlands: no fewer than 2,000 between ca. 1200 and 1800. They have published extensively from this database as well. The sources used for the database are obviously the archives of the guilds and of the municipal authorities that recognized them officially, thereby enabling their local monopoly in the economic industry where they operated. Such sources are not ordinarily kept at the Institute, although the NEHA collections comprise important printed city descriptions and collections of placards from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries, as well as some individual documents relating to the guilds.

Most of the documents found outside the actual guild archives are membership certificates. Some members were issued booklets of regulations (we have two copies of those) and some a separate diploma as well (of which we had three until now). Not all guilds were large enough or had the financial means to justify or afford this type of printed matter. Recently, two such documents were offered for sale, and the NEHA is fortunate to have purchased them.

The first is a printed list of the vintners’ guild of Delft and Delfshaven from 1772. This guild was mentioned first in 1615 and definitively disappeared two centuries later in 1811. In addition to...
Two days later he received his membership certificate from the hide merchants’ guild. The other information we have about him concerns his — probably second — marriage, from which a daughter was born, who died in Amsterdam in 1870.

Pauline Perdrix

Among many treasures from eighteenth-century French intellectual history, the Institute holds a nice collection of writings by Sylvain Maréchal (1750-1803), chiefly from the library of Max Nettlau acquired in 1935. Maréchal was a poet and for a number of years assistant librarian at the Mazarine, the oldest public library of France. An avowed atheist, he spent four months in prison for his Almanach des Honnêtes Gens (1788), in which he substituted the names of people he admired for the saints who used to grace the calendar. Afterwards, he published only anonymously.

In 1796, Maréchal took part in the movement of Gracchus Babeuf against the Directory that became known as the Conspiracy of Equals. His outline of its programme, the Manifeste des Égaux, was considered too radical even by the participants. After the failure of the conspiracy, he somehow evaded arrest and in 1799 published six remarkable volu-

the printed names of 26 vintners, 11 vinegar wholesalers, and no fewer than 26 distillers (mainly in Delfshaven), the list features hand-drawn trademarks used for branding their vessels. These enabled municipal inspectors to ensure that vintner’s vessels were used only for this type of contents and not for oil, butter, or the like. This was among the factors guaranteeing the reputation of the city’s products.

The certificate of membership we obtained was from the Amsterdam hide merchants’ tanners’ and shoemakers’ guild, which existed from 1468 until 1811. Thus far we had such membership certificates from only three guilds in our collections and are delighted to add this lovely fourth specimen. Especially since when combined with other small documents, this one tells us more about the guild member concerned. The certificate is for Henri le Grand, who came to Amsterdam from Ulm in Germany as one of countless immigrants in search of a better future. To join the guild, he had to become a citizen of Amsterdam first. On 1 December 1778 he paid his citizenship dues and took the oath. Two days later he received
In 1898 in Germany postcards were issued to commemorate the 1848 uprising. The leaders depicted here are (left) Friedrich Hecker (1831-1881) and (right) Gustav von Strube (1805-1870), the heroes of the armed uprising in Baden, from which various scenes from 1848-1849 in Freiburg, Mannheim, and Rastatt are depicted (Verlag Max Warneburg, Frankfurt a/M no. 376; IISH, B&G 462/345).

Picture postcards of Germany, Russia, Czechoslovakia

The majority of the Institute’s archives and other primary sources are acquired as donations or on standing loan. Only a small share is purchased and a still smaller one obtained through exchanges. One such exchange has resulted in the collection of political picture postcards offered to Huub Sanders by the owner of an antiquarian bookshop in Berlin. Although the price was high, the antiquarian turned out to be interested in several of our duplicate posters. The outcome was a wonderful exchange, especially because hardly any of the hundreds of picture postcards thus obtained from the period 1898-1946 was present in our collections yet. While most are from Germany and Russia, a few are from Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. The oldest German postcard was issued to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the 1848 uprising. Subsequent postcards feature the socialist view of agricultural work, crafts, and Factory labour and commemorations of party congresses, singing contests, and May Day celebrations. The 1919 uprisings are featured at length, photographed from various ideological perspectives. There are also sports photographs from the 1920s of social democrats at mass demonstrations in formats that could easily be mistaken for those a decade later. As for the Allied side, the lot included an entire series of Hitler caricature cards.

The Russian cards start immediately after the Civil War and, in
addition to featuring Lenin and Trotsky together and Lenin alone, highlight Father Stalin, as well as workers of all shapes and sizes engaged in sports. Other specimens address the – Great Patriotic – War.

**The 1930s Haarlem lecture circuit**

The first term that comes to mind to describe Dutch society between 1870 and 1970 is pil- larization, indicating that most inhabitants subscribed entirely to a single ideological and political current. This meant, for example, that socialists would join the SDAP, as well as a trade union affiliated with the NVV, listen to radio broadcasts by the VARA, and even shop at socialist bakers and butchers, if any were available. The same held true for Catholics and various Protestant denominations. All organizations pertaining to a certain ideological or political branch were closely connected at the top, and the leaders of the respective pillars would in turn discuss national affairs. Some would of course start in one pillar and end up in another. Examples abound. Both in the Netherlands and in other countries, plenty of individuals are known to have progressed from far left to far right-wing views. Few explained all the different ideologies on offer at the same time. Recently, however, at an auction we purchased a large notebook filled with notes and a few letters folded into it conveying all these different ide- ologies (Archives ‘Nederlandse Kleine Archieven, Personen’ 176). The notebook belonged to E.J.D. de Munck, who lived in Haarlem, an old city in the West of the Netherlands. We know very little about the man, except that he died in 954, and that he lived in Haarlem in the mid-90s and before that – in any case in 90 – in The Hague. Back then he maintained a very amicable corre- spondence with Willem Hendrik Haighton (born in 1907 and an
aficionado of Mussolini’s Blackshirts). A few years later, however, he was searching. According to his notebook, he attended one or more public meetings a week of political and social movements between 23 February 1935 and 6 November 1936. He reported in detail on the debates conducted there and in most cases included an admission slip, an announcement, or a newspaper report. This is the incarnation of civil society and perhaps of basic democracy as well (very suspicious minds might even wonder whether the notebook was kept by a spy from the domestic security services, but in our view this interpretation is overly imaginative).

De Munck’s interests covered a very broad horizon indeed. We encounter libertarian socialists, freethinkers, liberals, all varieties of Marxists, theosophists, Bellamy supporters, and people debating about questions such as ‘does God truly exist, or is He merely an illusion?’ or ‘do we need to change our financial system?’ (by the Dutch Douglas Gemeenschapscrediet Beweging) or ‘Lenin and Christ. Are there religious objections to Dutch socialism?’ (by the Dutch Douglas Gemeenschapscrediet Beweging). De Munck’s interests covered a very broad horizon indeed. We encounter libertarian socialists, freethinkers, liberals, all varieties of Marxists, theosophists, Bellamy supporters, and people debating about questions such as ‘does God truly exist, or is He merely an illusion?’ or ‘do we need to change our financial system?’ (by the Dutch Douglas Gemeenschapscrediet Beweging) or ‘Lenin and Christ. Are there religious objections to Dutch socialism?’ (by the Dutch Douglas Gemeenschapscrediet Beweging).

De Munck, in his zealous pursuit of the truth, travelled to lectures in other cities, such as Amsterdam, an easy train ride away. While some of these movements are clearly international, others are local associations and political parties from Haarlem, such as the Kleinfabrikanten [small manufacturers] or the Eenheids-bloc van Arbeiders en Kleine Middenstanders [United front of workers and small businessmen].

Modern media appear as well: the entry for 10 July reads ‘Important speech! Room half full, despite the heat about ‘what everyone should know about Indonesia,’ featuring a motion picture. Sometimes De Munck, in his zealous pursuit of the truth, travelled to lectures in other cities, such as Amsterdam, an easy train ride away.

In addition to De Munck’s own ecumenical disposition, several of the gatherings he attended were structured that way, for example the one on 3 February 1937, where the following persons described their observations in Soviet Russia: a Dutch-Reformed preacher, a Roman Catholic worker from Breda, and a politically unaffiliated worker from Wieringen.

Finally, not all the events our diligent reporter attended were intellectual, as confirmed by the admission ticket to the six-day cycling competition at the RAI in Amsterdam in March/April 1937.

Albert Einstein (1879-1955) Seventy-five years of systematic collecting not only brings together many collections on persons and institutions important in social history but also ‘condenses’ material from persons or institutions whose actual archive has been lost or ended up elsewhere. Albert Einstein exemplifies this process.

At the orientation visit of Robert Dijkgraaf, the new president of the KNAW, on 7 July 2008, we wanted to present a few of Einstein’s letters. After all, Dijkgraaf is a well-known physicist. To our amazement, our search in the different collections yielded not only dozens of letters and manifestos but also an unpublished lecture, an unpublished preface, and several visual discoveries.

How did these Einstein memorabilia end up here, without the 11th ever deliberately collecting them? The reason is simple. Even before the start of his tempestuous scientific career, Einstein was quite outspoken about social issues. He never joined a political party, as he feared losing his independence. Still, his stands on political issues definitely placed him at the left of the political spectrum. From the start of World War I, he was an avowed and principled pacifist – to the intense displeasure of his fellow academy members – and in Mein Weltbild (1934) he unabashedly stated: ‘I consider social class distinctions to be unjustified and of late based on violence.’

The collection of Einstein memorabilia at the KNH runs from about 1919 until 1947. In a letter dated 19 November 1920 to an admiring Minna Cauer, he shares the following kind and laconic observation: ‘I am aware that as a person and a spirit I fall considerably short of the image that you project of me. But what difference does it make? Some people are destined to embody the illusions of others, and strangely enough I have become one of them. As long as one acknowledges this situation, no harm is done.’ That he was indeed capable of this is apparent from his ability to admire others. On 19 February 1925, for example, he wrote the famous social democrat Eduard Bernstein: ‘so few have consistently been faithful to the common good, even when it was bitter and thankless. Still fewer have taken it for granted and done so with such modesty as you,’ followed on 7 November 1926 by: ‘It would take a powerful Diogenes lantern to find a second person who is as good.’

The most substantial portion of the Einstein memorabilia is presumably the rendition of a lecture, including the debate, about the causality concept, which the famous scholar delivered to the Marxistische Arbeiter Schule (m.a.s. / masch) in Berlin on 14 November 1930. Horrified at the rapid rise of National Socialism, he sympathized in the early 1930s with the communists who had founded this school. One of those present, Karl Korsch, even though he had resigned from the KPD in 1923, still attended such lectures open to the general public. In 15 typed pages he provided an account of the lecture, continuously interrupted by questions, which Einstein appears to have willingly answered.

He responded to one of those questions from the lion’s den: ‘Marxists […] attribute excessive significance to external causes. For example, Marxists like to say that the invention of machines is a consequence of external circumstances, such as a country’s sparse population, labour shortages, etc. But the opposite is equally true. Later in the lecture, ‘a leading member of the M.A.S. revisits this topic by stating ‘that legitimacy in the rise of human civilization tends to reflect a statistical pattern, and that accordingly the more recent developments in physics are no cause for questioning causality as the foundation of communist policy.’
Although Einstein expressed agreement, he could not help but add: ‘These subtleties [i.e. the current kpd policy] are in no way indicative of the legal necessity of human history. This is entirely independent of whether the latest laws of nature are statistical or strictly causal.’ Korsch’s report does not reveal whether this response satisfied all those present.

As far as the history of social movements is concerned, Einstein is of course known primarily for his dedication to the peace movement. Remarkably, on 10 July 1932 he and the Dutch Reverend J.B. Th. Hugenholtz (1888-1973) signed a Protokoll for setting up a radical-pacifist International Peace House, a plan that was never carried out because of Einstein’s flight from the Nazis to Belgium and later to the United States.

Ernest Mandel turns 25

The papers of the Belgian Marxist Ernest Mandel (1923-1995) were entrusted to the iiis by his widow in 1996. While these papers were already voluminous, spanning some 20 linear meters, at the beginning of 2008 the Institute received an accrual of another meter, stored in an old iron box. Since the early 1950s, this box had been kept by Georges Dobbeleer, a Trotskyist who played an important role in the publication of the well-known Open Letter to the Party by Karol Modzelewski and Jacek Kuron in 1963. The box contained typewritten documents and largely internal publications by the Fourth International, as well as a considerable share of Mandel’s correspondence, both with the movement’s leaders such as Michel Pablo and Livio Maitan and of a more private nature. Most letters are from 1946-1948.

The very existence of the box is interesting. After the start of hostilities in Korea, some Trotskyists
believed that World War III was imminent. This placed them in an unenviable predicament, as the two protagonists, the capitalist West and the Stalinist Soviet Union, appeared to agree on one thing only – both felt a mortal aversion to revolutionary Marxism, which was thus in a desperately vulnerable position. In addition to several political dilemmas, this analysis thus clearly indicated some very concrete dangers. As a precaution, Mandel put his papers in a box, which he then made disappear.

The characterization of the Soviet Union had been the subject of acrimonious debate at the Fourth International’s Second World Congress, which took place in Paris from 2 to 21 April 1948. During that conference – on April 5 – Mandel turned 25. His parents had mixed feelings about his presence in Paris, as illustrated by a letter that his father, who was both politically interested and socially active, wrote to his son that very day. ‘Dearest Ernest,’ his letter opens, ‘We would have liked so much to have you at home today to embrace you on your twenty-fifth birthday! Alas! There is nothing we can do about it, since you consider our love less important than your effort to bring to other people, who care little or nothing for you, a happiness they may not even want...’ (“Lieve Ernest, Wij hadden zoó graag gezien, dat je heden thuis waart om je op je vijf en twintigste verjaardag te kunnen omhelzen! Maar er is belaas niets aan te doen, vermits je ook onze liefde minder belangrijk acht dan je activiteit om andere mensen, die weinig of niets vooral voor je voelen, gelukkig te maken, wellicht tegen wil en dank...”) ❍

forty years ago

The Institute has an extended tradition of ‘correspondents’. Even before WW II the IISH had a branch office in Paris and was fortunate to attract several outstanding scholars and connoisseurs who assisted in systematically building the collection of important documents in Europe. After the war, Georg Scheuer, an Austrian-born revolutionary Marxist, and Willem Frijhoff, now a famous historian, spent some time collecting documents in Paris. Frijhoff in particular added substantially to the documentation on May 1968, which has of course been expanded since. Not long ago we received another supplement, consisting of a small collection of documents from Hepzibah Kousbroek.

In May 1968 the daughter of Rudy Kousbroek and Ethel Portnoy, two Dutch authors who lived in Paris for decades, was a 14-year old pupil at the Lycée Molière, then open to girls only. She immersed herself in the movement, which affected not just factories and universities but also schools, and participated in the Comités d’Action Lycéens. The material she donated dates from those days and comprises leaflets, ephemeral magazines, press clippings, and the like, including an interesting 3-page list of the many slogans written on the walls of the Sorbonne.

eugenics in holland

Pieter Koenders, the author of Tussen christelijk réveil en seksuele revolutie on the struggle against immorality in the Netherlands from 1900 to 1958, donated some of the documents left by Arie Bouman (1911-1999), who figures prominently in his book. In addition to being an expert on church organs, Bouman was deeply concerned about the Dutch population’s moral health. Indeed, according to Koenders, ‘Much of the post-war agitation over moral decay derives from the activities of Bouman, who laid his plans during the [Nazi] occupation.’ Bouman was prominent in the Middernachtszending (Midnight Mission) – an organization dedicated to eliminating prostitution – and the Nationaal Comité van Instellingen voor Zedelijke Volksgezondheid (National Committee of Institutions for Moral Public Health). The Institute already held part of the Committee’s records, documenting efforts to combat trafficking in women from the late nineteenth century onward.

Bouman’s papers also contained the records of the Vereeniging Geneeskundig Onderzoek vóór het Huwelijk (Association for Medical Examinations before Marriage). This organization belonged to the eugenics movement, and its archive, though incomplete, is an interesting discovery, as Jan Noordman, the historian of eugenics in the Netherlands, has noted that hardly any archival documents remain.

Ever since the infamous Nazi sterilization programmes, eugenics inspires almost universally negative associations. Yet when Darwin’s cousin Francis Galton coined the term in the 1880s, eugenics appeared to be readily accepted by the many contemporary reform movements that optimistically set out to improve mankind, from theosophy to neo-Malthusianism and from vegetarianism to teetotalism. Moreover, the Netherlands never experienced the kind of eugenic fervour seen in the United States, Sweden, or Germany; those interested in problems of heredity in the Netherlands mostly pursued a more moderate approach. They included a number of prominent women such as Tine Tammes, who held the first Dutch chair of genetics; the biologist Mari...
Anne van Herwerden, one of the most outspoken propagandists of the movement; and the feminist Welmoet Wijnaendts Francken-Dyserlinck, whose husband was deeply involved as well. Some of their work was practical, such as the free medical examinations offered to prospective couples by Bernard Premsela, a general practitioner and sexologist in Amsterdam.

Preventing hereditary illness was a major aim of the Association. They pursued this objective mainly through educational and political measures, which they endeavoured to secure through legislation. Members tried to have enlightening articles published in the press that catered to engaged couples, such as the magazine reproduced here, and to persuade municipalities to distribute similarly enlightening brochures to applicants for marriage licenses. Yet although the authorities were often sympathetic, they resisted legal steps and refused to accept the brochures. Dutchmen were suspicious of state interference in family life and preferred to leave responsibility for children, including those not yet conceived, exclusively with their parents.

Asian socialists
The Institute’s branch office in Bangkok functions as a hub for much of Asia. Originally focusing on Burma, Bangladesh, and Pakistan, it later extended its activities to include Hong Kong, Malaysia, Nepal, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka (see Eef Vermeij’s lecture, On the Waterfront, 6, 008, pp. 0-). This brought it in contact with a number of political parties, some of which decided to entrust part of their records (whether duplicates or originals) to the Institute in Amsterdam.

One of them is the Parti Sosialis Malaysia, founded in 1998 but formally recognized by the government only in June 2008, although it participated in several earlier election campaigns and won its first parliamentary seat in March 2008. The psm is not the only socialist party in the country – Malaysia has in fact been represented in the Socialist International by the Parti Tindakan Demokratik (Democratic Action Party) since 1967 – but it evolved gradually from a number of smaller groups after the Parti Sosialis Rakyat Malaysia (Socialist People’s Party) dropped the word ‘socialist’ from its name in 1990. The records now at the iish date back to the precursors to the party and the days of the Socialist Popular Front (1996-1998). They include a set of conference minutes and documents from the beginning up to the present, although access to them remains restricted.

Another example is the Nava Sama Samaja Party (New Social Equality Party) of Sri Lanka, founded in 1977 after internal debates had split the country’s Trotskyite movement. The nssp is now the Sri Lankan section of the reunited Fourth International. Its documents at the iish relate chiefly to election campaigns from 1985 to 2008. Since 1998, the nssp has contested elections as a member of the New Left Front coalition, which has chosen a table as its symbol.
Lecture by
Jan Lucassen and Jaap Kloosterman
on censorship

The topic of this lecture has been selected in recognition of Amsterdam’s designation as world book city (from 22 April 2008 through 22 April 2009). The iish, which has the third-largest library in the city (after the University of Amsterdam and the public library), is pleased to contribute. Together with the Dutch Press Museum housed on the same premises, this contribution is about censorship. In September an exhibition on this subject will feature a wealth of material from the iish collections. In a sense the history of the iish relates directly to this theme, as we will argue in the last section of our lecture. But first we will explain this concept.

Many things are prohibited, ranging from ideas through expressions of them to actions. As far as actions are concerned: social movements and organizations deriving from them and focused on them may be prohibited in violation of the right of association and assembly. This right in fact predates the French Revolution (and the above guilds are a manifestation of this right) but has become acknowledged as a right only gradually since then. Also for workers.

Rather than elaborating on this, we will focus on censorship: the type of prohibitions where authorities target public manifestations of thoughts and ideas, verbal, visual, and audio expressions. The ability of authorities to prohibit the expression of thoughts or the possibility that they will, subsequently instigates all kinds of self-censorship, which may involve refraining from publication or requesting permission in advance in the form of instructions, approbations, and the like. This indirect impact of censorship probably exceeds the direct one – as holds true for other forms of intimidation as well.

Practising censorship is complicated and requires a great many actors. Authorities rarely act of their own accord; especially in countries with a semblance of democracy, where pressure from social groups is required. Traditionally, churches have figured prominently in this respect, especially where separation between church and state is absent or poorly defined. From the start of the nineteenth century, social lobby groups have endeavoured to remind the state of its duties. One early example was the American Society for the Suppression of Vice from 1802. This obviously approximates self-censorship as well. Opinions and actions vary on this subject within the state apparatus: some persons and organs favour censorship, but in most cases they are outnumbered by ones that object.

Finally, an important group of actors evades censorship. After all, censorship measures are never universally accepted. In fact, censorship encourages specific persons, often motivated largely by commercial interests, to print banned books, perform prohibited plays, or post forbidden motion pictures on the Internet anyway.

What do authorities like to prohibit? First, political expressions that displease them. Insults directed at friendly heads of state are an obvious example, as are attacks on the incumbent regime. Displeasing theological views are
applied censorship to such matters as licentious books, pictures or plays. Neither does it appear that the one existing example of proletarian government, Soviet Russia, takes this issue very seriously. A plausible explanation lies in the fact that the middle class position can be maintained by generations only by thrift, prudence and self-control – virtues that are believed to be seriously shaken by licentious communications. In England, France, the Netherlands and Germany the antagonism of the middle class to aristocratic licentiousness exhibited itself in diatribe and sermon long before the bourgeoisie attained a position of political dominance.

The fourth and final theme concerns military censorship in times of war or the imminent threat thereof. This form of censorship, especially of letters, is intended to prevent dissemination of information that might be useful to the enemy. Censoring letters from prisoners pertains to this category as well.

Brief historical review

Although early forms of censorship of manuscripts are known (e.g. the actions of the legalists in China in the third century BCE, targeting views conflicting with Confucianism), during the many centuries that literacy was rare, the theatre was the primary source of concern to the authorities. In classical antiquity several examples are available from both Greece and Rome. Aeschylus, Euripides, and Aristophanes all experienced this type of censorship directly. A strictly monothestic religion such as Christianity attributes tremendous value to the prohibition of heterodox writings. Once elevated to the state religion, such bans may be enforced systematically. In 499 Pope Gelasius issued a catalogue of banned books that is considered to be the first Index. The ban, however, did not relate to personal use of the texts listed but to reading them aloud in public. Once again, literacy was apparently minimal. Another example is the fierce struggle between iconoclasts and iconodules in the Byzantine Empire: were the express public and visual communication media such as murals and icons allowed, and, if they were, which depictions were permitted and which prohibited?
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Bachrach-Sprague (N.), with the collaboration of and Bergner (W.), 1870: Index Librorum Prohibitorum Sanctissimi Dominii Nostri Gregorii XVI Pontificis Maximi. Cum Summis Pontificis Specialis Concessione Modestiae 1850 Recusus [. . .]. (1599–1851) (Paris, Rouveyre, 1877). Ever since its beginnings, the Roman Catholic Church has tried to protect the faithful against what it sees as dangerous thoughts and writings. Following the invention of the printing press this led to the Index Librorum Prohibitorum (1559; Pope Paul IV). The index contains texts banned by the Roman Catholic authorities because they were said to endanger faith and public morals. (IISH Library, 128/124).
forced the church to take measures. In 1501 Pope Alexander VI issued an encyclical against printing without prior authorization. Many states copied this initiative, including Rome’s archenemies, whose views differed in all other respects. In 1531 the Scottish parliament, for example, prohibited printing without authorization, while in England the London Stationers’ Company, founded in 1536, was granted the exclusive right to print. In 1586 this right was extended to Oxford and Cambridge, the number of printers was restricted, and they were ordered to submit all their commissions to the archbishop of Canterbury or the bishop of London for approval.

In 1539 the pope had published an official list of banned books (the famous *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*). This list was updated regularly and abolished only in 1966.

There was one exception to the rule of nearly ubiquitous advance censorship, which persisted into the eighteenth century and beyond (abolished first in England in 1659): the Dutch Republic.

**The Case Study of the Dutch Republic**

The Dutch Republic started with a placard in 1581 that differed little from what happened elsewhere: advance censorship by the authorities. This changed following the debates during the Synod of Dordt (a general convention of Dutch Calvinist churchmen held in 1618-1619). When the subject of censorship came up there, participants listened with approval to the reports from foreign observers. After what we have seen, it is not surprising that the English brothers advocated advance government censorship, requiring written authorization for each individual book. They even argued that only those who ‘professed faith in the reformed religion’ should be allowed to work as printers. The representatives from the Palatinate mentioned the need for political as well as government censorship and advised that censors be well-paid. The Hessians vehemently agreed and referred to dangerous books, such as … the Koran. They – and especially the Swiss – thought that university professors would be in the best position to determine which texts were harmful. Finally, the speakers from Bremen pointed out that the rules for books should apply for paintings and prints as well.

The Synod, however, failed to take into account the actual course of events. Before the churchmen were able to formulate a recommendation to the States General, this body had taken a decision on the subject on 22 December 1618, introducing the principle of retroactive censorship, emphasizing politically dangerous writings and ordering that all books list the name of the printer, as well as the place and year of publication. While this was very convenient for cataloguers, they were not the primary consideration. This was a type of framework act: implementation was in effect entrusted to the local authorities. These principles persisted until the Batavian era, despite an unsuccessful effort by the Court of Holland in 1769 to appoint *censors librorum*, who would have performed advance inspections.

In daily practice, retroactive censorship appears to have been virtually ineffective. Nearly everything passed in the Dutch Republic, notwithstanding all the attention that has been devoted by historians to the exceptions, as well as to the only true victim of book censorship under the Republic: Adriaen Koerbagh. In 1669 this freethinker died in jail in Amsterdam, after serving only a few months of a ten-year sentence for publishing about his Socinian and Spinozist ideas.

From about 1700, England became the first other country in Europe to emulate the liberal practices of the Republic. Sooner or later, the American and French revolutions and the adoption of their principles in other countries paved the way for book censorship to be eliminated everywhere. As a result, the Republic, and subsequently England, ceased to be the exceptions to the rule.

**The Iish’s Paradox**

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen adopted by the French Constituent Assembly in August 1789 stated that ‘No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views, provided their manifestation does not disturb...
accordingly, speak, write, and one of the most precious of the print with freedom, but shall be law,’ and that ‘The free community of ideas and opinions is the public order established by law,’ and that ‘The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man. Every citizen may, accordingly, speak, write, and print with freedom, but shall be responsible for such abuses of this freedom as shall be defined by law.’ Although these principles gained widespread acceptance in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, authorities continued to interfere with the freedom of the press and were often prepared to apply or amend the law accordingly. In fact, since the days of the absolutist state of the ancien régime, which, though powerful in theory, tended to be weak in practice, censorship has in many cases become more rather than less effective. This has at the same time forced its victims to become more inventive and innovative. The exhibition of the Press Museum and the iish will offer many examples, some of which are featured in this preview.

It is perhaps fitting to start with what has long been the only book prohibited in post-ww II Holland, Hitler’s vorgang opus. Written, or rather dictated, during and immediately following Hitler’s imprisonment after the abortive coup in Munich in 1923, Mein Kampf was freely published in 1925-1926. After the war, however, copyright was granted to the state of Bavaria, which disallowed its republication. Likewise, in the Netherlands, the government obtained the copyright for the Dutch translation, which has not been reprinted since. In both cases, this circuitous form of censorship leaves people free to own and lend the book and even to sell used copies. Of course, like any dictatorship, Nazi Germany imposed extensive censorship but was quick to denounce others. In September 1938, for example, the German press published (possibly doctored) photographs showing the half-empty front pages of Sudeten-German newspapers, blotted out by the pens of Czech censors.

Ironically, censorship is an important raison d’être of the Amsterdam Institute. A substantial share of its collection relates in some way to the practice, and many documents are rare precisely because they have escaped deliberate efforts to suppress them. This is illustrated by an anonymous letter of 28 July 1934 written from Berlin to Annie Adama van Scheltema, the librarian of the Economic History Library, who soon afterwards became the first librarian of the iish. Its author writes that he has sent a photographed copy of an underground newspaper – as it turned out, an issue of Kampffront, published by German council communists – and promises additional documents, as well as a more detailed explanation of what this is all about. In this and similar ways, the Institute received a wealth of material that miraculously eluded the police forces of many countries. The miniature photograph of Kampffront is probably the only copy still in existence.

One way to circumvent censorship is camouflage. This practice, which may be almost as old as printing, is well represented in the iish collection. Jewish anarchistic migrants in London at the turn of the nineteenth century, for example, published quite a few very
small pamphlets that were easily smuggled in the wide trousers of Talmudic students. With titles like *Memorial Book with Pious Prayers for the High Feast Days*, such pamphlets brought atheist propaganda back to the Jews of Russia. Several decades later, this example was followed by German communists and others who published hundreds of so-called *Tarnschriften* in covers that belied their real content. Titles such as *Strassenverzeichnis von Berlin* or *20 Rezepte für köstliches Backwerk* might thus contain news, political analysis, or the text of the *Communist Manifesto*. The Institute has one of the largest collections in the field, comprising over a third of the 900 or so titles that are known to have existed. The tradition never died, as exemplified by the journal *Plankton* (1969), disguising an issue of *Internationale situationniste* for distribution in Eastern Europe, or David Ryazanov’s *Zur Frage des Verhältnisses von Marx zu Blanqui* (1973), which contained documents of the German Red Army Faction.

In the Netherlands, like in many countries, restrictions were tightened during the Interbellum. This was not just a matter of politics but was also the result of the introduction of new means of communication (i.e. the radio), always a source of serious concern to moral and political authorities. Dutch socialists protested in vain against the introduction of preventive censorship of the broadcasting system – ‘objectionable and interfering supervision of adults,’ in the words of Meyer Sluyser (see *On the Waterfront* 17, 2009, p. 5). The pillarization of Dutch society was partially to blame. Various articles in the communist newspaper *De Tribune* that were considered blasphemous gave rise to the ‘*les Donner*’ (1932) to protect religious sensibilities.

Except of course for the war years, the situation did not change fundamentally until the pillarized structure of Dutch society started to crumble in the 1960s. For some time, confusion prevailed, when the Provo movement had many of its publications seized for reasons ranging from *lèse majesté* to sedition, but the courts had difficulty reacting proportionately. Once they did, a considerable liberalization set in, and censorship virtually ceased to exist. The few manifestations came from unusual sources, as in the case of the Dutch Broadcasting Foundation (now), which lost a lawsuit brought by the right-wing Centrum Partij, claiming in 1982 that one of its broadcasts in the standard series of political parties was intentionally disrupted. More recently, however, the pendulum has started to swing back, chiefly as a result of strong reactions against paedophilia and terrorism. The personal papers of the socialist lawyer Edward Bronersma, entrusted to the tsrm, attest at length to changed views on the first topic, which raised great interest in the 1970s but is now almost impossible to discuss dispassionately.

### Report on the General Friends’ Meeting of 3 July 2008

The most important topic at this General Meeting was of course the departure of Mieke IJzermans, one of the founders and driving forces behind the Friends of the tsrm. Thanks and appreciation were expressed for her tremendous dedication and creativity in organizing previous meetings. She always took a personal interest in the individual members, was delighted with new acquisitions, and provided delicious refreshments at the receptions following the meetings. As we announced in our previous issue (*On the Waterfront* 16, 2008, p. 2), she will remain active for the Friends, albeit less prominently. As mentioned in the same issue, Jaap Kloosterman, who recently stepped down as the director and is now head of the Acquisitions Department, will succeed her.

Jaap went on to explain that the tsrm intends to transform the Friends of tsrm (thus far not a separate legal entity and still using the Institute’s account) into an independent Foundation. The composition of the board will correspond closely with that of the Institute to avoid potential conflicts of interest. The board of the Friends as such will advise the Foundation board. While this new structure will entail virtually no changes in practice for the Friends, it will obviously offer legal and tax benefits. Additional details will follow at subsequent meetings.
Joost C.A. Schokkenbroek

Trying-out
An Anatomy of Dutch Whaling and Sealing in the Nineteenth Century, 1815-1885
ISBN 978 90 5260 283 7, 366 pp., € 29,90

This study describes and analyses a wide array of initiatives leading to the hunt, by Dutch whalemens, of whales and seals in Arctic waters, the temperate zones of the South Pacific and the waters of the Dutch East Indies during the major part of the nineteenth century (1815-1885) – an era neglected so far. In his pioneering book the author, Curator at the National Maritime Museum Amsterdam, focuses on the men involved in the two maritime industries – be it on shore or aboard the whaleship, as entrepreneur and whaleshipowner, Inn keeper, public notary, client for whale and seal products or, of course, whalemans and seal hunter. Research conducted in many divers and hitherto relatively uncharted archives brings to the fore the organisation and scope of financial involvement from the national government. Dutch socio-economic and maritime developments in whaling and sealing are compared with international developments in these fields. Peeling layer after layer Schokkenbroek reveals the back bones of the two maritime industries. As such, Trying-out is what it stands for – an anatomy of whaling and sealing in the nineteenth century.

Bo Poulsen

Dutch herring
An environmental history, c. 1600-1860
ISBN 978 90 5260 304 9, 264 pp., € 35,00

In the seventeenth century the Dutch herring fisheries in the North Sea was the largest single fishery in Europe. For centuries the Dutch practice of fishing the entire North Sea with factory-like vessels was the most sophisticated and demanding fishing operation anywhere in the World. Processing the catch on board immediately after hauling in a night’s catch, a prime product was made, which was marketed and sold all over Europe and overseas and provided food for millions. This study assesses the dynamics of the North Sea herring, and herring fisheries over the span of several centuries, greatly increasing our understanding of the driving forces in pre-modern natural resource exploitation.

Zina Dubbe, Eva Geudeker, Frances Gouda, Catrien Santing, Kristine Steenbergh & Anna Tijseling (red.)

Lijf en leden
Gender en het historische lichaam.
Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis 28
ISBN 978 90 5260 310 0, 202 pp., € 17,50

Met Lijf en Leden. Gender en het historische lichaam verkent het Jaarboek voor Vrouwengeschiedenis de vele aspecten van de geschiedenis van het materiële lichaam vanuit een genderperspectief. In artikelen met theoretische, (kunst-)historische, oral historical en letterkundige invalshoeken worden lichamen uitgelicht tegen uiteenlopende achtergronden als de historische medische praktijk, het denken over de zintuigen, het barokke naakt en het belang van ondergoed. Dit nummer doet u aan den lijve ondervinden hoeveel het materiële lichaam de gendergeschiedschrijving te bieden heeft.