

## Provisional Programme

### SPRING CONFERENCE 2020

Work in progress: power and politics from a historical perspective

23-24 April 2020, Utrecht



**Organization: Netherlands Research School Political History  
in cooperation with Koos-jan de Jager, Lidewij Nissen and Nanka de Vries**

**Date:** Thursday 23 and Friday 24 April 2020.

**Location:** Utrecht University, Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21, Utrecht. Accessible via the entrance of Drift 27 (University Library City Centre), entrance via the courtyard at the rear. There is virtually no parking space in the vicinity of the library. It is, however, easy to reach by public transport from Utrecht Central Station (bus lines 28, 18 or 2 to Janskerkhof bus stop) or a 15 minutes' walk through the historical city center.

#### Program day 1 – 23 April 2020

Time	Event	Location
09.15-09.45	Registration, coffee and tea	Hall, Drift 21
09.45-10.00	Opening on behalf of RSHP DIRK JAN WOLFFRAM	Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21
10.00-11.00	Keynote lecture and questions JEROEN DUINDAM, 'Political history beyond the nation state: obstacles, choices, chances'	Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21

*Abstract: The history of states and nations was the prime concern of nineteenth-century academic historians, yet this disposition did not persist long after the second world war. A focus on the political development of a single country has increasingly been viewed not only as reflecting parochialism, but also as fundamentally flawed because of its tendency to neglect the impact of exchange. In fact the same critique has been used against comparison in its classic form: the juxtaposition of various states. Entangled history, with its numerous variants -- transnational, connected, croisée -- has become the norm for the current*

generation. The challenge of global history further complicates the choices of researchers: while many agree that we cannot neglect the global dimension, it remains far from clear how we can effectively integrate it. Jeroen Duindam discusses these developments from the perspective of his research themes and choices, pleading for a reinvigorated form of comparison, combined with *longue durée* and global perspectives.

**11.15-12.45** Panel round 1

**Politics and institutions**

Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21

PETER POSTMA, “‘Nothing matters but the future”. Dutch captains of industry and their visions of the Netherlands in a changing world order (1934-1948).’

ALESSANDRA SCHIMMEL, “A Europe of Consumers: BEUC and the Europeanisation of consumer organisations”

TIM VAN DER MAAREL, ‘Measuring and conceptualising historical institutions’

Chair: TBA

**International relations and political power**

JOSSIE VAN TIL-DUIJSTERS, ‘The generation of 1813, the new monarchy and her role in the new European security culture’

Drift 6, kr. 007

ELZELIEN VAN DE PAVERD, ‘Military Innovation and Political Power: The British Cavalry and the American Horse-Tamer John Solomon Rarey (1827-1866)’

JELLE PLESMAN, TBA

Chair: TBA

**12.45-13.45** Lunch and poster presentations

Hall, Drift 21

**Poster presentations**

LINDA BURGER, ‘Euroscepticism in the Netherlands, 1990-1993’

ANNELOTTE JANSE, ‘The Pursuit of White Security. The Far Right in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United States (1970-2015)’

NANKA DE VRIES, ‘Eleanor Roosevelt and the United Nations.’

**13.45-15.45** Workshops

Workshop Academic writing (in English) by MARIELLE MATTHEE Drift 6, kr. 007

*Academic writing is a creative process: from the initial idea to the final version of your paper or dissertation. However, it may not always be easy to get the ideas on paper, particularly when the language in which you write is not your native language. During the workshop, we will do some practical exercises that will help you to formulate your ideas in concise sentences and well-structured paragraphs while bearing your readers in mind.*

Workshop Radio-interview en mediaoptredens (in Dutch) by LEONARD ORNSTEIN Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21

*Mediaoptredens zijn voor wetenschappers belangrijke momenten. Zeker voor jonge onderzoekers kan een goed mediamoment nationaal of internationaal aandacht genereren. Maar hoe doe je dat eigenlijk – optreden in de media? Hoe bereid je een radio-interview voor? In deze workshop gaan we aan de slag met praktische vaardigheden voor promovendi.*

**15.45-16.15** Break with coffee and tea

Hall, Drift 21

**16.15-17.45** Panel round 2

### **Governments and ideologies**

Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21

PAULINE ONDERWATER, 'Safety, government and citizens in the Netherlands during the First World War'

AYMAN AL SHARAFAT, 'Language planning and policy issues in the speeches and addresses of the United States' presidents from 1901 to 2019.'

CELIA NIJDAM, 'The Federal Theatre Project and Hallie Flanagan: Visions of a National and Relevant Theatre.'

NAOMI WOLTRING, 'The devil is in the details?'

Chair: TBA

### **Political protests and resistance**

Drift 6, kr. 007

PAUL REEF, 'Politicizing a game? Researching protests against mega sport events reflexively.'

MARTIN SCHOUPS, 'Masters of the street. Practices of spatial claims-making in the city of Antwerp, Belgium, 1880-1940.'

DEBBY ESMEÉ DE VLUGT, '"Alle Macht aan het Volk!": Black Panther Solidarity in Dutch (Caribbean) Context.'

PAUL BRENNAN, 'The Civil Liberties of America's Liminal Citizens: The ACLU and Aliens, Native Americans and the American Territorial Possessions During the Interwar Years.'

Chair: TBA

**18.00-19.30**

Dinner

TBA

**20.00-22.00**

**Publieksevenement (in Dutch)**

TBA

Tussen proefschrift en bestseller. Historici en het schrijven van publieksboeken.

TBA

### **Program day 2 – 24 April 2020**

**Time**

**Event**

**Location**

**09.30-10.00**

Coffee and tea

Hall & Sweelinckzaal,  
Drift 21

**10.00-11.00**

**Keynote lecture and questions**

Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21

INGER LEEMANS AND GEERTJE MAK, 'Molding land and people: cultivation and emotionalization as political tools'

**11.00-11.15**

Break with coffee and tea

Hall, Drift 21

**11.15-12.30**

Panel round 3

### **Religion and political change**

Drift 6, kr. 007

HENK TIJSSEN, 'Protestants nationalisme en 'christelijk' nationaalsocialisme in het interbellum en tijdens de Duitse bezetting in met name de Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk (1917-1945).'

MARLEEN VAN DEN BERG, 'Politics and religion in the investigation of the persecution

and legal restoration of the Jews in Rotterdam.'

KOOS-JAN DE JAGER, 'Fighting God's War. Religious and Political Motivations in the Indonesian War of Independence, 1945-1950.'

Chair: TBA

### **Power and politics at the courts**

Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21

BRUNO FARINELLI, 'Hunting for ambition.

The royal hunt and the representation of power at the court of Savoy.'

QUINTEN SOMSEN, 'Informele macht: Intimen en vertrouwelingen aan het hof.'

LIDEWIJ NISSEN, 'Female dynastic power in the Dutch Republic: comparing the consorts of four seventeenth-century Nassau stadtholders'

Chair: TBA

<b>12.30-12.45</b>	Closing remarks	Sweelinckzaal, Drift 21
<b>12.45-13.45</b>	Lunch	Hall, Drift 21
<b>14.00-15.30</b>	<i>Social networking activity</i> , organized by the PhD-council	Utrecht, City Centre

### **Instructions for registration and participation**

Please register or confirm participation in the seminar before 1 April 2020 via this online form: <https://forms.gle/oXZEhDWvzUFqm8yV8>. The RSPH offers lunch, dinner and drinks.

Conference fee for non-OPG-members is € 75,00. Participants who are not a member of the OPG will receive an invoice for the conference fee. Please send an email to [bu-reau@onderzoekschoolpolitiekegeschiedenis.nl](mailto:bu-reau@onderzoekschoolpolitiekegeschiedenis.nl) if you have any questions about the fees.

### **Keynote speakers and organization**

**Prof. Dr. Jeroen Duindam** is Professor of Early Modern History at Leiden University. The comparative study of rulers and elites forms the core of his research interest. Initially concentrating on early modern France and the Austrian Habsburg lands in the European dynastic context, he has been moving towards a global perspective including the Ottoman empire and Late Imperial China as well as Africa. Recent publications include: *Dynasties. A global history of power 1300-1800* (2016, Cambridge University Press) and *Dynasty. A Very Short Introduction* (2019, Oxford University Press).

**Prof. Dr. Inger Leemans** is Professor of Cultural History at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Principle Investigator of a NL-Lab, a new research group on Dutch Culture and Identity at the Humanities Cluster of the KNAW (Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences). Her interdisciplinary work covers: Cultural Economics, History of Emotions/Senses, History of Knowledge and Digital Humanities. Currently, she works on a cultural history of stock trading and financial crises, researching trade practices and discourses as affective economies. She is also director of ACCESS, the Amsterdam Center for Emotion and Sensory Studies, and one of the hosts of the History of Finance platform (<https://history-of-finance.org>).

**Prof. Dr. Geertje Mak** is Professor Political History of Gender at the University of Amsterdam and researcher at the NL-LAB of the KNAW. She has written on the history of lesbianism, female masculinity, and hermaphroditism in North-West Europe in the long nineteenth century, as well as on histories of Dutch migration, racial science and colonialism. Currently, her research concerns practices of Dutch colonial governmentality, in particular the fundamental role of householding (bodies, houses, work, care, sexuality, children) in protestant missionary strategies aiming at transformation in the norther part of Dutch New Guinea. Latest publications include 'Touch in Anthropometry. Enacting Race in Dutch Papua New Guinea 1903 – 1909', in: *History & Anthropology* and (with Saskia Bultman) 'Identity in Forms: Paper Technologies in Dutch Anthropometric Practices around 1900', in: *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity*, 7 (2019):64-109

**Koos-jan de Jager MA** is a second year PhD candidate at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam working on religion and warfare, focusing on the Indonesian war of independence, 1945-1950.

**Lidewij Nissen MA** is PhD candidate at Radboud University in Nijmegen. She works on a project called The 'First Ladies' of the Dutch Republic: The Political Agency of the Stadtholders' Wives in the Seventeenth Century. She is currently in her second year of her PhD trajectory and is a PhD member of the OPG.

**Dr. Margit van der Steen** is Managing Director of the Research School Political History in the Netherlands and affiliated researcher at Atria.

**Nanka de Vries MA** is a third year PhD candidate in American History at the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies (RIAS) in Middelburg, the Netherlands. In her PhD, she explores the various strategies used by Eleanor Roosevelt to promote the UN's global mission as an international institution for peace and justice.

**Prof. Dr. Dirk Jan Wolffram** is Director of Education of the RSPH, Professor in the History of Administration and Politics in the Modern Era at the University of Groningen and chairman of the board of editors of the *Low Countries Historical Review (BMGN/LCHR)*.

## Abstracts and biographical notes of participants

### Panel Politics and institutions

#### **Peter Postma, “Nothing matters but the future”. Dutch captains of industry and their visions of the Netherlands in a changing world order (1934-1948).’**

During the economic crisis of the 1930s, contact between Dutch multinational firms and policymakers intensified. In 1934, Philips, Unilever and Shell initiated the *Contactcommissie*, which advised policymakers on trade policy. These contacts continued during the Second World War, through a loose-knit, yet interconnected global network of business-initiated study groups based in London, New York, Curaçao, Buenos Aires, South Africa, and in the Netherlands East Indies. My preliminary research has shown that these study groups consisted of prominent Dutch (transnational) businessmen as well as academics, who advised policymakers and diplomats on a wide variety of international political-economic themes, ranging from colonial ties, ending neutrality policy, European cooperation, the growing political power of the United States, to broader connected social issues. While historians have always been aware of the London-based study group, thus far no comprehensive study of its ideas and influence exists, let alone of the *Contactcommissie* and the network of study groups.

The archival material of these groups, firstly, offers a lens through which the political thought of prominent business actors, in the context of a radically changing world order, can be analyzed. My project, secondly, can also shed light on how ideas circulating in these business networks about the political-economic position of the Netherlands in the postwar world, possibly, were uploaded to the state, and pushed policymakers towards new postwar international political and economic partnerships, such as European economic integration or transatlantic cooperation. Business actors and their political ideas are still, however, largely outside the scope of most political and diplomatic history. In my proposed (poster) presentation, hence, I would like to raise the question: how can these (non-state) business actors, their political thought, and the influence of their interactions with policymakers, effectively be integrated in, and thus broaden political history?

*Peter Postma MA graduated in American Studies in 2010. He works at the Hanze Hogeschool in Groningen and is currently working on a PhD project on the political thought of Dutch captains of industry such as Paul Rijkens (Unilever) and Frans Otten (Philips).*

#### **Alessandra Schimmel, ‘A Europe of Consumers: BEUC and the Europeanisation of consumer organisations.’**

The PhD-project “A Europe of Consumers: BEUC and the Europeanisation of consumer organisations, 1960s-1990s” focuses on the concept of political representation in consumer organisations in the European Community, and in the European umbrella organisation BEUC (*Bureau Européen des Unions de Consommateurs*) in particular. It aims to analyse ideas and practices of political representation within these organisations; to examine how a European consumer interest has been negotiated, and how BEUC emerged as the voice of the European consumer. The European organisation BEUC is approached as a transnational

political arena, in which various consumer organisations from differing national contexts and traditions came together and interacted with one another.

Following a two month research trip in early 2020, this presentation will introduce preliminary findings from the BEUC archives, located at the Historical Archives of the European Union in Florence. In line with the project's methodological approach, I aim to chart the concept of political representation within BEUC and its members, the European consumer organisations, using four main clusters of analysis. First, *organisation*. This part will address different types of consumer organisations in terms of structure, funding, and possibilities for member participation. The second cluster discusses consumer organisations' *constituencies*, focusing on membership, socio-economic distribution of its members, and their political affiliations. *Ideology* forms the third cluster, and addresses discrepancies and similarities with regards to organisations' aims, world view, conceptions of 'the consumer', and their outlook on the position of consumer organisations within the sphere between government and market. The last cluster concerns *strategies*, and discusses the various approaches and repertoires of action that consumer organisations have wielded in order to achieve their objectives.

*Alessandra Schimmel is a PhD candidate at Utrecht University, in the section History of International Relations. Her PhD project is part of the NWO-funded research project "Consumers on the March: Civic Activism and Political Representation in Europe, 1970s to 1990s".*

### **Tim van der Maarel, 'Measuring and conceptualising historical institutions.'**

My project focuses on the question why competitive authoritarian states tend to develop high capacity in some areas, such as surveillance, and low capacity in others, such as healthcare and infrastructure, and how this relates to incumbency and economic (under)performance. The project connects to the academic discussion on the role of political institutions, capacity building and democratization. In the project, I argue that current conceptions and measurements of state capacity in this regard are misleading and simplistic.

I argue that leaders choose to invest in specific dimensions of state capacity conducive to staying in power. Their decisions follow a logical model of political survival and are constrained by existing institutions, capacity and (the source of) revenue. The project tests this hypothesis of institutional path dependency via a series of comparative historical case studies.

This approach has two methodological complications. First, the rational choice model employed uses crude approximations for the institutional variables. Second, state capacity is notoriously difficult to conceptualise and measure, with disciplines reducing it to a simplified single proxy or using descriptive methods, complicating empirical comparative analysis. In-depth historical analysis, however can provide more accurate data to test the hypothesis with. However, this raises the question how this can be done in a transparent, meaningful and reliable way.

The main question is how to integrate qualitative and quantitative data from in-depth historical analysis in a constructive, transparent and reliable way into empirical and mathematical models. Or, more broadly, how to use data from historical analysis as input for empirical research? And, in that regard, how to strike a meaningful balance between the detailed and specific information from the historical method and the necessarily simplified and standardized methodology of political and economic science?

*Tim van der Maarel is a PhD Candidate affiliated with the University of Groningen and the Research School Political History of the Netherlands. His current project seeks to contribute to our understanding of how historical path dependency in political and economic institutions shape contemporary political developments and policy decisions.*

### **Panel International relations and political power**

**Jossie van Til-Duijsters, 'The generation of 1813, the new monarchy and her role in the new European security culture.'**

The Congress of Vienna (September 1814 until June 1815) was the start of a European Security culture, in which the new monarchy of the Netherlands had a distinct role as a 'bulwark' against aggression from France. These first years of the new monarchy were a daunting period where every outcome was possible and personal opinions and visions could be decisive. A small elite group, the 'generation of 1813', had to address the feelings on security and at the same time shape the new monarchy. In my research I focus on the ideas of this 'Generation of 1813' which they used to deal with this double task. I use biographical research to gain an insight in their ideas, visions and emotions and their perceptions of threat, protection of interests, order, tranquility and stability and how they dealt with these challenges. There are a lot of sources available like correspondence between these men, who were often related or befriended, and official state documents. In my presentation I want to discuss my first findings about the main ideas these politicians used in those first months of the monarchy and the sources of these ideas: do they originate from the French bureaucracy, the German political sciences, influential books or? At the end I address whether these ideas fit within the concept of security culture.

*Jossie van Til-Duijsters is an external PhD candidate in History at Utrecht University. She had a career of forty years at Utrecht University in IT, especially in Business Information in Human Resource Management and from 2001 onwards in Research Information. She retired in January 2019.*

**Elzelien van de Paverd, 'Military Innovation and Political Power: The British Cavalry and the American Horse-Tamer John Solomon Rarey (1827-1866).'**

In 1857, John Solomon Rarey, a farmer from Ohio, travelled to England to propagate his method of taming horses. In England, peripatetic "horse whisperers" were not unknown. Yet, none enjoyed the phenomenal popularity that Rarey gained.

Within six months, his exploits had become a regular feature in English periodicals of diverse interest, from *The Times* to literary magazines like *The Athenæum*. Within four years, he had become the most famous horse-tamer in the United Kingdom, Continental Europe, and the United States. All but forgotten now, at the time he was welcomed by European aristocracy, endorsed by professional horsemen and sportsmen, and honored by animal welfare societies.

Horses were, of course, ubiquitous. Used for draft, conveyance, sport, and war, horses were both familiar and fundamentally important to everyday economic and social life. But starting or "breaking" a horse (making it fit for human use) was not necessarily a topic of wide-spread interest. Much like the mechanics and maintenance of a car in our times, this was usually the province of professionals. This American horse-mechanic, however, became no less than an international hero, appreciated by men and women from all walks of life.

Army men were among the first to recognize his importance. But how did their recognition aid Rarey in his stellar rise to fame? What kind of political power did the military wield that allowed Rarey to gain access to the Queen within seven weeks on English soil?

*Elzelien van de Paverd is a PhD candidate History at the University of Cambridge, working on John Solomon Rarey (1827-1866), the American Horse-Tamer.*

### **Jelle Plesman, TBA**

In 1867 the Dutch king William III was not only head of state for the Kingdom of the Netherlands, he was also Grand duke of Luxembourg, which was part of the German Confederation. In the aftermath of the Austro-Prussian War (1866) the German Confederation ceased to exist and William started negotiations with France for the sale of Luxembourg (France wanted to extend its territory as a way to balance against the expansion of Prussian territory). The German chancellor Otto von Bismarck seemed to have no objections to the sale. However, when the negotiations became public Bismarck vetoed any sale of 'German territory' and threatened war if the deal went ahead. The Netherlands was caught between a rock and a hard place and its traditional policy of neutrality and aloofness was proving very difficult. My research focuses on the actions of the Dutch government during the eventful weeks of April 1867. How did Dutch foreign policy come to be under these extreme circumstances and how does this relate to the long term tradition of Dutch neutrality?

My presentation will deal with the concept 'balance of power'. A crucial concept for understanding international relations in Europe in the nineteenth century. The literature on this topic is immense (both historians and scientists of International Relations have written extensively and in various ways on this subject). So, how do you know you have a sufficient grasp of the concept without losing yourself completely in the literature? Furthermore, the balance of power is an important factor in understanding the Luxembourg Crisis, but it is not my main focus. How do you write about the topic without getting sucked in to the ongoing scientific discussion? In other words, how do you deal with a 'big' concept that is not central to your dissertation?

*Jelle Plesman studied History and International Relations at the University of Groningen. He now specializes in Dutch foreign policy and International Relations in the nineteenth century. He is especially interested in decision-making processes during international crises. Currently, he is doing a PhD (buitenpromovendus) at the University of Leiden. The topic of his dissertation is the Dutch foreign policy during the Luxembourg Crisis of 1867.*

## **Politics, ideologies and government policies**

### **Pauline Onderwater, 'Safety, government and citizens in the Netherlands during the First World War'**

In my PhD I focus on how relations between civilians, society and government changed in the Netherlands during World War I, a time when pre-war notions of freedom of speech, censorship, civil rights etc. were heavily contested. By comparing metropolitan and rural areas, I am tracing the effects of the war on a lower level, by analysing the way in which local governments responded to the demands caused by the war, the translation of national policies on a municipal level and the role played by expectations from civilians.

In the first part of my thesis, the subject at hand is safety. This section revolves around the question of where the authority for safety lay. Local governments had to deal with local military authorities, and were sometimes subjected to certain rules in a State of Siege situation. What did this practically mean for subjects relating to safety? For instance, where did citizens go with grievances about military measures? How did the 'duty' to help the country to remain safe and neutral become connected to citizenship? On the other side of the coin are disturbances during the war, which were used as an instrument to extend certain rights. How did local governments respond to this breach of the safety of their municipality? In my presentation I will explore this "power struggle", a struggle between different types of authorities (civil and military) and a struggle between duties and rights of both citizens and government.

*Pauline Onderwater is an external PhD at the University of Amsterdam. After completing the research master History she worked at the Dutch institute for war studies (NIOD), was a member of the foundation for the Netherlands and a hundred years First World War, and published about the subjects relating to the Netherlands during the First World War.*

### **Ayman Al Sharafat, 'Language planning and policy issues in the speeches and addresses of the United States' presidents from 1901 to 2019.'**

The Constitution of the US indicates nothing regarding language, that means the Founding of the Union did not select an official language because they believed language to be a personal choice. During the 15th century approximately 250 to 1,000 Indian languages were in the North America. In the colonial period during the 18th and the 19th centuries, Swedish, German, Dutch, Spanish and French were spoken in North America. At the turn of the 20th century and with immigration waves the United States assimilated a large-scale of immigrants with their cultures and languages. At the same time African Americans were under the legal segregation laws of Jim Crow, which stated that Black and White could be separate but equal. Black could only attend segregated schools. The children of Native Americans were taken from their families and societies to attend foreign schools, where they were forbidden from speaking in their native languages. Furthermore, many people concealed their German languages during the German-US conflict in the era of the World War I, due to the distrust of all things German and xenophobic discourse. In the 1960s, after the wars were ended and with the civil rights movements, Federal government came to support some multilingualism programs.

This study analyzes language policy and planning (LPP) in the US through presidential communications and speeches, during the period from 1901 to 2019. This period started from the Theodore Roosevelt administration and ended with the Donald Trump administration. The study examines documents of 20 presidents in the target period. It answers the question of how were LPP described in the presidential documents during the twentieth century. To examine the LPP issues which appeared on the presidential agenda, we use the searchable "Public Papers" archive of "The American Presidency Project" (<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/>), maintained by John Woolley and Gerhard Peters. For clarifying LPP statements the study uses Wiley (1999) and Ruiz (1984) classifications.

*Ayman Al Sharafat, MA (1987) is currently a third year PhD candidate in American studies at Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE) in Budapest, Hungary. Al Sharafat received an MA in American studies from the University of Jordan in 2016.*

### **Celia Nijdam, 'The Federal Theatre Project and Hallie Flanagan: Visions of a National and Relevant Theatre.'**

The Federal Theatre Project (FTP) was a project which was started in 1935 under the Works Progress Administration during Franklin D. Roosevelt's presidency as a way to mitigate unemployment under theatre workers in the United States. The FTP was one of several art projects initiated by the government during that time. The project ended in 1939, leaving an impressive legacy. One of the reasons the project had to close was a government investigation into alleged communist activity. While the accusations of communist infiltration remain unfounded, the FTP was a space where personal ideologies thrived. Instead of focusing on Communist infiltration from outside, this research project will show that people working for the project had already embraced a shift to the left in their personal, artistic, and outward politics.

Moreover, it will focus on the artistic direction of the FTP and how it was mainly steered by its National Director Hallie Flanagan's ideas about art, politics, education, and society. And that this led to the selection and production of certain social and, what she called, "relevant" plays. Moreover, the plays the FTP produced will be analyzed to investigate whether or not they followed the ideologies of the people working for the FTP, or if they were selected to serve the ultimate goals of the FTP, reduce unemployment among theatre workers.

One of the significant issues this project encounters is the fact that it mostly deals with ideas and ideology and that both are difficult to prove if not explicitly mentioned by the actors. While I would like to be able to give a definitive answer about Hallie Flanagan's personal politics, she publically down-played her interest in Russia and Communism, but personally wrote extensively about both. This makes it difficult to tie her to a single, constant position.

*Celia Nijdam is a Ph.D. candidate at the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies and Leiden University. Currently, she is working on a project which explores the exchange between leftist politics, theatre, and expressions of American identity in the New Deal's Federal Theatre Project of the 1930s.*

### **Naomi Woltring, 'The devil is in the details?'**

How much do you need to know of a specific policy area to be able to describe the influence of an political ideology? When doing research on the consolidation of neoliberal ideas and governmentality in the reforms of the Dutch welfare state, one needs to look beyond the obvious. In the utterings of politicians, civil servants and opinion leaders one will find loads of examples of neoliberal ideas. But how exactly does this translate into policy practice? In the case of social housing, does one need to look at the way the sum of rent increases in the social housing sector reflects rent increases in the market sector ('huur-sombenadering')? Does one need to know the details of what is considered 'state aid' according to European competition policy? Does one need to the specifics of the decoupling of rent policy and wage policy? In short, to what extent should the researcher become an expert in the policy area at hand to be able to discuss the influence of an ideology?

*Naomi Woltring is 3rd year PhD-student at Utrecht University. Her research focuses on the consolidation of neoliberalism in the Dutch welfare state reforms between 1989 and 2008, with a particular emphasis on social housing, social security and labor relations.*

### **Political protests and resistance**

**Paul Reef, 'Politicizing a game? Researching protests against mega sport events reflexively.'**

The Olympic Games and FIFA World Cup have become the world's largest mega-events watched by billions, yet their rising social, financial and environmental costs are increasingly controversial. Facing growing opposition, organizers now claim international sport events are apolitical and promote peace, equality, democracy, human rights, and a sustainable legacy. My PhD project analyzes the development of local and transnational protest movement against this societal impact since the 1970s. It asks how local, national, and international actors shape and contest the societal impact of hosting the Olympics and FIFA World Cup. The project focuses on Amsterdam 1992, Athens 2004 and South Africa 2010 as case studies to analyze three key dimensions of how global protest has developed over time: 1) the transfer of protest repertoires 2) transforming interplay between protesters and authorities 3) the function of media perceptions and narratives.

In my presentation, I aim to reflect on the politics behind political historical research on two levels. Firstly, how our choices in research design are political or reflect underlying ideological assumptions. Studying the protests against the negative impacts of sports events arguably is a political act in itself. More fundamentally, my research assesses the political beyond the formal spheres of politics and parliament and draws sport into the arena of political contestation. Analyzing the back-and-forth game of (de)legitimizing this impact between a range of actors lies at the very core of my research, but can they be charted impartially? Secondly, how our individual ideologically or societally situated disposition shape our approaches to and engagement with historical controversies, actors, and discourses. There are many shades of reflexivity between activism and objectivity – anti-Olympic protests can be studied neutrally at all. Rather, the presentation aims to open up the discussion about how to integrate this reflection in day-to-day research practices, or to what extent.

*Paul Reef is a PhD candidate at the Institute for Historical, Literary and Cultural Studies of Radboud University, Nijmegen. His PhD research explores transnational protest movements against the societal impact of the Olympic Games and FIFA World Cup since the late 1970s.*

**Martin Schoups, 'Masters of the street. Practices of spatial claims-making in the city of Antwerp, Belgium, 1880-1940.'**

Urbanization and democratization intertwined on Belgian city streets. Reforms were won on the cobbles, through protest and strikes. At the same time, the street also served as an arena for infighting between ideological blocks, as well as a stage for consensual political rituals and ceremonies. The cities' central role in these processes is readily acknowledged, but a spatial perspective on the practices themselves is lacking. Therefore, this paper questions how city dwellers in a democratizing country used urban space to make collective claims. Focus is on the port city of Antwerp, the largest Belgian city in the period 1880-1940.

In these years the country steadily urbanized, and gradually interchanged its census voting system for single male suffrage.

Through the analysis of police records and local newspapers, my paper will be guided by three questions with a diachronic dimension. First, how did urban dwellers appropriate urban space and how did these repertoires change over time? Second, where in the city did they make claims and did these “hot spots” change over time? Third, which consequences did these actions have on urban space? Methodologically, I take an inclusive scope on what a collective claim is. Both catholic processions, as workers’ demonstrations and gang fighting are included in my analysis. By zooming in on street practices, this study seeks to combine a spatial with a praxeological perspective, rather than to focus on a single movement, organization or issue. In this manner, the diversity of street repertoires will be demonstrated. On the other hand, this paper will argue that these very different phenomena were all motivated by the same principle: the mastery of the street.

*Martin Schoups is a PhD Fellow of the Research Foundation - Flanders (FWO) at the research group Social History after 1750 at the University Ghent. For his PhD-project “Popular Street Politics and Political Modernization” he researches the micropolitics of democratization in an urban context in Belgium, 1880-1940.*

### **Debby Esmeé de Vlucht, “‘Alle Macht aan het Volk!’: Black Panther Solidarity in Dutch (Caribbean) Context.’**

In 1968, revolutionary Curaçaoan journal *Vitò* introduced a new column to its primarily black audience: *Black Panthers na Korsow*. Written by a group of Antillean students inspired by the American Black Panther Party for Self Defense, this column described how racism shaped everyday life in the Netherlands Antilles. *Black Panthers na Korsow* included the iconic image of the black panther and marked the arrival of the Black Power movement in the Dutch Caribbean. Through its focus on black internationalism, the launch of the column symbolized the beginning of a new era of Afro-Antillean protest.

Meanwhile, support of the Black Panther Party was also growing among students and people of color in the Netherlands. Aiming for alliance rather than direct affiliation, activists in Amsterdam established the Solidarity Committee Black Panther Party and the Freedom School. In contrast to their Antillean counterparts, who focused on the Panthers’ campaign for black empowerment, the majority of Dutch activists saw the Black Panther Party as a model for socialist resistance. In their protest, they appropriated Black Panther slogans and iconography to advocate for global as well as local revolutions.

By connecting their own goals to those of the Black Panthers, Dutch (Caribbean) grassroots organizations in the late 1960s placed themselves into a worldwide struggle for black liberation and anti-imperialism. Ultimately, this presentation will explore how Black Panther symbolism created a transnational and intercommunal platform for political resistance that allowed activists to combine their global ambitions with their local agendas. As such, this presentation highlights a central question in my overarching project on Black Power in the Dutch Caribbean between 1968 and 1975.

*Debby Esmeé de Vlugt* is a PhD candidate at the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies and Leiden University. Her primary research interests are transnationalism, North American interconnections, race and resistance, grassroots politics, and cultural identity.

**Paul Brennan, 'The Civil Liberties of America's Liminal Citizens: The ACLU and Aliens, Native Americans and the American Territorial Possessions During the Interwar Years.'**

My dissertation topic is focused on the American Civil Liberties Union's (ACLU) work during the Interwar years on behalf of those with a more ambiguous legal status. That is, cases involving such individuals as non-citizen residents (or aliens), Native Americans, and the subject peoples of the American territorial possessions. Given that the existing scholarship of the civil liberties movement during the Interwar years has been preoccupied largely with only the civil liberties of American state-based citizens, my dissertation aims to broaden the scope, both conceptually and spatially, of civil liberties history.

How I intend on doing this is as follows: the initial priority of my dissertation will be the essential step of establishing how the ACLU itself conceptualized and articulated its work in these areas. In doing so, I will additionally scrutinize their involvement in such cases to determine whether they were consistent in their approach to such work. If it turns out they were not, then I will naturally turn my attention to try and account for such contradictions or exceptions being made. My assessment of their consistency will not be limited to whether this lines up with their more known commitments (free speech, conscientious objection, and due process protections) and activities (protests, publicity, litigation, etc.) on behalf of US, state based citizens but as to whether they were consistent in their involvement on behalf of those whose citizenship status was more uncertain, fluid, and ambiguous, yet unequivocally subject to American governance and power.

*Paul Brennan* is a third year PhD candidate at the Roosevelt Institute of American Studies. Paul works on late nineteenth and early twentieth century reformism and intellectual history.

## **Religion and political change**

**Henk Tijssen, 'Protestants nationalisme en 'christelijk' nationaalsocialisme in het interbellum en tijdens de Duitse bezetting in met name de Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk (1917-1945).'**

Volgens Hobsbawm waren de jaren tussen 1918 en 1950 het hoogtepunt van het nationalisme. Door de verzuiling kende Nederland een diversiteit aan stromingen, zoals de socialistische, de liberale en de confessionele. De confessionele zuil bestond uit de rooms-katholieken en de protestanten. Laatstgenoemden behoorden tot diverse politieke partijen, zoals de ARP, CHU, SGP, HGS (Hervormde (Gereformeerde) Staatspartij), CNA (Christelijke Nationale Actie) en CDU. Protestants nationalisme manifesteerde zich met name in de HGS en de CNA. Volgens beide hervormde partijen was er een relatie tussen Kerk (Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk), Oranje en Vaderland (of ook wel: God, Nederland en Oranje, het drievoudig snoer bedacht door Izak da Costa in 1831). Protestants nationalisme in het interbellum was 'radicaler' dan in de negentiende eeuw. De reden was het felle antipapisme dat in 1925 tot een hoogtepunt kwam met de nacht van Kersten (leider van de SGP) toen het kabinet viel vanwege het gezantschap bij de paus.

De vraag waar het in het proefschrift om gaat, is hoe het kan dat er relatief veel HGS- en CNA-aanhangers in of al vóór de Duitse bezetting een keuze maakten voor de NSB en/of

nazi-Duitsland. Wat zijn de redenen dat Hugo Visscher, de leider van de CNA, tijdens de oorlog de NSB steunde? En waarom deed bijvoorbeeld Lodewijk Ekering, hoofdbestuurder van de HGS en Amsterdams hervormd predikant dat? Hij ging al in 1936 over naar de NSB en zat zelfs in de Amsterdamse gemeenteraad voor de NSB.

Christelijke nationaalsocialisten kwamen tijdens de oorlog op zondag bijeen in wijdingsdiensten die aangekondigd werden onder het kopje 'Evangelie en Volk.' Ook was er een aantal jaren een eigen blad onder die naam. De vraag is: wat is de relatie (als die er al is) tussen het protestants nationalisme tijdens het interbellum en het 'christelijk' nationaalsocialisme tijdens de oorlog?

*Henk Tijssen is docent op het Hoornbeek College (MBO). Hij studeerde geschiedenis aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, schreef verschillende boeken en werkt momenteel aan de Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam aan een proefschrift over protestants nationalisme en 'christelijk' nationaalsocialisme in het interbellum.*

### **Marleen van den Berg, 'Politics and religion in the investigation of the persecution and legal restoration of the Jews in Rotterdam.'**

On the verge of the Second World War, Rotterdam counted the third largest Jewish community of the Netherlands. At the end of the Second World War, the Jewish community of Rotterdam had decreased dramatically. Only less than 5.000 of the 13.000 Jews who lived in Rotterdam in the spring of 1940 survived the war. During the German occupation, the Jews were isolated, deprived and finally deported to the extermination camps. Their houses were sold by German institutions, their belongings were sent to Germany or sold. When the surviving Jews returned to Rotterdam after the War, they had to request their belongings back. In person or by court.

In my PhD project 'Jewish Rotterdam' I want to investigate the processes of looting and persecution and of return and redress. The research will contribute to the knowledge about 'Jewish Rotterdam', especially about the Rotterdam Jews during and directly after the Second World War. Moreover, this research aims to build a bridge between the historiography of the holocaust and the historiography of post-war restoration.

By researching the processes of looting and restoration of rights it is clear that politics plays an important role in my research. By focusing on the Jewish community and especially by looking on the history of the Jewish community of Rotterdam, however religion also can not be omitted. In my contribution to the panel on politics and religion I want to use my research on Jewish Rotterdam as a case study in investigating the relationship between religion, politics and the Second World War. What role does religion play in a history about persecution and legal restoration?

*Marleen van den Berg MA is a PhD candidate at the NIOD Institute of War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies and the University of Amsterdam. In her research project 'Jewish Rotterdam', she investigates the processes of looting and prosecution and of return and redress during and directly after the Second World War.*

### **Koos-jan de Jager, 'Politics and Religion in the Indonesian War of Independence, 1945-1950.'**

Between 1945 and 1950, a Dutch army of 200.000 soldiers fought against the Indonesian army. In two military offensives, in June 1947 and December 1948, the Dutch unsuccessfully tried to overthrow the Indonesian Republic. According to recent research, religion was a central motivating force for Indonesians fighting for their independence. Especially pious Muslims interpreted the war as a religious struggle for the establishment of an Islamic State. In the Netherlands, Dutch military violence during this war is subject of extensive historical research. However, religion is completely neglected as motivation for Dutch soldiers fighting in the Indonesian archipelago. On the one hand, political and military historians tend to focus only on colonial and economic motives for the war. Studies from religious historians on the other hand mostly do not pay attention to the war experiences of Dutch soldiers.

In my PhD-research I bring the fields of political, military and religious history together, focussing on the role of religion in the everyday military practice. During my presentation, I want to highlight the ways in which Dutch churches and confessional political parties supported the war. In their decision to support military intervention in Indonesia, religious arguments were employed, closely interweaved with political arguments. The war against the Indonesian Revolution ultimately was portrayed as God's will. Secondly, I investigate how these religious and political arguments in favor of the war shaped the ideas and war experiences of Dutch soldiers. This investigation is based on the analysis of a large corpus of military egodocuments and reports of Dutch army chaplains. Thirdly, I show how these religious motivations were criticised by Protestant and Catholic missionaries who were working in Indonesia for decades. This Christian criticism of military intervention in Indonesia shows the complexity of religious motivations in the Indonesian war of independence.

*Koos-jan de Jager MA is a second year PhD candidate at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam working on religion and warfare, focusing on the Indonesian war of independence, 1945-1950.*

## **Power and politics at the courts**

**Bruno Farinelli, 'Hunting for ambition. The royal hunt and the representation of power at the court of Savoy.'**

Sovereignty is now understood to be a continuous activity of claim making. As a result, the on-going performance of power can be studied through seemingly trivial activities. If any of these deserves to be studied from that perspective, it is most certainly the princely hunt. It would even be difficult to conceive of something more apt to reach a deeper understanding of the performance of sovereignty. The means [assets] allotted to the hunt offer an instrument to measure the levels of investment in – and therefore the long-term evolution of – that performance. They not only show how royal magnificence was achieved time and again; they also reveal how the symbolic violence exercised by the princely hunt encountered resistance. By studying the evolution of the royal hunt at the court of Savoy over a long period of time, this project has the ambition to deliver a new interpretation of the performance of sovereignty.

Starting from the issues of the last seminar of Jacques Derrida, *La bête et le souverain*, my presentation aims to highlight the problem of the overlap between the animal kingdom and sovereign power. To what extent is the relationship between rulers and animals useful

to understand the mechanism of the symbolic production of power? How did rulers use violence and the prohibition of violence against some animals to increase their power? Why did the hunt become an instrument of political legitimisation? On the basis of some examples and data from economic and jurisdictional sources, I want to show how ruling nature becomes ruling the people.

*Bruno Farinelli MA is PhD student at the University of Antwerp in the research group Power in History, Centre for Political History.*

### **Quinten Somsen, 'Informeel macht: Intimi en vertrouwelingen aan het hof.'**

Mijn onderzoek richt zich op de semi-monarchale regimes van stadhouder Willem V in de Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden en van landgraaf Wilhelm IX van Hessen-Kassel gedurende de late 18de eeuw. De entourage van deze vorsten, het hof, staat centraal in mijn vergelijkende onderzoek. Welke functies vervulde het hof en hoe was het verbonden met de formele regeringsinstellingen en het leger? Kortom, welke positie had het hof in de politieke constellatie van het late *ancien régime*? De aanname dat hoven in deze periode aan politiek belang moesten inboeten, wordt pas recentelijk door historici ter discussie gesteld. De uitzonderlijke staatkundige positie van de stadhouder maakt het daarbij extra interessant om te zien in welke opzichten zijn hof overeenkomsten had met de Duitse hoven, waarmee hij zo nauw was verbonden.

Politiek historici hebben zowel de mannen als vrouwen die een hof functie vervulden lang niet serieus genomen als een relevante groep. Het onderzoek was vooral gericht op ministers, diplomaten, en de formele besluitvormingsgremia. In het *Nederlands Repertorium van ambtsdragers en ambtenaren 1428-1861* is voor de hovelingen van de stadhouder geen plaats en ook in de biografische naslagwerken krijgen zij minder nadrukkelijk vermelding. Selectie en archief organisatie zijn vaak nog steeds gebaseerd op een 19de -eeuwse visie van politieke relevantie. In het licht van de bronnen is dat misschien ook begrijpelijk. Als vertrouwelingen en dagelijkse metgezellen hadden de hovelingen vooral informeel contact met de vorst. Dit maakt het moeilijker om hun politieke invloed en relevantie te bepalen. Welke methoden en bronnen ik gebruik om het politiek gewicht van deze groep te onderzoeken wil ik in mijn korte OPG bijdrage graag aan de orde stellen.

*Quinten Somsen is als promovendus verbonden aan het Instituut voor Geschiedenis van de Universiteit Leiden. Samen met de postdoc-onderzoekers Jos Gabriëls en Joost Welten maakt hij deel uit van het NWO-project Monarchie in beroering, onder leiding van prof.dr. Jeroen Duindam en prof.dr. Ida Nijenhuis.*

### **Lidewij Nissen, 'Female dynastic power in the Dutch Republic: comparing the consorts of four seventeenth-century Nassau stadtholders'**

Whereas historiography on early modern European court politics has traditionally focused on male rulers and courtiers, recent studies have made clear that there were also plenty of opportunities for women to take charge. Women's ability to make use of these opportunities depended not only on the political situation and the formal legislative structures that confined female agency, but also on the personality of the women and their husbands. Princely couples often developed their own division of tasks in order to evolve into a successful 'Arbeitspaar'. Crucial for an examination of the fields of female agency and princesses' ability to make use of them, is a thorough understanding of the dynastic basis of

early modern politics. Both princes and princesses made use of the repertoire of political mechanisms that were connected to and dependent on both their individual dynastic position (i.e. married or unmarried, head of the family or not, etc.) and the position of their dynasty (i.e. ruling dynasty or not, high or low noble rank, etc.). But how did this dynastic basis of princely power function in a non-monarchical setting? In my project, I focus on the dynastic position of women in the Dutch Republic, in which the political arena comprised both the regent members of the sovereign States and the stadtholderly Nassau dynasty. On the basis of a comparison of the responsibilities and competences of four seventeenth-century stadtholders' wives, I investigate if and how the stadtholders' wives dynastic position functioned as a gateway to female power. In my presentation, I will reflect upon the challenges I encounter in trying to connect the vocabulary often used in studies on female power (such as public/private, formal/informal) to the Dutch setting. Moreover, I will also discuss the sources and (comparative) methods I use in order to come to grasp with the activities of the four princesses.

*Lidewij Nissen (1992) is PhD candidate at Radboud University in Nijmegen. She works on a project called The 'First Ladies' of the Dutch Republic: The Political Agency of the Stadtholders' Wives in the Seventeenth Century, which deals with the political and dynastic responsibilities of the princely consorts of four seventeenth-century Nassau stadtholders and is funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). She is currently in her second year of her PhD trajectory and is a PhD member of the OPG.*

### **Poster Presentations**

#### **Linda Burger, 'Euroscepticism in the Netherlands, 1990-1993.'**

This project investigates to what extent Euroscepticism among Dutch voters was taken into account during the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty. Based on an analysis of public and political debates in the Netherlands, it is argued that politicians were aware of growing Euroscepticism among Dutch voters. An analysis of news articles shows that the Danish referendum on the Maastricht Treaty sparked the public debate in the Netherlands about European Integration. An analysis of minutes of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Netherlands shows that this public debate was followed by a critical political debate. The focus of this analysis is on arguments presented by politicians from the smaller Christian parties. According to Dutch voters, these political parties showed the strongest opposition to European integration. Most arguments from the public debate, including critique on the democratic deficit of the European Union and the fear of losing national sovereignty due to the Maastricht Treaty, are reflected in the political debate. In contrast to most research on Euroscepticism in the Netherlands, which focuses on the 2005 Dutch European Constitution Referendum, this essay focuses on the years 1990-1993. As a result, this paper provides a more complete history of Euroscepticism in the Netherlands. In addition, it gives a historical perspective on the concept of Euroscepticism and thus contributes to the debate about this term. Moreover, it adds to scholarly debates about the democratic deficit in the European Union and to what extent power should be shifted from the Member States to the European institutions. Furthermore, this paper contributes to a better understanding of public debates about European integration in the European Union.

*Linda Burger is connected to the University of Amsterdam as a second year Research Master student in the field of history. Previously, she studied European Studies. Her research interests include European history, Russian history, European politics and migration.*

**Annelotte Janse, 'The Pursuit of White Security. The Far Right in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United States (1970-2015).'**

'It's the birth rates, it's the birth rates, it's the birth rates,' read the opening line of the manifesto written by the man who allegedly killed 52 Muslims in Christchurch, New Zealand on March 15, 2019. Since then, the Great Replacement Theory that drove the perpetrator has inspired other attacks across different continents. Despite its recent invention, the theory does not stand itself. Contemporary narratives of hate stand in a longer genealogy of far-right ideas on security, racial fears, and 'grammars of exclusion' and are passed along trans-generationally by members of far-right movements. Yet, mainly concerned with contemporary developments, what has been lacking in most studies on the far right is historical consciousness, the insight that the contemporary far right has been drawing on 'a store of ideas from the past' while taking 'new energy from current-day issues'. Therefore, this project postulates that right-wing extremism has a 'dynamic trajectory' and should be understood as a process of continual evolution and adaptation, which can be mapped through studying the dynamics of far-right securitization moves, narratives of hate, and corresponding practices. It attempts to unearth how these dynamics propelled far-right movements into action in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United States (1970-2015), in order to excavate the historical bases of contemporary far-right ideas and their modification, adaptation, and application. With that, this project applies a much-needed longitudinal perspective to the far right while historicizing security both as a concept and as a set of practices shared by far-right actors.

**TBA**

**Nanka de Vries, 'Eleanor Roosevelt and the United Nations'**

Many researchers have studied the work and life of Eleanor Roosevelt. However, the extensive literature on her continues to expand. A widely analyzed topic in the scholarship on Roosevelt are her activities as a proponent for the United Nations. Scholars have thoroughly examined her role as an official U.S. delegate to the United Nations, until she resigned in 1952, when President Eisenhower came to power. My PhD project builds upon this body of research and follows the new direction set out by historians who now recognize Roosevelt as a cultural, citizen and public diplomat. My project aims to be the first comprehensive analysis on how she continued to educate the public, lobby politicians and mobilize support for the UN from 1952 until 1961, as a private citizen, both at home and abroad.

The hypothesis of this research is that Roosevelt utilized a dual strategy to advocate support for the United Nations: public education and the mobilization of public opinion. The main instruments she used to educate the people on the UN were her radio-shows, TV-shows, speeches, books, articles, lectures and newspaper columns. Additionally, which I will focus on during my presentation, she joined the American Association for the United Nations (AAUN) as a volunteer in December 1952. At the AAUN, an organization that supports and raises awareness of the UN and its policies, she lobbied powerful politicians at the State Department for an active involvement at the UN and tried to change policy within the UN. She raised understanding of the UN in elite circles and at the grassroots level, as she

frequently gave speeches around the country on behalf of the organization. She worked tirelessly to broaden the network of the organization, raised funding, appeared on UN radio spots and wrote newsletters. In doing so, she worked directly with the AAUN's program director Estelle Linzer and its director Clark Eichelberger. Finally, in my presentation I would like to discuss how her advocacy of the UN was influenced by domestic and foreign policies at the time.

*Nanka de Vries MA is a third year PhD candidate in Political History at the Roosevelt Institute for American Studies (RIAS) in Middelburg, the Netherlands. In her PhD, she explores the various strategies used by Eleanor Roosevelt to promote the UN's global mission as an international institution for peace and justice.*